# WORLD
*Problems of*
# MARXIST
*Peace and Socialism*
# REVIEW

February 1978, Vol. 21, No. 2 $1.00

Mongolia/18

Arab liberation movement/77

Monopoly capital power in Canada/92

Anti-communism in the late 70s/29

Southern Africa/102

Panama/86

Workers of all countries, unite!

# WORLD
Problems of
# MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
# REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

February 1978 Vol. 21, No. 2

**Features**

3 International significance of the new Constitution of the USSR
*B. Ponomaryov*

18 A leading regularity
*D. Molomjamts*

29 Anti-communism in the late 70s: some features and trends
*E. Papaioannou*

**Party experience**

40 The socialist state and society's economic development
*W. Stoph*

50 The lessons of February 1948 in Czechoslovakia
*V. Bilak*

**Exchange of views**

64 The communists and the consciousness of the masses
*F. Gamboa*

**Viewpoints**

77 National and class aspects of the Arab liberation movement
*F. Warrad*

86 For Panama's complete independence
*R.D. Souza*

92 Structure of monopoly capital power in Canada
*A. Dewhurst*

102 African panorama
*O. Tambo, S. Nujoma, J. Nkomo*

124 Political situation in Ecuador
*R. Mauge*

**The press**

129 Weapon of the truth
*G. Polikeit*

137 The changing world
*A. Kohen*

*Continued next page*

*Continued*

**Facts and figures**

140 The cost of health under capitalism

143 Contrary to détente

---

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

---

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada. ISSN 0043-8642

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

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

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

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

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE, 71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5V 2P6.

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

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

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

*feature*

# International significance of the new constitution of the USSR

*Boris Ponomaryov*
Alternate PB member and
Secretary of CC CPSU

'In democracy man does not exist for the law but the law for man . . . This is the fundamental distinction of democracy.'*

1

The words of Karl Marx cited above express the very essence of the socialist idea of democracy which is today embodied in the new Constitution of the USSR. This is the law that exists for man. The Constitution has formalized the historic achievements of socialist society, the creation of the world's first state of the whole people, whose chief purpose is to serve the people, their interests, to strengthen the ideals of peace, freedom and socialism. It has defined the magestic prospects of Soviet society's further progress along the road to communism.

The draft of the Fundamental Law of the Soviet state drawn up by a Constitutional Commission presided over by Leonid Brezhnev, that distinguished Leninist statesman, was discussed by the whole Soviet people. For several months, in conditions of full-scale Soviet democracy, in an atmosphere of keen labor and political enthusiasm, Soviet people considered every article of the draft in a businesslike and deeply interested manner, expressed their opinions, put forward proposals, and made critical comments. It can be said without exaggeration that the whole Soviet people took a creative part in making the Constitution.

The Constitution of the USSR differs radically from the constitutions of all capitalist states. According to Lenin, 'the Soviet system provides the maximum of democracy for the workers and peasants; at the same time, it marks a break with *bourgeois* democracy and the rise of a *new*, epoch-making *type* of democracy . . .' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 54). This new-type Constitution corresponds to the state of

*K. Marx, F. Engels. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 3, p. 30.

the new, socialist type. The main features determining the international significance of this historic document are as follows:

— it is a Constitution of peace and friendship between the peoples;

— it is the Constitution of the world's first state of developed socialism, of a society which has to deal with all-embracing creative tasks, including home and foreign policy, the economy, the sum total of social and national relations, science and culture, and the cultivation of high moral standards;

— it is the Constitution of the first state of the whole people known to history, a Constitution for the people, for the protection of their interests, ensuring constant, direct and ever-increasing participation by the working people in government;

— it is a Constitution that grants the broadest and most practical social, political, economic, cultural and civil rights to the working man and is their reliable guarantee;

— it is a Constitution of the further unfolding of socialist democracy offering scope for its perfection, for its growing into social self-government as progress is made toward the classless, communist society.

Our friends, representatives of the progressive, democratic circles across the world rightly call the new Soviet Constitution a 'Manifesto of socialist democracy,' a 'code of developed socialism,' a 'charter of peace and internationalism.'



The new Fundamental Law of the USSR convincingly shows that the Soviet state is a *state of friendship and peace between peoples*.

It qualifies the promotion of peace and development of international cooperation as one of the basic tasks of the socialist state of the whole people. It stresses that 'the USSR steadfastly pursues a Leninist policy of peace and stands for strengthening of the security of nations and broad international cooperation.'

The indivisibility of socialism and peace is one of the chief characteristics of the very nature of the socialist state, a stable tradition of the new society. Everyone knows that the first decree of Soviet power was the Degree on Peace, which was followed by the withdrawal of revolutionary Russia from the First World War. History has recorded an interesting episode connected with the discussion of the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR. The first design for the State Emblem of the republic included a sword. ' . . .Why a sword?' Lenin asked when he saw the design. 'We don't need conquests. A policy of conquest is completely alien to us; we are not attacking, but defending ourselves from internal and external enemies; our war is defensive and the sword is no emblem for us.'

The new Constitution of the USSR gives an extended definition of the aims of the Soviet state in the international sphere. 'The foreign policy of the USSR is aimed at ensuring international conditions favorable for building communism in the USSR, safeguarding the state interests of the Soviet Union, consolidating the positions of world socialism, supporting the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament, and consistently implementing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.' There is no need for any special proof that these precise definitions are no mere declaration. They are a reality of the whole 60-year practice of the Soviet state.

No matter how far the bourgeois propagandists go in talking about the 'Soviet threat,' they cannot refute the indisputable historical facts. And the facts are that the most bloody war in the whole history of humankind, the Second World War, was unleashed by imperialism. And, on the other hand, it was socialism, the Soviet Union that made the decisive contribution to the defeat of fascism, to ensuring peace, the blessings of which could have been enjoyed now for more than 30 years by all peoples of the world, had this peace not been broken yet again by the military ventures of imperialism, such as its aggressive intervention in Vietnam, the Middle East and Africa.

The peaceful and internationalist policy of the USSR, the socialist community, has had a tremendous impact on the whole system of international relations and on international law. Many of the most important ideas and principles of the UN Charter, and of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference were formulated under the influence of the USSR. The initiative and active support of the USSR were responsible for the passing of the UN Declarations on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples; the banning of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons; the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of states, and on the protection of their independence and sovereignty; the strengthening of international security, and many others.

The new Constitution of the USSR, in its turn, fully reflects the most important demands of international law. It is no exaggeration to say that it does this with a fullness unequalled by any constitution of a bourgeois state. Specifically, it states: 'The USSR's relations with other states are based on observance of the following principles: sovereign equality; mutual renunciation of the use or threat of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; cooperation among states,

and fulfillment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law, and from the international treaties signed by the USSR.' The Constitution thus legally formalizes the real substance of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. In the West it is often said that this is just propaganda. But let the bourgeois states include all these principles in their constitutions and try to fulfill them in practice. But the political practice of imperialism, unfortunately, is far removed from this. It persists in the policy of the arms race, it develops more and more new death-dealing weapons systems. So our country and the whole socialist community are compelled to take the requisite measures to strengthen their security, to ensure peaceful conditions of life for all nations. And this, too, is firmly stated in the new Constitution of the USSR.

The Fundamental Law of the Soviet state formalizes the principles of international relations that are taking shape in the socialist part of the world. These principles are based on the high ideals of proletarian internationalism which, in their application to the interstate relations of the socialist countries, are formulated as the principles of socialist internationalism. The attempts to present matters as if the principle of socialist internationalism contradicts the general norms of international relations are quite futile. On the contrary, it represents a further deepening of the general democratic principles of cooperation between nations and defines the formation of a new type of relations based on fraternal friendship, on mutually advantageous economic integration, on ideological and political cooperation, that is, on something that cannot exist in relations between capitalist and socialist countries.

International opinion has noted that the Constitution defines one of the most important duties of Soviet citizens precisely on the principles of internationalism: 'It is the internationalist duty of citizens of the USSR to promote friendship and cooperation with peoples of other lands and help maintain and strengthen world peace.'

3

Representatives of the communist and workers' parties, of the broad democratic forces have particularly noted *the truly popular character of the new Soviet Constitution, of our whole political system.* And in fact, the Constitution states: 'The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, the working people of all the nations and nationalities of the country.' And it continues: 'All power in the USSR belongs to the people. The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR. All other state bodies

are under the control of, and accountable to, the Soviets of People's Deputies.'

Our state of the whole people, which expresses the socio-political and ideological unity of Soviet society, does not satisfy the advocates of bourgeois 'pluralism.' They reject the very possibility of this unity, the blending of the interests of the whole society and of every individual in the activity of the socialist state and its policy.

What can be said about this?

We all know what an uproar was raised by bourgeois propaganda when the first Soviet Constitutions, of 1918 and 1924, established certain franchise restrictions for representatives of the exploiting classes in order to strengthen the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. 'Dictators!,' 'tyrants!,' were among the milder epithets thrown at the political system of the Land of Soviets by the bourgeois press in those days.

But time passed. By the mid-30s the foundations of socialism had been built in our country. The USSR Constitution of 1936 abolished franchise restrictions based on class and political status. The right to vote was granted to all citizens who had reached 18 years of age. Voting by a show of hands was replaced by the secret and direct ballot. Forms of application for employment no longer contained questions on social status on whether the applicant had belonged to the former exploiting classes. And what was the result? The Constitution of 1936 was attacked just as vehemently as our earlier constitutions.

Another 40 years passed. Our country made unparalleled political, economic, social and cultural progress. The democratic foundations of our state, and the whole political system were tremendously developed. The alliance of the working class, the collective farmers and people's intelligentsia, the friendship of the nations and nationalities of the USSR were strengthened. The Soviet state, socialist democracy withstood the rigorous trials of the nazi invasion. Having fulfilled the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet state became a state of the whole people.

The 1977 Constitution reflects a new, higher stage in the development of our political system. What is the result? A new torrent of slander has been heaped on Soviet democracy. These self-styled defenders of democracy are not at all interested in the real advances made by our society. They refuse to notice the profound and comprehensive development of socialist democracy, the extension and consolidation of the real rights and freedoms of citizens. They see nothing beyond the model of the bourgeois state, its political system, although every day brings fresh proof of the regress and decline of bourgeois democracy, fresh evidence of infringements on the vital

interests, rights and freedoms of the working people in the capitalist world.

The emergence of bourgeois democracy 200-250 years ago in a relatively small group of countries of Europe and North America was a big step forward in the political development of civilization. But today this democracy is the receding past of humanity and ever more clearly reveals its inability to satisfy the interests of society.

The leading political trends of the 20th century are determined by the emergence and development of socialist states. And every new level to which the socialist state in the Land of Soviets has risen is yet another blow to the defenders of the doomed system of capitalism and the capitalist state.

We fully realize that while the imperialist world continues to exist, its constantly growing propaganda machine will go on producing all manner of fabrications about the Soviet Union, the countries of existing socialism. But progressive opinion the world over must see that the main source of the attacks on socialist democracy is imperialism, which is defending its system of domination by every means available and imposing its notion of democracy, which imperialism itself violates at every turn.

## 4

The profoundly democratic essence of our state is vividly revealed in the provisions of the new Constitution on the *rights and freedoms of Soviet people*.

The Constitution reflects the new approach of socialism to the problem of human rights. What is the essence of this new approach? What is the contribution of existing socialism to the experience gained in the struggle of all progressive humanity for a radical change in the status of the individual in the modern world? It is:

— first, that socialism has been the first to fulfill the rights of the working people in practice instead of the formal proclamations of citizens' equality characteristic of bourgeois democracy, that it has established real equality of classes, strata, groups, nations and nationalities;

— second, that socialism has, for the first time, guaranteed a wide range of real socio-economic human rights by extending democracy to the sphere of the economy, social relations and culture;

— third, that the new system has closely linked man's political and civil rights with the struggle for socialism and communism and, consequently, for steady progress, for the building of a society that would fully satisfy all the material and spiritual needs of human beings.

The Constitution has substantially extended the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens and strengthened their guarantees. It includes

a much wider range of individual rights and freedoms than is envisaged by the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

The USSR's massive economic and cultural achievements have made it possible not only to constitutionally confirm the rights to work, to leisure, to free education, to maintenance in old age, but also to add new rights that were not in the 1936 Constitution. These are the right to health protection, the right to housing, the right to enjoy cultural benefits, and freedom of technical and artistic work.

Let us take the right to work. There has been no unemployment since 1930 and for almost half a century Soviet citizens have not known what it is to be without work; the whole able-bodied population has guaranteed employment.

Or take the right to housing. Between 1951 and 1977, 55,765,000 flats have been built free of charge for Soviet citizens. More than 200,000,000 citizens have had house-warming parties.

Or take the right to education. From the primary school to the higher educational establishment, everyone studies free of charge, and in the higher schools, technical schools and a number of other educational establishments students receive state grants. In 1950 expenditure on education came to 4,900 million rubles, and in 1977 to 26,500 million.

Let us consider the question of pensions and medical aid. Forty-six million Soviet citizens draw state pensions, which allow them to retire in comfort on reaching pension age. All types of medical aid — at home or at work, in clinics and hospitals, for adults and for children — are free of charge.

Take the right to leisure. In 1976 48 million Soviet citizens spent their vacations at health and holiday centers. In 1950 there were 3,707 health and holiday centers in operation; by 1976 their number had grown to 12,192.

One could cite many other facts testifying to the viability of Soviet citizens' rights.

As Leonid Brezhnev has noted, the new Constitution 'confirmed once again that all the transformations, all the changes that are brought about in our country are designed primarily to secure for every individual truly human conditions of life. It has again shown convincingly that the concepts of freedom, of human rights, democracy and social justice acquire real substance only in the conditions of socialism.'

Socialism's new approach to ensuring human rights is of great international significance because it is one of the fundamental problems of modern times. And this is not, of course, because bourgeois propaganda has recently mounted a vociferous campaign about 'defense of human rights,' which pursues purely speculative aims and is

calculated to worsen international relations and slow down détente.

The problem of human rights exists in reality, independently of imperialism's ideological maneuvers. And working people the world over know that in practice it is linked with the struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the capitalist system, which exploits and oppresses the individual, against imperialism, which enslaves and strangles the freedom of nations. Now the bourgeois politicians are trying to steal a leaf out of our book, but this is not fair play. For it is the communists, ever since the birth of the movement, who have been the most consistent, self-sacrificing and committed champions of the rights and freedoms of the working man. It is the communists who spare no effort or even life itself in the struggle against imperialist oppression, social, national and racial discrimination.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community have exerted a tremendous influence in the struggle for the recognition of socio-economic human rights in international law. It was on the Soviet Union's initiative that the individual's socio-economic rights were written down in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in international covenants on human rights passed by the UN General Assembly in 1966. Like the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union ratified all these documents. However, the USA and the overwhelming majority of other capitalist countries still abstain from ratifying the 1966 covenants.

This is no accident. Take, for instance, the question of such a vitally important right as the right to work. The more than 15-million army of unemployed in the capitalist countries, including eight million in the richest of the capitalist powers, the United States, is a living reproach to the politicians and ideologists of the bourgeois world who behold the mote in another's eye instead of seriously considering the beam that is in their own.

Or take the question of national and racial equality. Unemployment among Blacks in the United States is double that of the white population. The income of the average Black family is only about half that of the average white family. This gap is not growing any narrower; it is widening. In the United States today there is 40 per cent unemployment among Black youths. The position of American Indians is no better. The equality proclaimed by the Constitution, like many other laws forbidding racial discrimination, remain for millions of Americans a mirage in the desert.

The Soviet Constitution sets forth the rights and freedoms that are fully guaranteed by the state and for the observance of which it is responsible to society.

The guardians of the bourgeois way of life are perfectly well aware that in the sphere of the individual's socio-economic rights their hand

has been played, so they are trying to shift the argument entirely on to the plane of narrowly interpreted political rights. But even here their efforts are doomed to failure.

In guaranteeing broad political rights — freedom of speech, the press, assembly, street processions and demonstrations, and the right to associate in public organizations — the Constitution of the USSR points out that these rights and freedoms are granted in accordance with the interests of the people and the aims of strengthening the socialist system.

What is there here to criticize? It is natural that the Constitution of a socialist society should have the aim of protecting the socialist system and this aim is fully in accordance with the interests of the whole Soviet people, as was once again affirmed by the unanimous approval of the Constitution. How can it be asserted that socialism is wrong in defending the system of public ownership, the political system of the whole people and its peaceful foreign policy from attacks by individuals? No, this is not only a right, but a duty of the socialist state.

In commenting on our Constitution some people in the capitalist countries have expressed anxiety as to whether individual citizens have sufficient opportunity to express their views in terms of fulfillment of the right to criticize shortcomings, including the activity of various people in positions of authority, the clash of different trends in the arts, and so on. This is a practical problem and in socialist conditions it is solved in a practical way, on a consistently democratic basis. The new Constitution not only formalizes this practice, it also creates better conditions for its further development and perfection. 'Every citizen,' states the Fundamental Law, 'has the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organizations for improving their activity, and to criticize shortcomings in their work. . . . Persecution for criticism is prohibited. Persons guilty of such persecution shall be called to account.'

5

The truly popular character of our system, its concern for the interests of all society and each individual, its consistent adherence to the cause of peace are embodied in the *gigantic creative activity of the Soviet state*. By broadly defining the tasks and functions of the state in guiding the national economy the Constitution has shown the world the true purpose of the socialist state as an effective instrument for multiplying social wealth and improving the people's well-being.

The Constitution describes the bedrock of our state in the following words: 'The supreme goal of social production under socialism is the fullest possible satisfaction of the people's growing material, cultural

and intellectual requirements.' Not a single bourgeois constitution could include such a principle, let alone carry it out in practice.

The enormous scale of economic development in our age, the unprecedented successes of science and technology, which make it possible to constantly raise the productivity of social labor have made an urgent issue of the problem of effective management of the economy. The expansion of the functions of the bourgeois state in the economy, the development of state-monopoly capitalism have provided fresh proof of the failure of capitalism's political system to come up to the demands of economic and social progress. The orientation of many branches of the bourgeois economy on arms production, the formation of gigantic military-industrial complexes expose yet again the anti-popular direction of the activity of the bourgeois state, the deformed nature of its intervention in economic life.

The planned socialist economy that has become established in our country is the real embodiment of the idea of management of the economy by the people themselves, without the bourgeoisie, without the monopolies. This is its profoundly democratic essence. And this is also the foundation of the socio-political orientation of our country's economic progress. Today, when the whole world can see the results of the 60-year development of the USSR, no one can doubt that this is peaceful construction, aimed entirely at perfecting society, at improving the working people's well-being. The Soviet Union is wholly dedicated to the great goal of building communism on its own soil. And if this is a 'threat,' it is certainly not the kind that our adversaries in the West and East keep telling the world about with such unforgivable disregard for the truth. It is an example of creating a model of a more perfect, effective, just and democratic social system.

Some foreign commentators express doubts as to whether the Constitution assigns too large a role to the state, whether this could lead to a slackening in the activity of the social institutions representing the public at large. Does the Constitution not intensify the elements of centralism at the expense of democracy in guiding the economy and social and cultural processes?

We shall answer at once that there are no grounds for such misgivings. It is a fact that the socialist state is still assigned a huge role in guiding the life of our society. But at the same time, alongside the constant perfecting of the work of the state apparatus, new and extremely important measures to strengthen the democratic, popular principles of its activity are being put through, the role of the public organizations in running the affairs of society and the state is being substantially increased, and control by the people strengthened.

A fundamental feature of the Soviet political system lies in *the*

*organic blending of state and social principles, of the work of the political organs with the activity and creativity of the people themselves.*

A striking example is provided by the role of the work collectives in managing the affairs not only of factories, offices, and collective and state farms, but also the whole of Soviet society. The new Constitution raises this role to a new, higher level. The first chapter states: 'Work collectives take part in discussing and deciding state and public affairs, in planning production and social development, in training and placing personnel, and in discussing and deciding matters pertaining to the management of enterprises and institutions, the improvement of working and living conditions, and the use of funds allocated both for developing production and for social and cultural purposes and financial incentives.'

Not a single bourgeois constitution makes, or could make, such a statement. It is no accident that the question of worker participation in the management of enterprises is one of the most important issues in the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries. The monopolies have complete control over the management of plants and factories and in practice give the workers no part in it. As for the political activity of work collectives, their speaking out and acting on major questions of state policy, these things are forbidden and suppressed at capitalist enterprises.

A fundamental feature of our state is the fact that its bodies are surrounded by millions of activists who do not belong to the state apparatus but participate daily in state administration.

Who are these activists? They comprise 35 million people working together with the deputies in the Soviets of People's Deputies; 9.5 million people represented in the people's control; 3.5 million members of the standing production conferences at plants and factories; and 3.2 million members of the management boards of collective farms. It has been estimated that one in four citizens of our country over the age of 18 takes an active part in the daily administration of state affairs.

## 6

The statements of bourgeois ideologists on *the role of the Communist Party in our country's political system* bear no relation to reality. The defenders of the bourgeoisie do not understand, or refuse to understand, that the role played by the Communist Party in socialist conditions cannot be compared with the role of the bourgeois parties in the capitalist countries. The CPSU, the party of the working class, is the vanguard of the whole Soviet people. It embodies all that is most progressive and revolutionary, all that is most active, professionally

qualified and dedicated to communism that is to be found among the workers, peasants and intellectuals. It is the flower of the people, its pride. And at the same time it is the flesh and blood of the people themselves.

Leonid Brezhnev has expressed this in a striking phrase: 'To try to counterpose the party to the people,' he said, 'by talking about the "dictatorship of the party" is tantamount to trying to separate, say, the heart from the whole of the body.'

Being the vanguard is not only an honor, but a great responsibility. Soviet communists were always on the most difficult and dangerous sectors in the years of the Civil War and the Patriotic War. Today also, the communists perform the most complex and difficult tasks in economic construction, in the armed forces, and in the foreign-policy activities of the state.

Formulating the targets and prospects of the country's social development and the political line in world affairs is becoming an ever more important part of the processes of guidance in the context of the gigantic growth of the scale of the economy, the deepening of social tasks, the growing complexity of the problems of international life. Only the party as the vanguard of the people can successfully perform this important and very responsible function. It is the headquarters of the country's theoretical and political life.

What the apologists of bourgeois democracy find it most difficult to grasp is the simple truth that the communists are not just a group of functionaries in top party organizations, which is how bourgeois parties operate. The communists, all the more than 16 million members of the party, are the most active section, the advanced detachment of the people. They are all engaged daily and constantly in performing various tasks of administering public and state affairs at all levels. This is a fundamental feature of our political system and it has an incomparable advantage over the bourgeois system, where administration is the privilege of persons in authority representing the interests of the ruling class.

The new Constitution defines the role of the CPSU as the leading and guiding force of our society and state, its place in the political system of the USSR, and lays down a definite constitutional framework for the activity of party organizations. It formulates the following vital principle: 'All party organizations shall function within the framework of the Constitution of the USSR.' This standard is designed to further enhance the role of the Constitution as the Fundamental Law, to clearly delimit the tasks and functions of the party and other institutions of our political system. This approach is of enormous practical as well as fundamental significance and makes it possible to improve efficiency in all guidance of socialist society and fulfill

the scientific principles of administration even more consistently.

Bourgeois ideologists counterpose the experience of the development of the political system of existing socialism to the multi-party system. But this multi-party system did not come into being as a gift from the bourgeois state to the masses. Even now in some capitalist countries it means only the existence of several parties of the bourgeoisie itself. In the course of a fierce, uncompromising struggle lasting for centuries the workers, peasants and other groups of the working people have won from the bourgeois state the right of existence of their parties, including the communist and workers' parties. However, the whole experience of the 20th century indicates that in times of crisis monopoly capital does everything to reverse these gains, to abolish the progressive revolutionary parties and to ban or closely restrict representation of the workers and other working people in parliament.

The zealous defenders of bourgeois democracy who, magnifying glass in hand, searched for infringements of rights in the socialist countries, would be well advised to look back a little more often at the not so distant past of the capitalist states. German fascism arose in the conditions of a 'pluralist' democracy in Germany during the Weimar Republic, where the Social-Democratic Party had been in power for a number of years. The establishment of a fascist dictatorship not in some outlying area, but in the heart of Europe with its long democratic traditions (Germany and Italy), strikingly confirms what the communists, what Lenin had asserted long before — that the bourgeois state was fatally sick, that it had an obvious tendency to reject democracy. And only the active, consistent, self-sacrificing struggle of the working class in alliance with the peasantry and progressive intellectuals could prevent this state from sliding into the abyss of militarism and diehard reaction.

## 7

A distinctive feature of the socialist state is the *constant perfecting and developing of socialist democracy*. Having passed through the period of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, brought into being by the need to defend revolutionary gains, suppress the resistance of class enemies and fundamentally transform social relations, our state has grown into a state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of all classes, groups, nations and nationalities of the country. This is the main expression of the advances of socialist democracy, the main political achievement of the road it has travelled since the great October.

The Constitution itself not only formalizes the existing level of democracy, but also sets out a program for its further development.

'The principal direction in the development of the political system of Soviet society,' the Constitution states, 'is the extension of socialist democracy, namely, ever broader participation of citizens in managing the affairs of society and the state, continuous improvement of the machinery of state, heightening of the activity of public organizations, strengthening of the system of people's control, consolidation of the legal foundation of the functioning of the state and of public life, greater openness and publicity, and constant responsiveness to public opinion.'

The development of socialist democracy derives from the very nature of socialism as the first phase of communism. The Constitution of the USSR solemnly proclaims the supreme goal of the Soviet state as the building of a classless, communist society, in which social, communist self-government will be developed. No matter how long the road toward this goal, no matter how difficult the obstacles that have to be overcome, the very struggle for its realization stimulates the all-round progress of society, including the sphere of political relations.

8

As the fraternal parties have noted, *the new Constitution's further development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state* is of great significance.

The building of socialist society has confronted our party and people with the fundamentally new practical and theoretical questions of the development of socialism on its own basis, of the specific ways and forms of transition to communism.

Our party, its Central Committee, the Politbureau, led by Leonid Brezhnev, that true continuer of Lenin's great cause and outstanding champion of peace and social progress, have answered these questions, have developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, of socialist democracy, our whole political system with respect to the contemporary stage of communist construction. The major ideas formulated by the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties include:

— the idea of developed socialism as a stage in the transition of society to communism;

— the idea of the transformation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people as a vital instrument in the building of communism;

— the theory of the party as the leading and guiding force in the political system and the whole society of developed socialism;

— the scientific principles of guidance of society and the state based on blending the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist system;

— definition of the principles of the mutual relations between the countries of the socialist community on the basis of socialist internationalism, equality and mutual assistance, economic integration and all-round cooperation;

— definition of the aims, basic directions and principles of the peaceful Leninist foreign policy of socialism;

— characterization of the new principles of the mutual relations between the socialist countries and the countries that have freed themselves of imperialist domination;

— extended definition of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, etc.

Today these ideas are written down in the new Constitution of the USSR, they constitute the basic law of life of our society and state and definie the perspective for their development toward communism.

The 60 years of the existence of the Soviet socialist state and the approximately 30 years of development of the other states of the world socialist system have yielded splendid models and a great variety of forms and methods for the working class to exercise its leading role and the working people to participate in administration of the state. The practical experience of existing socialism with its democracy of the new, socialist type will, as time goes on, be of ever greater interest to other peoples, to all the progressive forces of modern times.

This conclusion is borne out by the fact that the working class, the peasants, the progressive intellectuals, and broad sections of the petty bourgeoisie, in developing the struggle against the all-powerful monopolies in the developed capitalist countries, find example and inspiration in the experience of existing socialism, which is graphically embodied in the new Constitution of the USSR. This conclusion is also borne out by the experience of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the progressive forces are fighting for the power of the working people, for a socialist orientation.

---

# A leading regularity

*Demchigiyn Molomjamts*
PB member and secretary of
CC, Mongolian People's
Revolutionary Party

## THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES' CONVERGENCE AND MONGOLIA'S EXPERIENCE

On the world scene socialism presents an impressive picture of growing mutual ties among socialist countries. In the 1970s, this process entered a new phase whose substance is the gradual drawing together of the fraternal countries. Delivering the Central Committee's Report to the 25th Congress of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: 'The ties between socialist states are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy and social life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development. This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective regularity.'

In formulating and implementing its policy in all the basic spheres of social life, our party takes account of the regularity of the fraternal countries' convergence, regarding it as a key factor in fulfilling the strategic tasks of Mongolia's socio-economic development. Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the CC MPRP and Chairman of the Presidium of the MPR Grand People's Khural, said at our party's 17th Congress in June 1976: 'The current tasks and perspectives for our country's further development make it exceptionally important to intensify Mongolia's all-round consolidation and convergence in the economic, political, cultural and ideological fields with the fraternal socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place.'

This article deals mainly with how our party has pursued the policy of convergence in the economic field.

The tendency for nations, peoples and countries to draw together is known to stem from the objective internationalization of the productive forces and economic life as a whole, a process engendered by large-scale machine production. But realization of this tendency and its practical embodiment in the relations among peoples and states is not a mechanical effect of the level attained by the productive forces

but is determined above all by the character of the socio-economic system within which the process runs.

In the capitalist world, this tendency is attended by new and subtler forms of exploitation of the working people and also of entire peoples and countries, more intense rivalry among states and competition among the monopolies, inequality, interference in domestic affairs, and so on. In the socialist world, the same regularity is realized in a totally different way. Even before the October Revolution, Lenin wrote that 'economic expediency and internationalist and democratic instinct and consciousness demand the earliest association of all nations and their merging in a socialist society' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 23, p. 68). The development of relations among countries and peoples within the framework of the world socialist system has fully borne out this prediction of Lenin's.

In terms of world history, the way to the drawing together of nations on the principles of equality and fraternal cooperation was inaugurated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose 60th anniversary was one of the most outstanding events of the past year. The development of relations among nations in the Soviet Union offers the first example in the practical implementation of this regularity. The experience gained by the CPSU and the Soviet state in this matter, as summed up in the new Constitution of the USSR, is, we believe, of international significance. The practice of existing socialism shows that the basic factors channeling the objective process of internationalization of the productive forces toward a gradual convergence of socialist nations are public ownership of the means of production and the resultant relations of cooperation among friendly classes not only within individual countries but also on an international scale; the community of the vital interests and goals of the peoples of the socialist countries; the internationalist consciousness of the working class, the chief social force of socialist society rallying together all the other working people; and a correct, Marxist-Leninist policy pursued by the ruling communist and workers' parties.

Although the basic elements of convergence have their beginnings in the formation of the world socialist system, we feel that it would hardly be right to designate relations among the socialist countries in that period as a fully established regularity of convergence. The point is that the latter is a process which reflects not only the quantitative aspect of these relations (say, the volume of cooperation in the various fields) but also the qualitative aspect. Convergence as the leading regularity in the development of relations among the fraternal countries in the present period means:

*a multiplication of similar features* in the socialist countries' political and socio-economic life, in the ways and means used to tackle

their tasks, which, for their part, likewise become more similar and of the same type;

the fact that the active and ever deepening cooperation among them is *comprehensive,* that is, ranging virtually over every sphere of social life;

that this cooperation is itself *much closer,* including regular and most diverse forms of consultations, coordination of action, exchange of experience at various levels, on a bilateral and multilateral basis, assuming in the economic field the form of integration of the national economic complexes.

We believe that these basic features constitute a new quality in relations among the fraternal countries and allow one to regard these relations as convergence.

We believe that experience now at the disposal of the socialist community warrants the conclusion that convergence is a qualitatively new, socialist-type internationalization of social life, consistent with the present stage of the maturity of socialism, both as a social system and as a system of international relations. The mechanism of this process has taken shape and is pivoted on the fraternal friendship and cooperation of the Marxist-Leninist parties guiding construction of the new society in their countries and basing their relations on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, international solidarity, complete trust and equality. The most important result of this policy of the ruling communist and workers' parties is the strengthening and development of the community of socialist states and consolidation of their unity and cohesion.

The relations between Mongolia and the Soviet Union, with a history of more than half a century, offer the first practical example of the ever closer and deeper ties between states on a new socio-economic and political basis leading to their convergence in the long term. Neither the victory of the Mongolian revolution, nor the success in building the new life in our country would be conceivable without the sound class alliance, the unbreakable friendship and the steady expanding cooperation with the world's first socialist country — the Soviet Union — and subsequently with other socialist countries.

Our experience shows that as Mongolia rises to ever higher levels of socialist construction, the need for such an alliance and cooperation, far from lessening, in effect becomes ever more imperative and vitally important. The need for intensifying Mongolia's all-round ties and its drawing closer together in the economic, political, cultural and ideological fields with the fraternal countries, notably the Soviet Union, springs from the character and scale of the current and long-term tasks posed by the present stage of our country's development.

We are deeply convinced that we can attain the strategic goal of our policy — completion of the building of the material and technical basis of socialism in Mongolia, its transformation into an industrial-agrarian country in the near future, and a substantial reduction in its lag behind the industrially advanced socialist countries — only if we firmly adhere to the policy of convergence. It enables us to make much more effective use of our own material and manpower resources, and also to rely on the potentialities and advantages latent in the international socialist division of labor, collective experience in socialist construction and fraternal mutual assistance.

In this context, the following question may arise: does our lag in economic-development level hamper our drawing together with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries? Indeed, the socialist countries' convergence is an intricate process of extension and deepening of cooperation among states with dissimilar structures, levels and scale of economic development, different approaches to the tackling of concrete tasks in socialist and communist construction, and specific features in organizing social, political and cultural life. Practice shows that although this does influence the concrete forms and pace of convergence, it does not invalidate the objective need for the process itself. In our own country, the MPRP set convergence as a practical task just when Mongolia was about to complete the construction of the material and technical basis of socialism. Some aspects of this process obviously do not coincide with the building of mature socialism now under way in the European CMEA countries, which have reached a higher level of production, technical and socio-economic development. At the same time, the foundations of socialism have been laid in Mongolia, and its principles and laws have become definitive in all the crucial areas; a social-class and political structure which is of the same type as that in the other socialist countries has been formed, and a ramified and steadily growing system of ties between our country and party, and the USSR and CPSU, and the other fraternal countries and their communist parties has taken shape.

We believe that it is the similarity of the basic features in the organization of socio-economic, political and spiritual life in Mongolia and the other socialist-community countries, our country's participation in the system of socialist international relations and the socialist international division of labor that enable it to be an equal partner in the process of convergence. It is a different matter that in the case of our country this process tends to acquire a specific tenor which is determined by the peculiar features of its development already mentioned.

The historical experience of Mongolia's ties with the Soviet Union

and the other fraternal countries indicates that convergence does not in any sense signify a levelling of their political and socio-economic organization and culture to fit some single pattern. On the contrary, it helps each ruling fraternal party creatively to apply the general regularities of socialism in the concrete historical and national conditions of its country, because such application rests on a much more active exchange of experience, all-round cooperation and mutual assistance. Nor does convergence signify any detraction from the socialist countries' sovereignty and independence. It proceeds with full respect for each country's national interests and on the basis of voluntary and equitable cooperation.

Convergence is a process that is consciously guided and regulated by the socialist countries' communist parties. The key aspect of this activity is the steady advance of each country and strengthening of their unbreakable friendship and all-round cooperation. It is tremendously important to coordinate each country's national interests with the international interests of the socialist community as a whole. This is not an easy task. However, the experience in the development of the world socialist system shows that it has always been successfully carried out, even in the most difficult conditions, whenever the communist parties of the fraternal countries took the approach of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

But we find that while the socialist countries' drawing together does result in a closer interlacing of national and international elements, it does not eliminate the task of harmonizing and concerting these in the various fields. On the contrary, we believe that it brings to the fore the task of constantly perfecting the mechanism of coordination of these interests, so that, far from lagging behind the level attained in the fraternal countries' convergence, it should serve as an effective instrument for giving it greater depth. The socialist-community countries' ruling parties have given much attention to this problem. Thus, in the past few years a number of important decisions have been taken on the CMEA's activity and socialist economic integration, notably the effort to align the national planning systems, perfecting the forms and methods of economic-plan coordination, both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis, frame and adopt a concerted plan of multilateral integration measures for 1976-80, elaborate long-term comprehensive goal-oriented programs through joint efforts by the CMEA countries, the treaty on the long-term development of the integrated power grids of these countries, and so on. Behind all these acts lies the fraternal socialist countries' urge to give even greater depth to their cooperation in every field of life in the socialist community, an urge which springs from their clear awareness that in present-day conditions no important domestic or foreign-policy problem can be successfully

tackled without the closest cooperation with other fraternal countries, without an effort to tie in their national interests organically with the common interests of the socialist community and without thorough consideration of international factors.

The premise and condition for the socialist countries' convergence in any other sphere is their drawing together in the economy, in material production. At the present stage, this is expressed in socialist economic integration, the highest historical form of internationalization of the productive forces. For my part, I should like to discuss those aspects of the problem which have a bearing on the socialist countries' economic convergence and Mongolia's specific involvement in it.

The internationalization of production, accelerated and deepened by the scientific and technical revolution, and the development of each country's industrial complex, in the light and within the framework of the Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration, result in even closer interweaving of the fraternal countries' economies and enhancement of the international character of the economic laws of socialism. What does this mean?

First, it means that within the framework of the individual countries, economic laws are an expression not only of the internal conditions of development, but also of the factors which spring from the growing cooperation among them. Thus, the law of economy of time expresses the requirement for a reduction in the inputs of socially-necessary labor not only in the light of the conditions of national production but also of participation in the socialist international division of labor. The law of balanced development reflects both national and interstate proportions, and so on. Second, enhancement of the international character of the economic laws of socialism and the use of forms and methods of cooperation arising in the CMEA countries' economic integration necessarily lead to the creation of a qualitatively new entity, an integrated world socialist economy. Increasing importance attaches to the fulfillment of tasks connected with a definition of stable international economic proportions, the establishment and operation of interstate production organizations working on an economic-calculus basis, etc. Finally, factors in enhancing the efficiency of production like application of the latest scientific and technical achievements, perfection of management, the raising of the level of skills among workers, technicians and engineers, higher responsibility and discipline in all fields of endeavor, and so on, now also operate no longer as purely internal or national elements, but also as international factors. This suggests, we feel, the following objective requirement: a system of management of the national economy, and its economic and planning bodies, should reflect the national and

international aspects of economic laws and the socio-economic organization of society.

But, of course, one should not lose sight of the remaining distinctions between the socialist countries in level of socio-economic development and their national and concrete historical specifics. Mongolia's experience shows very well that its drawing together with the Soviet Union and also with other socialist countries has gone forward in different concrete conditions and forms and at a different pace than that of countries building mature socialism and communism. Here, one could bring out the following specific problems.

First of all, there is the package of problems which arise from the fact that, as distinct from other CMEA countries, Mongolia began its transition to socialism not from the capitalist but from the feudal stage of development. This explains the Mongolian working people's long struggle to do away with the old relations, which had fettered the growth of the country's productive forces with the result that it takes much time in building the material and technical basis of the new society. Our country's transformation in a short historical period from a purely cattle-breeding into an agrarian-industrial country is the result of the MPRP's consistent Marxist-Leninist policy, the Mongolian people's dedicated effort, and the tremendous, all-round and steadily growing fraternal assistance from the land of the October Revolution and subsequently from other socialist countries as well. Despite the fast pace of our economic development (from 1971 to 1975, the gross social product increased by 45 per cent, the national income by 38 per cent, gross agricultural output by 23 per cent, and industrial production by 55 per cent), in industrial terms Mongolia remains the least developed of all the CMEA countries. In 1975, industry accounted for only 25 per cent of the national income (as compared with the 47 to 64.4 per cent in the other CMEA countries). The sixth five-year plan (1976-80) will be an important stage in Mongolia's further rise to the level of the industrialized socialist countries. The 17th Congress of the MPRP decided that in this period the social product is to go up by 40-44 per cent and the national income by 41.9 per cent. As I have already said, we regard the further deepening of economic cooperation and integration with the other CMEA countries as the most important external condition for meeting these goals.

Another package of problems springs from the fact that Mongolia has the smallest population of all the socialist-community countries, while having a territory that is second in size only to that of the USSR. All this presents a strain on manpower resources, requires additional material inputs into the building of cultural and everyday facilities, and creates difficulties in material and technical supply.

At the same time, Mongolia is rich in minerals: we have dozens of

proved deposits of hard and brown coal, non-ferrous, precious and ferrous metals, phosphorites and flourspar. These could become a most important source for meeting the requirements of the CMEA countries' economies in fuel and mineral raw materials over a long period. This is also in our country's interest, for it can use its natural resources for the Mongolian people's benefit only by relying on the fraternal countries' assistance. Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal has said: 'We believe that it is necessary to organize, through the joint efforts of the fraternal socialist countries, extensive use of Mongolia's mineral wealth for the benefit of our country and of the whole world socialist system. We feel that this would be harmonizing the interests of our country's national economy and those of the whole socialist economic system.'

In connection with the extensive program for working Mongolia's mineral wealth, interested CMEA countries have concentrated their efforts on developing its mining industry. In the current five-year period, its output will increase 6-6.3-fold. The following figures give an idea of the great role of this industry in boosting our export potentialities: the share of non-ferrous metal and other mineral concentrates in Mongolia's export to the CMEA countries is to go up from 6.9 per cent in 1975 to 30 per cent in 1980. On the other hand, the creation of a large-scale sophisticated mining industry will induce progressive changes in the structure of our whole national-economic complex and lead to important social advances.

The demographic trends which took shape in the country by the early 70s are also favorable. From 1970 to 1975, Mongolia had an annual population growth of 2.9 per cent, as compared with the average of 1.2 per cent for the other CMEA countries. The growing share of the economically active population has been established as a steady trend; there has been a marked absolute increase in the number of economically-active persons.

The cardinal problem in Mongolia's dynamic economic growth and the raising of the working people's well-being is the all-round development of agriculture. Today, it yields almost 70 per cent of the industial raw materials and one-half of the country's exports. In 1975, it accounted for 22.4 per cent of the national income, that is, slightly less than the share of industry. The main task here is greater productivity and intensification of cattle-breeding and feed production, and agricultural production as a whole. In tackling it we also rely on the fraternal assistance of and close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Thus, the Soviet Union is helping us in the technical equipment of agriculture, and in developing our virgin lands.

That being so, the MPRP has set the creation of an optimal

national-economic complex as the primary goal of Mongolia's close cooperation with the USSR and other socialist countries. This means ensuring for the basic industries a structure that would enable them to develop dynamically and in interconnection with each other, and that would ultimately lead to the attainment of the highest social productivity of labor. The foundations of such a complex are being laid in our country, as in other fraternal countries, through socialist industrialization. But considering the above-mentioned specific features of our country, which have made its economic development especially difficult, and also the potentialities and advantages of the international socialist division of labor, our party believes it to be advisable to concentrate our efforts and resources on developing the industries for which the most advantageous natural and economic conditions are on hand. This means, above all, the fuel, energy, mining and ore-processing industries, the structural materials industry, the processing of agricultural, and especially animal, raw materials, and the metal-working and machine-repair industry geared to the needs of the country and, of course, agriculture.

In mapping out the ways for achieving our program goals, which fully provide for the country's specific features, the MPRP has acted on the premise that alongside the utmost mustering of all our internal reserves and potentialities, our all-round cooperation and convergence with the Soviet Union, which have sound historical roots and good traditions, have played and continue to play a special role. It is no exaggeration to say that a sizable part of our production facilities in industry, agriculture and other sectors of the national economy have resulted from the fraternal assistance extended to us by the world's first socialist country. Today, the enterprises built or remodelled with the Soviet Union's assistance turn out nearly 50 per cent of the gross national product, 100 per cent of the coal and the electric power, almost 90 per cent of the flour, 100 per cent of the washed wool, and so on. The link-up of our country's central power grid with that of the Soviet Union has done much to build up our economy's energy potential.

We believe that the concrete forms and methods of our economic cooperation with the USSR provide a remarkable example of how general principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism are being applied with scrupulous consideration of both countries' specific features, of how socialism opens up opportunities for equitable adaptation of the economies of two countries, one small and the other — one of the greatest industrial powers of the world. We have in mind above all an original form of integration of the Mongolian and the Soviet economy like the establishment and operation of joint enterprises and interstate economic associations. An example of this

is provided by the activity of organizations like the Mongolsovtsvetmet economic association, which is engaged in the exploration and working of minerals, and joint construction and operation from next year of the Erdenet copper and molybdenum one-dressing complex, which is to become a Mongolian industrial giant.

What are the advantages of joint enterprises and associations, as we see them? First of all, these lie in the fact that they help to develop through joint efforts more progressive and highly efficient sectors of the economy and lines of production, make use of the latest scientific and technical achievements, and improve technologies, management and the organization of production. This provides a basis on which it is easier to enhance the efficiency of production, ensure a steady growth of the national income, raise cultural and skill standards, make better use of natural and economic conditions and ultimately bring about a steady rise in the working people's material and cultural levels.

The continued extension of Mongolian-Soviet economic cooperation in the 1976-80 period and the more than two-fold increase in the volume of the USSR's economic assistance to our country shows that the policy of convergence is definitive in the relations between the two countries. The visit to the USSR in 1976 by a Mongolian party and government delegation, led by Y. Tsedenbal, was an important milestone in the two countries' convergence. The documents signed in the course of the visit, jointly defining the principles and basic lines of deepening the ties between Mongolia and the USSR, between the MPRP and the CPSU, and of the all-round convergence of the two countries are of historic significance.

Our country's cooperation with other fraternal countries within the framework of the Comprehensive Program is highly important for the successful fulfillment of the task of gradually evening out our country's level with those of the other socialist countries, our further economic upswing through substantial improvement of our economic structure, enhancement of the efficiency of social production and growing labor productivity. The program says: 'Considering the economic condition of the Mongolian People's Republic and the attendant specific problems, the CMEA countries, by agreement among interested countries and the MPR, will coordinate on a multilateral or bilateral basis and work out special measures aimed to accelerate the development and enhance the efficiency of the MPR's economy in the light of its natural and economic conditions.' This is a striking example of the CMEA countries' collective solution of new and major problems in the spirit of socialist internationalism.

In accordance with the provisions of the Comprehensive Program, the Soviet Union and certain other CMEA countries have fixed new

foreign-trade prices for Mongolia's basic cattle-breeding products with the use of incentive increments to the basic prices, which has enabled us to put through important measures in building up our material and technical basis and stimulating the development of agriculture. Our country has received credits from the USSR and other socialist countries on exceptionally favorable terms: a low interest rate, relatively long repayment periods, and economically advantageous forms of repayment. The CMEA countries have been giving our country free assistance in setting up 11 research units, training scientific personnel, specialists and skilled technicians and workers, dispatching their own specialists to Mongolia on terms which are advantageous to us. From 1971 to 1975 alone, 169 production, cultural and every-day units were built and started with the technical and economic assistance of the USSR and other CMEA countries.

Our party is aware that the more effective our use of their assistance, the more fruitful will be our cooperation with the USSR and other socialist countries. That is why the documents of the 17th Congress of the MPRP and subsequent decisions taken by the CC and the Mongolian government envisage concrete measures orienting party and government organs and the Mongolian working people upon the effort to ensure timely commissioning and bringing to full design capacity the units being built with the assistance of the fraternal countries, and upon fulfillment of Mongolia's commitments under bilateral and multilateral agreements and plans.

Every day in our country's life provides fresh confirmation of the fruitfulness of the MPRP's policy of utmost convergence between Mongolia and the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries. This is an inexorable tendency because it springs from the objective requirements of the development of socialism and from the need to use the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. Our party will continue firmly to pursue its policy of developing integration ties with the land of the October Revolution and all the other socialist-community countries.

---

# Anti-communism in the late 70s: some features and trends

*Ezekias Papaioannou*
General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL)

In the past few years, considerable changes have been taking place in anti-communist strategy. These have been caused by the fiasco of the ideologico-political complex, which had been geared to the 'cold war' period, and by the fact that public opinion is coming to believe less and less in the crude inventions about the communists. There is an erosion of the propaganda clichés the bourgeois mass media have been spreading for decades. Many doctrines and theoretical conceptions which had provided the ideological framework for the anti-communist thinking of almost a whole generation of 'specialists in communism' have been shelved.

When we say 'erosion' and 'shelved' we do not mean that this marks an end to the grosser, primitive forms of anti-communism or that they already decayed and are a thing of the past. Today there are many wild anti-communists and out-and-out fascists advocating violent and physical suppression of the communist and working-class movement. That is something we never allow ourselves to forget. But in this article I should like to consider some of the new features and trends in anti-communism stemming from its efforts to adapt itself to the present-day realities of the class struggle in the international arena and in the individual countries, notably Cyprus.

Even today, anti-communist propaganda is still being escalated, mainly through anti-Sovietism. The new element here is that anti-Sovietism is being increasingly used as a means designed to influence not so much the Soviet Union's stand (although the bourgeoisie has never abandoned such illusions) as the attitude to that stand on the part of communist and other democratic political organizations in the non-socialist world. Bourgeois propaganda, of course, still tries to arouse feelings of alienation from, and then of hostility and enmity toward the Soviet Union among various sections of the population, but it is no longer content to manipulate the thinking of politically immature people, and has been trying to fabricate a special arsenal of instruments to exert an influence on progressive circles as well.

Furthermore, bourgeois propaganda pretends that its anti-Soviet campaigns are aimed not against socialism as such, but only against its 'excesses' and 'inadequacies' and do not, in any case, apply to those who seek to 'improve' socialism.

We are deeply convinced that anti-Sovietism is a frontal attack on the common goals and interests of the communist movement as a whole. Our conclusion is based on the following points.

First, there is an obvious connection between the attempts to discredit socialism as an existing system and the urge to erode the chief and definitive motive underlying the communists' activity in any country, which is their deep conviction that socialist ideas are true. The bourgeois propaganda ploy is to try to smear socialism in the Soviet Union and not only to drive the masses away from the socialist ideology but also to generate processes that ultimately kill the anti-capitalist, proletarian-class content of the communist parties' goals and policies.

Second, by their attacks on the Soviet Union the reactionary imperialist circles hope to check the positive changes in the international arena and to undermine the détente, which is the common cause of the communists and all the other democratic and peace forces. Bourgeois propaganda is trying to stamp out the truth that the struggle for peace is incompatible with antagonism to the Soviet Union, the main guarantor of peace.

Third, anti-Sovietism is designed to undermine the communists' internationalist stand, which springs from the realities of the modern epoch and their responsibility for the destinies of the working class and their people as a whole. It expresses an urge to deny the significance of the support provided by the USSR for all the peoples in their anti-imperialist struggle and thus induce communists to isolate themselves from the mighty force of social progress.

In view of this, we believe that we must intensify our efforts to expose anti-Sovietism, doing this not only defensively, but also by going over to a more active ideological offensive. Anti-Soviet propaganda deliberately distorts the reality and conceals, obscures and plays down the achievements of socialism. It relishes and exaggerates problems which occur in the course of building the new society, and which the ruling parties of the socialist countries, incidentally, have never concealed in their systematic efforts to solve them. That is why spreading the truth about the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is an effective method of combating anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda. This is something without which no understanding of the realities of the contemporary world is possible. We know from our own experience that the more chance the working people have to lay hands on objective information about the socialist

countries and the more easily they can compare the actual state of affairs under capitalism and under socialism, the more fertile the soil for our efforts in spreading socialist ideas.

With the situation as it is in our country, it is especially important to expose the anti-communists' fabrications that the Soviet Union's support for and solidarity with the Cypriot people, who are fighting for their freedom, is an 'AKEL invention.' Through the party press, at rallies and in conversation we explain the Soviet Union's stand on the Cyprus issue, and let the people know the true facts to counter such lies. We are sure that the Cypriot people's united and sustained liberation struggle with growing support and solidarity from the Soviet Union, a great and friendly power, and all the other socialist and non-aligned countries will ultimately be successful.

Another important line of struggle against anti-Sovietism is exposure of its attempts to distort the state of affairs in the communist movement. Now that many communist parties have shown themselves to be an important national force, the old tactic of persecuting communists and undermining their positions by labelling them partners in a 'world conspiracy guided by the hand of Moscow' no longer works. However, bourgeois propaganda has taken another tack in seeking to exploit this myth by bringing up a pseudo-problem that is entirely artificial, namely, 'liberation' of the parties from the 'Kremlin's iron grip' and from the 'subconscious nostalgia for the Comintern.' The bourgeois press has provocatively classified the communist parties as 'independent' and 'dependent' in an effort to range them against each other. It has suggested that a 'critical attitude' to the CPSU is the criterion of their independence. This is being done to prevent the communist parties from taking an active part in the joint struggle against imperialism, from putting forward common goals and working out their common solidarity.

It is common knowledge that there are no parties in our movement which are either leading or led, that is, subordinate. Even the bourgeois slanderers have been unable to discover a single word in the documents of the CPSU laying any kind of claim to 'leadership' of other parties. On the contrary, the documents of the CPSU clearly and unambiguously stress that it is against any hegemonism in the communist movement, and for genuinely internationalist equal relations between all parties. (See Report to the 23rd Congress of the CPSU). Nor is there the slightest hint of 'subordination' in the documents of the other fraternal parties. It is not surprising, therefore, that the bourgeoisie has had to resort to tricks. The main trick is to distort the meaning of proletarian internationalism (which allegedly implies 'unilateral advantage' and 'denial' of democracy in inter-party relations, 'neglect' of independence, 'coercion' to concerted action,

'subordination to the center' and so on) in an effort to implant irrational thought patterns that give rise to negative mental attitudes and responses. The idea is to induce an emotional antipathy for proletarian internationalism, an unconscious bias that produces a kind of immunity to the arguments of reason, science and experience. Incidentally, anti-communist propaganda has used similar methods of brainwashing in other matters, where it has also revealed an incapacity to propose a positive program to counter scientific socialism.

While holding forth on autonomy, bourgeois politicians and ideologists naturally turn a blind eye to the fact that the communist parties are independent, sovereign and equal. Contrary to bourgeois propaganda assertions, these are the generally accepted rules of inter-party relations within the communist movement, and the observance of these rules is an important basis for its continued progress. The subject of the parties' independence is not a new target for anti-Soviet and anti-communist speculation, for which nationalistic prejudices have always provided fertile ground. However, in the past, and in our country in particular, they were used mainly to separate the Communist Party from the masses. Our enemies claimed that the Communist Party was non-national and anti-national, that it rated 'alien' interest above the national interest. We now find a slightly different accent: nationalistic prejudices are being used by the anti-communists as a means for isolating the communist parties in the international arena. Communism, our adversaries claim, is becoming increasingly nationalistic and anti-internationalist.

So the anti-communists have had to adopt ever more cunning tactics in the fight against the communist movement. The imperialist bourgeoisie's response to the communist movement's growing influence in the modern world has been, first, to try to break up and undermine the communist movement as an *international* force, and second, to weaken and eliminate the role of communist parties as the driving force in *national* development. But erosion of the communists' international unity and solidarity is not regarded as an end in itself but rather as a means of altering the international situation, which is unfavorable for imperialism, and also of isolating the communist parties so as to uproot them from their national soil or to cause their transformation.

The anti-communists also try to provide a geopolitical basis for their tactic. They claim that the goals of the communist parties are 'incompatible' because they belong to different geographical regions. The communism of the 'East' is contrasted with the communism of the 'West,' that of the 'South' with that of the 'North.' The anti-communists deny the unity of the world revolutionary process and its general regularities, which determine mankind's advance and transi-

tion to lasting peace and socialism. This geopolitical approach to the communist movement is specifically expressed in the concept of 'Eurocommunism' launched by bourgeois propaganda. Another reason for our being particularly interested in this question is that the London *Economist* has described our party — in contrast to the 'Eurocommunists' and 'anti-Eurocommunists' — as 'uncommitted' and 'uninvolved.'[1]

Having invented the term 'Eurocommunism,'[2] bourgeois propaganda does not use it merely as an inoffensive euphemism or, more simply, as a term to designate the similar stand on some problems taken by some parties in our region. In the communist movement, as we know, there are different views of this matter and it is being discussed. But the bourgeoisie, seeking to divide communism into several parts on the geopolitical principle, give the term a peculiarly biased anti-communist slant and use it to put pressure on our movement and as a way of fighting the communist parties.

Why does the bourgeoisie need the concept of 'Eurocommunism?' What dividends does it expect from it? Bourgeois press comments invite the conclusion that the purpose of the propaganda hullabaloo over this concept is to cause distrust and alienation between communist parties that will end in confrontation and the breaking-off of relations. Here is an illustration.

The bourgeois press has for some time been discussing the 'double challenge of Eurocommunism.' It argues at length that 'Eurocommunism' poses a bigger problem for the 'East' than for the 'West.' Anti-communists peddle the preposterous idea that the distinctive path to socialism taken by one country endangers the communist cause in other countries. They treat the struggle for socialism in the capitalist countries as the antithesis of the development of the socialist countries. Non-ruling communist parties are represented as opponents of the socialism existing in the 'East' while ruling parties are made out to be opposed to establishing socialism in the 'West.'[3] One has the impression that the publicity given to 'Eurocommunism' by imperialist circles is prompted by plans to use this concept as a means of subverting the socialist community and the foundations of the communist movement.

Characteristically, anti-communists give the concept of Eurocommunism an ideological and political content by no means reflecting geographical, regional features. They link it with hopes of 'social reformization' of the communist parties and try to set them 'moving toward social democracy from Leninism, both in methodology and goals.'[4] In turn, right-wing social democrats plainly reckon to make political capital by publicizing 'Eurocommunism,' which they interpret as 'renouncement of the belief' in revolutionary development in

Western Europe and the 'acceptance' of the reformist course.[5] So according to the opponents of communism, the insertion of the particle 'Euro' turns communism into reformism. This is what interests bourgeois and right-wing social-democratic politicians and ideologists in the subject of 'Eurocommunism' and this is the standpoint from which they carry on their offensive against the communist parties.

The objectives pursued by the bourgeoisie in its efforts to encourage reformism in the working-class movement are quite obvious. Lenin wrote: 'The stronger reformist influence is among the workers, the weaker they are — the greater their dependence on the bourgeoisie, and the easier it is for the bourgeoisie to nullify reforms by various subterfuges. The more independent the working-class movement, the deeper and broader its aims, and the freer it is from reformist narrowness — the easier it is for the workers to retain and utilize improvements' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 19, p. 273). But in some conditions reformism may also mean, as Lenin pointed out, 'destroying the Marxist organization and abandoning the democratic tasks of the working class . . . replacing them by a liberal-labor policy' (*ibid.*, p. 375).

Even so, the communists' adversaries are aware that it is a far cry from their interpretation of the concept of 'Eurocommunism' to the actual policy and ideology of communist parties. This is why they have had to attack almost from the outset the myth they themselves created. Anti-communists are increasingly beginning to wonder whether they are not lulling their own vigilance with self-delusion.

The condemnation of 'Eurocommunism' as a farce and a fraud by its own 'godfathers' also betrays something more serious. It is a ruse through which the bourgeoisie would like to entice communists into making political and ideological concessions on their fundamental principles. It is as if they were being asked to prove that 'Eurocommunism,' as interpreted by anti-communists, is no farce. But surely communists do not have to abandon the universally valid laws of scientific socialism or the basic interests of the working class of their countries or join battle with each other in order to make political gains. We think our opponents are very wrong to count on this.

Anti-communism in the late 70s has been characterized by excessive emphasis on distinctions in the strategy and tactics of the communist movement stemming from the fraternal parties' awareness of the specific conditions in which the laws of the class struggle operate in different countries. As anti-communists see it, the 'growing diversity' in the communist movement must give rise to centrifugal forces leading to its disintegration and to the rise of a 'multidoctrinal communism.' Nor do anti-communists assign themselves the role of mere onlookers. They speak frankly of the need to encourage disruptive

processes by exerting political and cultural pressure on communist parties, and try to transform distinctions into differences of opinion. They seek to exacerbate every disagreement between working-class parties 'and turn it into a split,' as Lenin put it (Vol. 4, p. 176).

By absolutizing the differences between the various paths leading to socialism, which are perfectly natural and are recognized by all Marxists, the bourgeois press contrasts the search for these paths with the very substance of 'traditional Marxism,' that is, scientific socialism, founded by Marx, Engels and Lenin. In the exercise by every communist party of its right to think independently and freely and to decide how its country should advance to socialism bourgeois propaganda would like to see abandonment of the scientific world outlook and the scientific method of transforming social reality.

To present this process as something 'inevitable' and 'logical,' anti-communists draw an absolutely groundless analogy between the contemporary communist movement and the 16th-century Reformation. They argue that the first step in the Reformation was the secession of the Protestant Churches, while the next, and most important, step was the rejection by the local Protestant Churches themselves of ecclesiastical organization and mediation in interpreting the faith. The communist movement, the anti-communists assert, is on the way to a reformation of its own, but the independence of the parties, which our adversaries interpret as self-isolation and abandonment of anti-imperialist solidarity, is still not enough. What they want is a restructuring of the parties to break through the 'blockage' in man's political conscience allegedly created by party organization and communist ideology. They complain that the new Luther who could do this has not yet appeared on the scene.[6]

U.S. correspondent James O. Goldsborough has translated this 'philosophy' into more pragmatic terms, insisting that communist parties' opponents have centered their attacks 'on democratic centralism, which incarnates the lack of individual freedom within the party structure.'[7] In holding forth on the 'party reformation' and 'freedom of political conscience' within the parties, the anti-communists clearly hope to generate processes that would erode the parties from within.

An analysis of recent anti-communist propaganda shows that it is not confined to the task of 'disintegration' of the communist movement. Indeed, its activities along these lines is part of more far-reaching subversive action whose dominant feature is the attempt to bring about a change in the very *nature* of communist parties.

There is no disregarding the fact that certain aspects of the present-day tactics of the campaign against communist parties echo, so to speak, the strident anti-Soviet campaigns of the 60s. Certainly,

in those years the policy of 'peaceful pressure' on the socialist countries was aimed at inducing them to 'liberalize' themselves, that is, discard Marxist-Leninist principles in theory and practice. This method is now being used against communist parties. Anti-communists talk about eroding and 'liberalizing' communist parties.

The similarity of the anti-communists' methods of combating socialism and communist parties — with corresponding modifications of course — is not accidental. Anti-communists draw appropriate lessons from the class struggle. Historical experience has shown that it is impossible to weaken or alter socialism as long as the working people's communist vanguard remains unchanged. On the other hand, the degeneration of social democracy more than 60 years ago played a notable part in saving capitalism in a number of countries when the worldwide revolutionary wave was battering against its pillars.

Generalizing the above-mentioned anti-communist propaganda trends, we may say that what preoccupies anti-communists most is the attitude of communist parties to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. And understandably so, because Marxism-Leninism is the most important ideological and political determinant of every true communist party.

Hence the intensified attacks on the ideological foundations of the communist movement. Moreover, it is becoming obvious that they tend to focus more and more on the specific forms in which the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin are linked with the working-class and anti-imperialist movement in various countries and with the accomplishing of new tasks by the parties. Anti-communist propaganda tries to make capital out of the problems generated by the development of the modern world, and particularly out of phenomena that have not yet been fully analyzed. There can be no such thing as an ideological vacuum. Where there are no answers to new problems, where scientific theory has not been thoroughly worked out, its adversaries are able to feed like parasites.

Prophesying the communist parties' loss of their general ideological basis and a 'withering' of scientific socialism, the anti-communists contrive a kind of 'theory' to back up such assertions. In embryo it is seen in the opposing of Leninism, alleged to be a purely 'Russian phenomenon,' to Marxism. While denying the international character of Leninism and the experience of the Soviet Union in the first decades of the existence of the Soviet state, the anti-communists did not, however, make any broad conceptual generalizations with regard to the communist movement as a whole, which was presented as a 'supernational' force. The next step came with the speculation on 'national communism,' the essence of which was regarded as refusal

to submit to supernational leadership. At the same time the anti-communists 'theorized' that the adaptation of communist ideology to local conditions might lead to the erosion of its internationalist goals and the prevalence of nationalistic prejudices. Now they are completing the edifice of their 'theory.' One of its authors, U.S. presidential adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, claims that the application of communism in specific conditions is so varied and diversified that, like the liberalism of the 19th century, it is steadily losing its meaning as a unifying and universal conception.[8]

The falsity of these arguments sticks out like a sore thumb. Communism, in contrast to 19th-century liberalism, is not merely a political ideology but a science. Therefore the view that the practical application of a theory in concrete conditions — and that is what the communists have been doing — involves not its development but its distortion is hardly worthy of serious discussion. That is the first point. Secondly, the sophistry of the arguments we have cited lies in the fact that recantation from communist ideology is presented as a rule while any facts testifying to the opposite are ignored. These facts are: the developed socialist society in the USSR, and the building of developed socialism in the socialist countries, the successes won in the class struggle in the developed capitalist countries, the gains of the peoples' national-liberation movement, the communist parties' growing influence in many countries, and the solidarity of the communists in the struggle for détente and peace, against imperialism. To these could be added very many other achievements, which enhance the attractive and unifying force of scientific communist ideas because they confirm their correctness. Thirdly, the working class, as Marx and Engels said, is national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word (*Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 124). The meaning of the national in the communist movement appears to be beyond the comprehension even of the theoretical exponents of the bourgeoisie's anti-communist aspirations. Hence the decisive failure of their arguments. Contrary to their predictions, the application of scientific socialism to national peculiarities is not an obstacle to the development of the international unity of our movement. Quite the opposite. Marxist-Leninist theory has no truer ally than the parties' own experience, than international practice.

In their efforts to combat our movement the anti-communists try to use the similarity of conditions in a number of countries, which has led to some interesting research into the new problems encountered by these countries. Protesting any sign of international solidarity among communists and denying the international significance of party experience, they all but advocate a 'monolithic' attitude that denies distinctions in the activity of parties stemming from specific national

features. In this way the anti-communists hope to lure communists into a position of isolation from the international communist movement.

The experts on combating the communist movement have of late particularly stressed the 'Leninist style of thinking.' They allege that it 'shackles' communists when it comes to evolving their national strategy. In what way does this style displease our opponents? Apparently because even on the peaceful road to socialism the communists continue to support revolutionary methods of action, give precedence to politics, to the question of state power, suggest the need to go further in the development of freedom and democracy than bourgeois democracy has ever gone or could go, pursue a policy of alliances between the working class and the middle strata, form blocs with other political parties in order to solve national problems in a spirit of social progress, and so on. As we see, the anti-communists center their attack on some key aspects of the peaceful transition to socialism that have been established by social science and confirmed in practice while trying to impose on the communist parties something 'universal' that would cause them to break both with scientific theory and with practice.

Our party is true to the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is why it has been able to evolve an original strategy and tactics for the conditions of our country. AKEL is the most influential political force in Cyprus. In the 1970 elections it won more than 40 per cent of the vote. And in the elections of September 1976, the three cooperating parties — AKEL, the Democratic Front, led by Spyros Kyprianou, and the Unified Democratic Union of the Center (EDEK) — won about 75 per cent of the vote. In recent months the presidential elections have formed the hub of the island's political life. During the election campaign we are concentrating on preserving patriotic unity on as broad a basis as possible. We have therefore decided not to nominate a candidate from our party on the assumption that his victory in the elections could create a situation bordering on civil war, which we wish to avoid. Moreover, the Turkish army might use this victory as a pretext for occupying another part of the island. There would be a real danger of interference in our internal affairs by NATO. We believe that the tactics evolved by our party on the basis of scientific analysis of the specific situation in our country and its international position are effective, promote a solution of the problem of Cyprus in a democratic spirit and correspond to the long-term as well as the short-term interests of our people.

We have described some of the devices of anti-communism in the late 70s, which do not of course account for the whole arsenal. The underlying factor in the concepts offered by imperialist circles is class

hatred and enmity toward the communist parties. Imperialist circles would like to see the communist movement divided, and the communist parties weakened or even no longer communist. That is why they try to interfere in the affairs of communist parties, incite them against one another, and even lecture us on how to behave, where and with whom we should go, present their intentions as our aims, egg us on toward disarray and whip up dissension.

The imperialist opponents of communism are bent on eliminating or eroding the communists' jointly proposed aims of common struggle against imperialism for the interests of the working class, for peace and social progress. As was stressed at the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, the communists 'will develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of equality and sovereign independence of each party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism.' It is from this clear and definite position that the imperialist circles waving the flag of anti-communism would like to shift us.

1. See, *The Economist*, November 5-11, 1977, p. 60.
2. See *Newsweek*, December 6, 1976, p. 15.
3. See, for instance, *International Herald Tribune*, July 2-3, 1977; September 8, 1977.
4. *International Herald Tribune*, February 5-6, 1977, p. 6.
5. See *Socialist Affairs*, May-June 1976, p. 65.
6. See, *The Economist*, November 12-18, 1977, pp. 13-14.
7. *Foreign Affairs*, July 1977, p. 814.
8. See, *International Herald Tribune*, October 10, 1977.

*Party experience*

# The socialist state and society's economic development

*Willi Stoph*
Member, CC PB, SUPG, Chairman
GDR Council of Ministers

## THE ECONOMIC-ORGANIZATION FUNCTION OF THE STATE IN THE GDR

The doctrine of the socialist state as the chief instrument of the revolutionary transformation of society is one of the most important achievements of Marxist-Leninist thought. The victorious working class makes use of it to consolidate its power, to suppress the overthrown exploiters' resistance, and to carry on the economic restructuring of society. This has been borne out by the whole history of existing socialism, including the history of our country.

At the stage of building and perfection of developed socialism the socialist state continues to be equally important for our society's life and further progress. That is why today, as at earlier stages in our country's development, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany works to strengthen the workers' and peasants' state and enhance its role in building up the material and technical basis of the new system. Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, emphasized in the CC Report to the Party's Ninth Congress in May 1976: 'It is the historical mission of the working class to build a socialist and communist society, and to do this it must have a firm hold on power. Power is the prime necessity.'

Our country has gained rich experience in forming and fortifying the socialist state and social system. Its development is rooted in the epochal victory of the USSR and its allies over Hitler fascism, and this has enabled the working class to overcome the division in its ranks and, through the establishment of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, to unite on a revolutionary basis. After the Soviet Army's crushing defeat of the fascist state, the chief task of the progressive forces was to eradicate imperialism and militarism and set up anti-fascist, democratic state organs. Representatives of the working class, the working peasantry, the intelligentsia and other anti-fascist, democratic forces, who made up the historically imperative class alliance forged by the working class, got down to transforming politi-

cal, economic and cultural life. In accordance with the will of the people, expressed in a referendum, war criminals and nazi activists were expropriated and their enterprises handed over to the working people. This provided a most important economic basis for the new state in the form of the property of the whole people. The elimination of the sway of finance capital and the establishment of state banks and insurance companies did much to advance the social transformations. A democratic land reform put an end to the large estates, the land passing to the farm laborers and the land-poor peasants. There were also reforms of the judicial system and education, which did away with the exploiter classes' privileges in these fields. Consistently, step by step, the old bourgeois law was eliminated and the new, socialist law introduced in every sphere of social life.

In putting through these revolutionary transformations, the SUPG, their guiding and leading force, relied on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the experience gained by the working class over the decades of fierce revolutionary battles. It used the valuable experience of the CPSU, which had, over the past decades, theoretically elaborated and practically solved all the main problems in conducting the policy of alliance between the working class and other classes and sections of society and in building a workers' and peasants' state. This made it possible in the course of a coherent revolutionary process to accomplish an anti-fascist, democratic revolution and to carry the socialist revolution to victorious completion. In forming the GDR, the working class established and fortified its political rule. It set up its socialist workers' and peasants' state as a form of the proletarian dictatorship, which it used to defend its socialist gains against the counter-revolutionary encroachments and other attacks by imperialism. An alliance of the proletariat with the cooperative peasantry, the intelligentsia and all the other working people took shape and was firmly established in the National Front of Democratic Germany. In this front, says Article Three of the GDR Constitution, 'the parties and mass organizations shall unite all the people's forces for the purpose of developing the socialist society by joint effort, thereby making it possible for the community life of all the citizens in the socialist society to accord with the principles: each shall be responsible for the common cause.'

In its 28 years, the socialist state in the GDR has passed through many and varied stages of development, and at each stage, we received disinterested internationalist assistance and support in every sphere of social life from the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist country.

Our country's socialist reconstruction has fully corroborated Lenin's conclusion that 'the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the

use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force. The economic foundation of this use of revolutionary force, the guarantee of its effectiveness and success is the fact that the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organization of labor compared with capitalism. This is what is important, this is the source of the strength and the guarantee that the final triumph of communism is inevitable' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 29, p. 419).

Bourgeois ideologists have been trying to exaggerate the force aspect of the workers' and peasants' state, but the socialist reality has shown very well that although this state must, in fact, use force against the overthrown exploiter classes, especially at the first stage of socialist transformations, it has a totally different goal. The main objective of the proletarian dictatorship, Lenin said, is to build socialism through creative and constructive effort (see Vol. 29, p. 388).

Accordingly, for all its importance in defending the socialist gains, the function of suppressing the exploiter elements is by no means the chief function of the socialist state. From the beginning and to this day, its chief and definitive functions have been economic organization and the spread of culture and education, for it is through the exercise of these functions that the socialist state fulfills its historic task: the creation of the material and technical, and also cultural and intellectual basis of socialism and communism. Also among its chief functions are protection of socialist law and order, socialist property and the working people's rights and freedoms, regulation of the measure of labor and the measure of consumption, securing of peace and defense of the socialist system against external threat, and organization of external political and economic relations, especially fraternal cooperation with the socialist-community countries. All these functions form a dialectical unity and are exercised through the cooperation of all the organs of the state.

The economic-organization function entails essentially the conduct of the SUPG's economic policy, balanced development of the productive forces and perfection of the relations of production, utmost consolidation and development of the material and technical basis of socialism and fulfillment of tasks in raising the working people's material and cultural levels.

The SUPG has always assumed that the state is not something ossified but, like society itself, tends to change and develop. The structure and forms of activity of its organs are being perfected to meet the concrete requirements of life. The economic-organization function itself undergoes definite changes in the course of socialist construction, with an especially marked enhancement of its role, scope and complexity at the stage of developed socialist society, since

the objective advantages of the socialist social system are not realized of themselves. Indeed, in the national economy as a whole and at every individual enterprise, these must be consciously used. As the tasks of socialist construction gain in scope, scale and complexity, ever greater demands are made on the state's economic activity. Today, it has to fulfill such substantial tasks as the balanced development of the productive forces and perfection of the socialist relations of production, use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and their combination with the advantages of the socialist mode of production, qualitative improvement of the people's living and working conditions, deepening of the international division of labor and development of socialist economic integration.

These are the crucial premises for implementing the policy mapped out by the Ninth Congress of the SUPG. Its substance was characterized by Erich Honecker in these words: 'SUPG policy will continue to be centered on consistent fulfillment of the chief task: the further raising of the material and cultural level of the people's life through a high rate of development of socialist production, enhancement of its efficiency, scientific and technical progress, and growing labor productivity.' The unity of economic and social policy embodied in the chief task set out by our party, helps to bring out the working people's creative capabilities, for they are well aware that they alone use the fruits of their labor, and that under socialism there is no other way to greater prosperity except honest work.

To put through the policy mapped out by the party, the socialist state has to take a comprehensive approach in shaping the social conditions that would promote the growth of the economic potential on a scale fully meeting the interests of the working class and its allies.

Here, the socialist planned economy, based on Lenin's principle of democratic centralism, has justified itself again and again. In application to economic activity, it means that centralized state planning and administration of the basic aspects of economic development are closely tied in with the responsibility of local state bodies and enterprises and the working people's initiative. The correct application of this principle helps to make more rational use of the productive forces, to effect a better blend of collective and social interests, and to enhance the efficiency of the whole administrative process.

The planning principle is written into the Constitution of the GDR and is expressed in other laws and normative acts. The main instrument of administration of the economy is the five-year plan, which is the basis for elaborating annual economic plans. The profoundly democratic nature of our plans is expressed not only in the targets set by them but also in the modes of their preparation and adoption.

Thorough discussion of state plan targets at the enterprises has become an extensive and well-established practice. The results of the discussion are summed up by the People's Chamber of the GDR, the highest organ of popular representation, which gives the plan the force of law.

The current five-year plan (1976-80) envisages sustained, stable proportional and dynamic growth of social production in our country and stimulates the efforts to make work more efficient and improve workmanship in every field of social life. The goals of the plan are impressive: by 1980, the national income is to go up by 27.9 per cent, and industrial output by 34 per cent. In socialist agriculture, the average annual crop is to increase by 20 per cent, as compared with the average for the preceding five-year period. Individual and social consumption are to rise by 22.5 per cent.

These new goals are to be attained chiefly through higher labor productivity. Science and technology are to be decisive in attaining these goals and markedly improving the cost-benefit ratio. The use of scientific and technical achievements alone is to account for 60-70 per cent of the planned growth of labor productivity.

State and economic organs regard the intensification of social production as being especially important in fulfilling the tasks of the current five-year period. Intensification is the main line of our country's economic development. It accelerates the growth of the economy's scientific and technical potential, which is required for further raising the people's living standards and constantly modernizing and enlarging the material and technical basis of socialism.

The effort to establish a close bond between economic and social policy is an important aspect in the formation of the developed socialist society. The drive for greater output and for higher efficiency is aimed systematically to improve the people's working and everyday conditions. Today, the fundamental difference between the socialist social system, which is in the ascendant, and the imperialist system, which is historically doomed, is more striking than ever. The working people in the capitalist countries have to suffer from mass unemployment and uncertainty in the future. By contrast, the socialist society, which is humanistic by its very nature, has increasingly demonstrated all its qualitative advantages, one of which is every citizen's complete social and material confidence. Our workers' and peasants' state provides full employment and guaranteed jobs for every citizen, and maintains stable consumer prices, housing rent and the cost of services. Let us recall that in our country, as in the other socialist-community countries, the prices of the basic foodstuffs and services, and rent are among the lowest in the world, while wages and pensions are being increased in a balanced manner. Another charac-

teristic feature of the socialist society is the highly developed education system, an extensive network of public health establishments, ample facilities for rest and leisure and for raising one's cultural level. From year to year, the socialist state has been increasing its outlays from social funds for the development of all these spheres.

Under the party's leadership, the state organs are now working successfully to implement the largest socio-economic program in the people's history. Thus, in the current five-year period, 750,000 flats are to be built or modernized, and this will help to improve housing conditions for more than two million citizens. By 1990, the housing question will be completely solved. Increases in minimum wages and other measures in this area will raise the earned income of nearly two million working people. In this period, over 6,000 million marks is to go into further improving the living conditions of pensioners and for social security. The important thing to note is that more than a million GDR citizens now have a 40-hour week, and gradually all the working people in the country will have the same in a five-day working week.

Appropriations for paid maternity leave are to go up to 1,200 million marks, and the duration of the leave is to be increased. At present it comes to six months with the birth of the first child, and one year, with the birth of the second and every subsequent child. All these and other outlays by the state on social needs come to the impressive total of 50,000 million marks that has been appropriated for these purposes in the current five-year period.

Our five-year plan is a genuine program of growth, a program for raising living standards and consolidating social stability. Every day, the working people feel that the policy of the state meets their vital interests, and that is why they are resolved to make the most active efforts to help in implementing it. This will be seen from the many initiatives aimed at markedly enhancing the quality and efficiency of labor and discovering fresh reserves. The GDR working people's complete support of the policy of the party and the state enables us painlessly to overcome the difficulties confronted by our economy whenever there is a change in the state of the world market. From the very beginning of the new year, labor collectives and all the working people have concentrated on fulfilling and overfulfilling the national-economic plans. In economic-organization activity, state organs are faced with the responsible tasks of putting the whole GDR economy on the highroad of intensification, while vigorously advancing its rationalization. This is the best guarantee of further successful implementation of the socio-economic policy of the SUPG and our socialist state.

When considering the development and perfection of the economic-organization function at the present stage of socialist con-

struction, one must note yet another important factor. Our party attaches much importance to broad social activity by workers, cooperative peasants, the intelligentsia and all the other working people who have been participating in economic planning and management and all the other affairs of society with a keen sense of political responsibility and expert knowledge. This activity is becoming ever more characteristic of our life. It is based on democratic centralism, the fundamental principle underlying the relations and activity of all the state organs. This principle ensures conformity between individual, collective and territorial interests, on the one hand, and the interests of society as a whole, on the other. As for the further building of the developed socialist society, the SUPG program says that 'the further unfolding and perfection of socialist democracy is the main line of development of socialist state power. Citizens' participation in the administration of the state and the management of the economy in diverse forms is becoming an ever more distinctive feature of life under socialism.'

The principle written into the GDR Constitution — 'Work Together, Plan Together, Manage Together!' — is being increasingly realized in every sphere of our society. The working people at the enterprises, members of producer cooperatives, personnel at research institutes and other establishments have been taking an active part in fulfilling the tasks in industry, agriculture, trade, culture, education and other spheres of social life. The principle of working people's participation in administration of the state and management of the economy has been established in normative law, including the law on the Council of Ministers, and the decree on the tasks, rights and duties of the people's enterprises, combines and associations of people's enterprises.

The make-up of state agencies and economic organs is highly important in conducting a policy aimed to benefit the working people. They are staffed by experienced men and women who have dedicated themselves to realizing the policy of our workers' and peasants' state. In order to ensure the leading role of the working class, the personnel for these bodies is selected from among the front-rankers in material production and also representatives of socio-political bodies. Much attention is given to steadily raising the level of political and professional training among state officials in accordance with the steadily growing requirements of social development.

The role of the trade unions in the everyday life of our country provides an especially vivid testimonial of the development of socialist democracy. The trade unions are the broadest class organization of workers, and in close cooperation with them government bodies discuss and decide on all the vital matters of economic and

social policy. The trade unions have the constitutional right of legislative initiative. Thus, last year, the Ninth Trade Union Congress put forward the draft of a new Labor Code, an important document in whose public discussion 5.8 million men and women took part. When public opinion had been widely consulted, the new Code was adopted by the GDR People's Chamber.

With an eye to further extending the working people's participation in state administration and planning, the Council of Ministers und the Central Board of the United Free German Trade Unions issued a joint decree on the principles governing the collective agreements which are concluded at the enterprises every year. The growing responsibility of the working class for the all-round strengthening of the state is most vividly expressed in the course of socialist competition, which is organized by the trade unions. The aim is to muster the working people to fulfill and overfulfill national-economic plan targets, and this is in the interests of the whole of society and of every individual. Increasingly, those taking part in such competition set themselves the task of enhancing the quality of workmanship and the efficiency of production, boosting labor productivity and improving working and living conditions. In the past few years, the new ideas' movement has acquired great scope. In 1976 over 1.6 million working people suggested new ideas, whose application helped to save 3,700 million marks. All this shows that in one form or another the working people of the GDR enjoy a real right to self-determination also in material production, the basic sphere of social life.

The formation of the world socialist system has brought about profound changes in the content and scale of the economic activity of the socialist state and has carried it beyond the country's boundaries. A new function has emerged, that of fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance among the socialist states, which is determined by the international character of socialism and the task of consolidating the cohesion of the countries building the new society. The socialist-community countries have been doing more together in economic, political, scientific, technical, ideological, cultural, military and other forms of cooperation based on the principle of proletarian internationalism and friendship of the nations.

At the stage of building and perfection of the developed socialist society, the socialist state has an even greater responsibility for deepening the ties with other fraternal countries and gradually bringing the socialist nations closer together in various spheres of social life. This process, which will take some time, was initiated by the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist-community countries, which are united in a strong fraternal alliance. Impressive evidence of the successful pursuit of this policy has come from the treaties of friend-

ship recently concluded between the GDR and the Soviet Union, and the GDR and other fraternal countries.

Socialist economic integration is the highroad for deepening the cooperation among the CMEA countries. This is an important means of building up the socialist countries' economic, scientific and technical potential in a balanced manner and securing the proportional development of their economies. The perfection of economic cooperation among the fraternal socialist countries and the reshaping of deep-rooted and stable ties in the main sectors of production, science and technology are indispensable premises for the fullest and most efficient use of the advantages of socialism in the interests of each individual country and of the community as a whole.

In this context, I must mention the great work that has been done by the state agencies of the CMEA countries in coordinating our plans for the 1976-80 period. Fresh opportunities are being opened up for the more rational use of the funds allocated for research and investment, for meeting our requirements in the key sources of energy and raw materials over a long period, and for stable planning of sales and improvement of transport operations. Measures are also to be taken for the broad use of the advantages of socialist economic integration in intensifying production.

In implementing the Comprehensive Program of Economic integration, the GDR attaches special significance to the steady development and deepening of cooperation with the USSR. The Soviet Union is our most important economic partner, accounting for more than one-third of our foreign trade. Deliveries from the USSR help us to meet a sizable share of our requirements in machinery, equipment, raw materials, fuels, and consumer goods. Deliveries from the USSR of sophisticated machines and complete installations to remodel and modernize production processes are highly important in building up the GDR's material and technical basis. Our cooperative farmers think highly of the powerful Soviet tractors, while the modernization of railway traction, for instance, is being effected mainly through the import of powerful Soviet diesel locomotives. For its part, the GDR supplies the USSR with a great deal of machinery and plant for industry and agriculture, chemicals and consumer goods.

The GDR's economic, scientific and technical ties with the other CMEA countries are also being expanded, and are based on long-term specialization and cooperation agreements. By the end of 1976, the GDR had concluded 400 such bilateral and multilateral agreements and these now account for nearly one-third of our exports to the CMEA countries. Long-term international coordination of economic planning increases the responsibility of state agencies in the countries concerned for meeting their commitments.

The GDR also maintains close ties with the fraternal countries in research and development. Suffice it to say that 80 per cent of the comprehensive projects for scientific and technical development under the state plan is being realized through cooperation with the USSR. This interlacing of the fraternal countries' scientific potentials gives them access to the latest achievements of the scientific and technological revolution. Increasingly vigorous joint efforts are being made in the design and manufacture of machinery, equipment and instruments, which are up to the best world standards. That this cooperation is mutually advantageous will be seen from the good results achieved through the development of new complete chemical plant, modern machine-tools, new technologies in the manufacture of high quality steel and the development and fabrication of a multizonal photgraphic camera for the Soyuz-22 spaceship. Just now, the CMEA countries' state agencies are engaged in jointly drawing up long-term goal-oriented programs until the year 1990, to help them solve the problems of raw materials, fuel and energy over a long period.

The international socialist division of labor within the CMEA framework provides a solid basis for extensive development of economic, scientific and technical ties with other countries, irrespective of their social and state system, on the principles of equality, mutual advantage and respect for sovereignty. We believe that one of the key joint tasks of the socialist states is to create favorable political conditions for expanding world trade that is free from any form of discrimination.

There is a direct connection between our activity in further sharping the developed socialist society in the GDR, and the peoples' struggle for lasting world peace. The preservation and consolidation of peace on the globe, and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems create favorable external conditions for the continued building of socialism and communism, while the strengthening of world socialism, for its part, exerts a substantial influence on the strengthening and growth of the forces of peace, democracy and social progress. That is why, shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and all the other socialist-community countries, our state has carried on a consistent and purposeful struggle to strengthen peace and security in Europe and throughout the world, and to back up the political détente with disarmament measures, something that our party deeply believes is consonant with the vital interests of men and women across the world.

Our people have joined the family of free socialist nations, which is solidly rallied round the Soviet Union. Our friendly ties with the newly-independent countries have been growing closer. The people of the GDR have displayed active solidarity with the working class of

the capitalist countries and with all the fighters for national independence and freedom from imperialist exploitation and oppression. We have also been working to foster in the minds of all our citizens a sense of pride in their socialist country, and love for their socialist homeland. This blend of internationalism and patriotism has increasingly determined the mentality and practical activity of GDR citizens. We believe that this is one of the historic achievements of our Marxist-Leninist party.

The SUPG's policy, which is aimed to advance the well-being of the working class and the rest of our people, helps to further strengthen the unity of the working people and the socialist state. United in their common goal, our people are getting down to the fulfillment of new tasks with optimism and confidence, under the well-tested leadership of the SUPG.

---

# The lessons of February 1948 in Czechoslovakia

*Vasil Bilak*
Presidium member and
Secretary CC CPCz

There have been many momentous events in the life of the peoples of Czechoslovakia that have influenced social development and been reflected in the history of Europe. None of them, however, worked on such a historic scale as the victory of the working people over reaction in February 1948. The further we travel in time from those glorious days the more clearly we perceive the significance of February as the stage at which the domination of the exploiting classes ended forever in our country and power passed once and for all to the working people under the leadership of the working class, guided by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. February 1948 launched a new era in our history — the era of the building of socialism.

Victorious February completed the growth of the national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution and provided a setting in which that revolution could tackle its creative goals. At the same time, the international status of our country was strengthened as never before. Our republic finally and irreversibly took its stand shoulder to shoulder with the USSR and other countries that had chosen the socialist road, and this was an important factor in the establishment of the world socialist system.

Experience has more than once confirmed the simple fact that socialism cannot come into being without revolution. But the success of the revolution depends on the internal and international conditions of the class struggle. The Great October and all subsequent revolutionary development, including the Czechoslovak revolution that culminated in the victory of February 1948, have shown with renewed force that the patterns of the transition to socialism discovered by Lenin have stood the test of practice and that they lead to the emancipation of the working man, to his deliverance from capitalist exploitation, and to a decent and happy life for all people, to the free development of all nations and nationalities.

When in connection with the 30th anniversary of the February victory we turn once again to the experience of our revolution, we are not merely taking an interest in past history. We realize that for the revolutionary movement the class battles of the past have always been one of the vital sources of knowledge of the present and foreknowledge of the future. One could cite as an example the well-known works of the Marxist-Leninist classics on the 1848 revolution in Europe, the Paris Commune, or Lenin's works on the Russian revolutions. The conclusions and propositions we find there were of inestimable importance for the communists of Czechoslovakia in their struggle and search for the ways to a victorious socialist revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the lessons of the revolutionary struggle is all the more important in view of our adversaries' attempts to interpret the history of the socialist revolution in our country in their own way. Unfortunately, such interpreters are to be found among people whom we once called comrades, who even participated in February 1948, but whose revolutionary spirit did not last through the years of long and stubborn struggle. Unable to stand the strain of revolutionary battles, they moved away from the party during the 1968-69 crisis and renounced the goals of socialism. Today, along with the bourgeois ideologists and their reformist apprentices, they strive to slander the policy of our party and the world revolutionary process. Because they cannot pass over or hide the actual fact of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the victories of other socialist revolutions and the successes of socialist construction in a number of countries, our opponents do all they can to distort the historical experience accumulated by socialism, to denigrate or cast doubt on everything positive in this experience. The same purpose is served by the attempts to 'improve on' the socialism we have built, to reconcile socialist ideals with the contradictions of bourgeois society and to turn socialism back from a science into a Utopia. In all these actions it is not hard to trace the thinly veiled desire to discredit

the attraction that existing socialism has for the working people of the capitalist countries.

This is why we see the February events in Czechoslovakia today as living history, closely bound up with modern times and inspiring us in the daily struggle for the new, for the progress of socialism.

The lasting significance of February 1948 lies primarily in the fact that the victory of the socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia, for the first time in history, established working-class power in an industrial country with developed capitalist production relations, with strong traditions of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarianism and reformist social democracy; in a country intimately connected, politically and economically, with the world capitalist system.

The victory of the working people in February 1948 exploded the assertions of bourgeois propaganda, which had been reiterating for decades that socialism, and particularly the Leninist principles of socialist revolution, were realizable only in economically backward countries with a predominantly agrarian structure, low cultural level and total absence of democratic traditions. The historical experience of February has shown that despite all the difference between the Russia of 1917 and the Czechoslovakia of 1948, despite the uniqueness of the historical situation and disposition of the class forces in the struggle, there exist and operate certain general patterns of class struggle, general patterns of socialist revolution that confirm the international significance and viability of Marxist-Leninist theory.

A close study of the preparations, character and course of the socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia convinces us that it was consistent application in the specific Czechoslovak conditions of the theoretical conclusions of Marxism-Leninism, of Lenin's theory on proletarian revolution and, above all, on the proletariat as the leading force of the revolution, the party as the vanguard of the working class, and the need to combine the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism, that enabled the CPCz to lead the proletariat and all the working people of town and country into a decisive struggle against the power of capital.

'The victory of the working people over reaction in February 1948 became possible mainly because they were led by the experienced Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, steeled in class and national-liberation battles and armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, a party which had mastered the strategy and tactics of class struggle,' says a resolution of the Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee in connection with the 30th anniversary. This feature of revolutionary development had been noted by the Ninth Congress of the CPCz (1949), which stated that 'without the party there would have been no People's Democratic Republic. Without the party there would have

been no Victorious February. Without the party there would have been no guarantee that we should not swerve from the road to socialism.' As a leading force of the people, the party relied not only on its Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the 1918-20 national and democratic revolution in Czechoslovakia, a revolution whose fruits had been reaped by the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie. The communists of Czechoslovakia gained invaluable help from the history of the three Russian revolutions, which had been generalized and developed by Soviet communists, from the experience of the whole international communist movement. The CPCz developed the experience accumulated in the struggle for a united and popular front in the period between the first and second world wars, the struggle in defense of democracy and the republic against fascism, and against the selfishness and treachery of the bourgeoisie and the reformist parties, which was expressed in the disgraceful Munich diktat.

All this is reflected in the communists' integral concept of the anti-fascist national-liberation struggle, which in the years when Czechoslovakia was split and occupied by Hitler's forces proved superior to Benes' bourgeois concept of resistance.

The communists regarded it as their main task to preserve the existence of the Czechs and the Slovaks, to restore national freedom and the state independence of the republic. To fulfill this task they bore countless sacrifices. In the hardest years of the struggle against Hitler and against reaction at home the communists were the decisive force of the resistance. Their record remained unblemished. And yet, they never lost sight of the need to fight the illusion that liberation from nazi domination would in itself eliminate the main class contradictions of the pre-Munich republic. They wanted the Czechoslovak republic to be reborn on new, progressive principles of people's democracy, they wanted a change in its previous pro-Western foreign-policy orientation, which in the past had brought about the tragedy of Munich. They wanted the foreign policy of the liberated republic to be mainly oriented on the Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty of friendship, mutual aid and postwar cooperation concluded on December 12, 1943.

Realizing that it would not be easy to achieve such fundamental advances in home and foreign policy, the communists made every effort for the working class to win by its participation in the resistance the right of hegemony in the national-liberation struggle and, in a broad class alliance with the other working people and progressive forces, to capture positions that would allow it to exert a decisive influence on the internal structure and orientation of their liberated country.

The importance of the revolutionary activity of the working class

and the broad masses, led by the communists, revealed itself to the full during the Slovak national uprising, which initiated the national and democratic revolution. Revolutionary bodies — the Slovak National Council, the revolutionary national committees, the councils at enterprises, etc. — were immediately set up on insurgent territory and took over power and the defense of the people's interests. Thanks to the communists' persistence and initiative, these revolutionary bodies carried out measures that accorded with the working people's notions of how the liberated republic should be organized. Revolutionary bodies of a similar type also emerged during the national-liberation struggle in Bohemia, particularly during the preparations for and in the course of the uprising of the Czech people in May 1945, and on the territory liberated by the Soviet Army. This confronted the bourgeoisie with the alternative of either agreeing to the existence of these bodies and the measures they were carrying out, or openly opposing the interests of the majority of the people. Party strategy and tactics, based on analysis of the revolutionary situation and realistic assessment of the balance of class forces, compelled the bourgeois circles, including the emigré government, to retreat from their former positions and cooperate with the communists in carrying through a national and democratic revolution.

The Kosice government program, passed on April 5, 1945, which had been drafted by the party leadership under Klement Gottwald and which, under the pressure of the masses, was also accepted by representatives of the non-communist political parties, was a creative confirmation of Lenin's ideas on the tasks of the proletariat in the national and democratic revolution. It opened the road to a just solution of the nationalities question in the common state of the Czechs and Slovaks based on the principle of equality. The program expressed the deep conviction of the broad masses that the new state should, step by step, carry out political and social measures that would gradually lead to a society of social justice, to socialism. The direction to be taken was defined in the concluding part of the program by the solemn promise of the first government of the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks that 'in the liberated republic the selfish interests of individuals and groups should not be allowed to predominate over the interests of the working people of town and country.'

Klement Gottwald expressed the political line of the CPCz at this stage of the Czechoslovak revolution in the following words: 'Our program is national. Fulfillment of the national program is the prerequisite for achieving socialist goals.' The party leadership did not proclaim any particular 'Czechoslovak socialism' but, through the struggle for broad national unity in specific Czechoslovak conditions,

it consistently created the foundations for Czechoslovakia's socialist orientation.

The primary precondition for this was the deepening and strengthening of the revolutionary party's vanguard role. Immediately after the liberation the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia redoubled its activity. It was structured as a mass party and, although it had lost many experienced party workers in the war, it grew quickly and increased its strength. The decisive majority of politically conscious workers joined the party and with these new recruits a firm and reliable nucleus was built up. Many peasants and intellectuals also joined the party, bringing its numbers to one million by March 1946.

The communists carried on systematic politico-organizational, propaganda and agitation work to win over the majority of people for its policies, for consistent realization of the national and democratic revolution, for strengthening the unity of the working class with the working peasants, intellectuals and middle urban strata. The success of this policy was expressed in the broad socio-economic transformations that were carried out, particularly the first stage of the agrarian reform, nationalization of the banks, insurance, the mines and other key industries, which seriously undermined the economic position of the bourgeoisie, and also in the success in the 1946 elections to the Constituent National Assembly, when the party gained 38 per cent of the poll. This allowed the communists to considerably extend their positions in the government, parliament and the national committees. The CPCz regarded the favorable election results as a manifestation of the working people's faith in the program of the national and democratic revolution, in the feasibility of peaceful transition to socialism.

As time went on, however, it became increasingly clear that the forces which had accepted the Kosice program had interpreted it in different and, sometimes, diametrically opposed ways.

The Communist Party and its leadership worked on the assumption that the limited structural changes in the politico-economic, social and cultural fields carried out on the basis of the Kosice, and later the Creative* government programs, were only an approach to realization of broad socialist transformations, the beginning of the transition from capitalism to socialism, but by no means a socialist revolution in the full sense. Further steps had to be taken to turn the national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. The bourgeoisie led by President Benes believed, on the contrary, that the changes that had already been brought about were the most they could accept and,

*The creative program was the name given to the program of the Gottwald government that came to power in the 1946 elections. It consisted mainly of a two-year plan for restoring the economy and drawing up a new constitution.

on this basis, tried to set up a mechanism that would ensure for them 'normal' development toward a bourgeois-democratic version under the vague slogan of 'self-socializing democracy.' Some people in the non-communist parties regarded the first socio-economic and political measures taken by the people's democratic state, as the final triumph of socialism in its specific Czechoslovak form. Like their political followers from the right-opportunist and revisionist camp two decades later in 1968, they tried to idealize the socio-political system that emerged after 1945 and presented it as the perfect model of 'Czechoslovak socialism,' whose chief feature was the so-called 'pluralism of political parties' based on the existence of several economic sectors, including exploiting sectors.

Up to a certain point the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks provided effective support for the people's government. It had been formed on the basis of the Kosice program and embraced representatives of parties that were not stained by collaboration with fascism, and the CPCz was its main and leading force. The National Front policy, which the CPCz pursued consistently, served as an important instrument for welding the unity of broad sections of the people and for using the constitutional bodies, the government and other instruments of state in the interests of peaceful development of the revolution, and also to draw the broad masses into the struggle for democracy and socialism through the mass revolutionary organizations and, above all, the united revolutionary trade unions. At the same time, however, there was a complex class struggle for preservation and development of the popular democratic character of the new Czechoslovak state. The contradictions within the National Front started a process of concentration and differentiation of class forces. Representatives of the bourgeoisie, who had gradually assumed leadership of the Nationalist-Socialist and People's parties in Bohemia, and the Democratic Party in Slovakia, opened the doors to the old reactionaries who had been ousted in 1945, and tried to halt the revolutionary process. Reaction's resistance increased as it began to lose its positions. With the full support of international capital it tried to bring chaos into the economy. It sabotaged economic planning and held up fulfillment of the two-year plan and postwar reconstruction. Black market speculation created a threat to consumer supply. The reactionaries even tried to exploit the severe drought in 1947 to their own ends. They placed obstacles in the way of cleansing the national life of collaborationists and traitors and undermined the work of the government, parliament and the national committees. Reaction's subversive activity became the main barrier on the road of revolutionary development.

Historians have yet to explain the fact that the revolutions of the

20th century after October 1917 show a definite tendency to arrive at a historical crossroads: either they grow into socialist revolutions and thereby consolidate and further develop their democratic gains, or, for certain reasons, they fail to achieve this transition and the revolutionary upswing is then followed by an onslaught of reaction and sometimes even a fascist dictatorship.

The lasting significance of the Czechoslovak experience, in our view, lies in the realization that the outcome of the first stage of the revolution, its democratic phase, only paves the way for further progress toward socialism. The emergent political and state system, in which part of the bourgeoisie participates in government along with the working class, is not and cannot logically be, victorious socialism. This system becomes only the basis for further class struggle and the formation of both revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces.

It must be stressed, however, that whereas in the first Czechoslovak republic the capitalist class itself was torn by the competitive struggle, whereas in the conditions of occupation the bourgeoisie was divided into pro-fascists and anti-fascists, as the national and democratic revolution developed it forgot its own contradictions, joined forces for subversive activity against the people's democratic system, and tried to secure the support of the right-socialist and reformist forces in order to split the ranks of the working people, isolate the communists and regain a dominating position in the state.

Already in the first postwar years our experience confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that every genuine revolution encounters the prolonged, stubborn and desperate resistance of the exploiters, who want counter-revolution and restoration of the old regime.

So, one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from an analysis of the Czechoslovak revolution is the inevitability, the natural tendency toward reactionary resistance on the part of the bourgeoisie as a whole, stemming from the increasing divergence of its interests from those of the working people, from national and state interests.

For the sake of historical truth it must be said that the communists foresaw this development and were well aware that the peaceful transition to socialism did not depend only on the positions and actions of the working class, but would also depend on the strength of the resistance offered by capital. They based themselves on their revolutionary experience, which teaches that the growth of reaction and counter-revolution cannot be treated passively. The communists, who were leading all the progressive forces, launched a counterattack

and came out with the slogan of winning over the majority of the nation in order to isolate bourgeois reaction politically.*

Moreover, the CPCz had no illusions that victory would be easy and would come by itself. By the second half of 1947 it was clear that the class and political struggle in Czechoslovakia was nearing its crisis. The further development of society depended on the answer to the question 'who will win?': either the working class and the working people led by the Communist Party would win, would consolidate the people's democratic state and take it further along the path of socialism, or victory would go to the bourgeoisie with its own political leaders and supported by the reformists, who would change the internal structure and restore the bourgeois-democratic system.

For three decades, now, bourgeois propaganda has described February as a communist conspiracy. But the facts tell us just the opposite. Yes, this was a conspiracy, not a communist but a counter-revolutionary, bourgeois conspiracy. The communists, in preparing for the 1948 elections, scrupulously observed all the laws, all the democratic standards of the republic's internal life. What is more, in defining their policy in the election campaign they proceeded from the idea voiced by Klement Gottwald at the CPCz Central Committee meeting in November 1947, when he proposed that the list of CPCz candidates should be made up so as to provide as broad a base as possible and secure as much support as possible among all sections of the working people of town and country. It should 'go beyond the bounds of party and embrace everything in the nation that is really progressive and really democratic.' The communists were successful in enlisting 'left-wingers from all parties.' (K. Gottwald, *Spisy,* Vol. 14, Prague, 1958, p. 192). In this situation, as acknowledged by J. Lettrich, then chairman of the Slovak Democratic Party and one of the leaders of the anti-communist bloc of those days, 'the non-communists were consequently faced with the alternative of either to resist these attempts, to provoke a government crisis and demand new parliamentary elections, or to allow the communists to continue their preparations for "obtaining the majority." The non-communists chose the alternative of a government crisis' (J. Lettrich, *History of Modern Slovakia,* New York, 1955, p. 257).

*Defining this slogan at the January meeting of the CPCz Central Committee in 1947, Klement Gottwald stressed that it had nothing to do with the Austro-Marxist notions that one had only to win an election majority and 'paradise would dawn in Austria.' 'Such a "percentage" policy,' Gottwald stated, 'is not for us and, to tell the truth, is not what we have in mind when we say that it is necessary to win over the majority of the nation. Our policy is a policy of active struggle against reaction, a policy of capturing more and more positions, a policy of consolidating the positions we have won and forcing the enemy to retreat' (K. Gottwald, *Spisy,* Vol. 13, Prague, 1957, p. 292).

But on February 20, 1948, when 12 ministers representing the anti-communist bloc in the government, resigned and thus evoked a government crisis which developed into a serious political crisis embracing the whole country, the masses, led by the CPCz, replied with united and resolute action. Thanks to the revolutionary activity of the mass of the people the bourgeoisie finally lost its share of participation in the government, its political parties disintegrated and all power was taken by the working class and the working people of the republic led by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

Moreover, it must be stressed that the ultimate solution to the question of power and clearing the road to socialism was achieved by peaceful means that fully accorded with the aspirations of the CPCz, which, as Klement Gottwald stated on February 21, 1948, at the meeting in Old Town Square, wanted 'to solve the crisis constitutionally, democratically and in parliament on the basis of a broad National Front representing all sections of the working people in town and country' (K. Gottwald, *Spisy,* Vol. 14, Prague 1958, p. 252). And this, indisputably, relates to the most essential aspects of the experience gained in the February events of 1948.

The peaceful road, as planned and followed by the CPCz, was a road of sharp class and political conflict, a revolutionary road.

The party consistently analyzed the course of events from Marxist-Leninist positions, taking into account the balance of class forces, reacting quickly to new events and tendencies and, on this basis, clarifying and defining its political line and determining the pace and forms of the revolutionary process. Consequently, the crisis provoked in February 1948 did not catch the communists unprepared.

At the decisive moment the CPCz showed that it was fully capable of leading the masses. It called on the working class and its allies to be vigilant and engaged energetically in all forms of political struggle, including the general strike. Bourgeois provocations were answered with class counter-blows and new demands on behalf of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and the trade unions. These demands were approved by the congress of factory councils on February 22, 1948, and the congress of peasant commissions that followed. The counter-revolution was paralyzed by the action committees of the National Front, formed on the initiative of the communists and the progressive forces in other parties within state bodies, parties and public organizations in the capital and on a local level. Thanks to Ludvik Svoboda, who was the Minister of National Defense at the time, the enemies of people's democracy were unable to exploit the armed forces, where they still had some influence, for their own purposes. The revolutionary cause was upheld by the tried and tested members of the National Security Corps, faithful to the people. And

to dispel all desire on the part of reaction to resort to force of arms the Worker's Militia — the armed working class — went into action.

The course of the February events fully confirmed the wisdom of Lenin's demands that a working-class party should master all forms and methods of revolutionary struggle and that it should be prepared for the most rapid and brusque replacement of one form by another (see *Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 96).

History records the use of various forms of transition to socialism and also the differing results thus achieved. Czechoslovakia's revolutionary experience exposed the fallacy of the arguments used by the opponents of the peaceful road to socialism. It likewise showed that this road should not be absolutized. The February events demonstrated that given favorable internal and external conditions a peaceful transition to socialism is possible only if the party is capable of assessing the specific course of the class struggle and the balance of forces, if it wins over the broad masses and through its strategy and tactics creates conditions suitable for applying various revolutionary forms and methods of struggle. What, then, are the factors that made possible the peaceful course of the February events?

Most important among these factors was the policy of a broad National Front drawn up by the CPCz on the basis of the revolutionary program and recognized by all political parties and public organizations. All who stood for the National Front program and helped to carry it out were considered allies of the Communist Party.

Another factor was combining the party's work in the organs of state power, where it played a leading role, with its work among the broad masses and their organizations, particularly in the revolutionary trade union movement. This made it possible to apply pressure from 'above' and from 'below' in order to realize the demands and revolutionary tasks that were put forward.

Another factor was creative work in renewing and building up the republic. It was precisely the realization of the creative program providing for the vital requirements of the people and of the country that led to a regrouping of class-political forces and the growing isolation of reaction.

Yet another factor was untiring work in exposing the bourgeoisie as opponents of national and democratic demands. The party was well aware that the bourgeoisie would not voluntarily give up its political and economic positions. Led by the communists, the working class by legal means compelled the bourgeoisie to make concessions and forced it to retreat.

Another factor was the consistent foreign-policy orientation of the Soviet Union, which not only played the decisive role in Czechoslovakia's liberation, but also extended fraternal aid to the Czecho-

slovak revolution when international imperialism was bent on strangling it economically. The republic received grain, raw materials for its industries and access to Soviet markets. This paralyzed the economic conspiracy of imperialism and the national bourgeoisie.

No objective assessment of the influence on our revolution of the Soviet Union's liberating mission and the alliance between our countries could possibly lend any weight to the notion of 'export of revolution.' Every social revolution stems from the objective contradictions in society, in its internal structure, and depends on the maturity of the internal revolutionary forces. But it is also indisputable that the very existence and strength of the Soviet Union, and our relationship of alliance with the USSR, were factors creating favorable external conditions for the peaceful development of the revolutionary process in Czechoslovakia and ruling out any possibility of foreign intervention in support of reaction. The international solidarity of the world communist and working-class movement also rendered us great assistance.

In connection with the 30th anniversary of the Victorious February, it is fitting and in accord with historical truth to again stress that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia — the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the working people — proved its maturity both in consistently carrying through the national and democratic revolution and during the transition to socialism and its construction.

In the new epoch launched by February, just as in the political battles before and during February, the party's leading role was the decisive prerequisite and main guarantee of successful achievement of our objectives. The past three decades convincingly show that growth in the role of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard is a general law of socialist construction.

Just as the February victory demanded creative application of the propositions of Marxism-Leninism on the proletarian revolution in specific Czechoslovak conditions, so the building of the foundations of socialism, and then of a developed socialist society, made it necessary to seek and find the most effective, specific ways of achieving our aims. Relying on the experience of the USSR and taking into account the national features of Czechoslovakia, the party proceeded from the general laws of socialist construction, such as: the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party; socialist public ownership of the means of production and the principles of planned management of the economy; Marxist-Leninist ideology and its assimilation by the masses; the principles of proletarian internationalism and their consistent application, above all in relations with the USSR and other socialist countries, where these principles

have evolved from standards of relationships between the workers of different countries and their parties, into standards of relationships between states and nations.

Ignoring these laws, as was strikingly shown by the 1968-69 crisis in the party and society, leads to an offensive by the right anti-socialist forces, holds up development of socialist society and threatens the loss of revolutionary gains. The party was able to overcome this threat also.

The changes that have been brought about in the political, economic and cultural life of the Czechoslovak people have no precedent in our history. Despite the difficulties, shortcomings and mistakes that accompanied the building of socialism, the achievements of the past decade, when compared with the development of bourgeois Czechoslovakia and the situation in the capitalist world today, reveal the great ideological, political, moral and material advantages and strength of socialism.

Dynamic economic development strengthened Czechoslovakia's position. Slovakia's industrialization and transformation from a backward agrarian region into an industrially developed area enhanced the country's economic might and the unity of the Czechoslovak state. With the creation of large-scale socialist farming, a new class of cooperative peasants was formed. The social structure of society changed. Under socialism the working people acquired a strong sense of social certitude — unemployment was abolished, the right to work was guaranteed, comprehensive medical aid was made available to all and security in old age ensured. Living standards of all classes and strata of the population improved greatly. The general access to cultural values brought an unprecedented upsurge of education and culture. Science was developed successfully and the social activity of the masses increased.

The experience of Czechoslovakia, like the experience of the USSR and the other socialist countries, confirmed the fact that it was not possible to effect a direct transition to communism by building the foundations of socialism and attaining a certain level in socialist development. We were also faced with the historically inevitable and relatively long stage of building a developed socialist society. This stage involves the all-round development and perfection of every aspect of socialism, revealing ever more vividly and fully its advantages, its objective laws and principles.

The working people of our country, led by the Communist Party, have proved in practice that they can both manage and govern better than the capitalists did. They have proved this, among many other things, in recent years too. The 15th Congress of the CPCz rightly noted that this was an extremely fruitful and successful period in the

history of the party and the whole history of socialist construction.

Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CC CPCz and President of Czechoslovakia, noted at the 15th Congress that 'the successful development since the 14th Congress has confirmed that the party can fulfill its historical role only when it builds all its activities on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, when it is closely linked with the people, when it has firm, united and efficient leadership. Our advance has become possible thanks to the growth of the party's inner strength, unity and efficiency, thanks to the strengthening of its leading role in society and of its Marxist-Leninist character.' This is one of the most important lessons learned from the Victorious February.

The victory of the working people in February 1948 and the success of socialism in Czechoslovakia are one of the proofs of the international significance of Marxism-Leninism, a logical continuation of the Leninist revolutionary road that has shown itself to be correct in Czechoslovak conditions. At the same time they are proof of the correctness of CPCz policy, which proceeds consistently and creatively from this revolutionary theory, solving the specific problems of the building of a developed socialist society and making its contribution to the historical advance of the forces of peace, progress and socialism on a world scale.


**New Rates for Communist Viewpoint**

Effective January 1978

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

**Write to: Progress Subscription Service**
**71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor**
**Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6**

exchange of views

# The communists and the consciousness of the masses

Interview with *Francisco Gamboa,* member, CC Political Commission, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica.

*Q.* After a long interval, your party is now legally taking part in the election of the country's president and deputies of the Legislative Assembly and the municipal councils. What new opportunities does this open before the party and what are the problems it faces in its work among the masses and in the extension of its influence?

*A.* Elections in Costa Rica help to establish contacts with almost the whole people and we take every opportunity to use the press, radio and television, and also to meet the people directly. In this connection it is important that the state guarantees law and order in holding meetings and rallies. Even in the past our party never ceased participating in the electoral struggles, although it had no legal status. Of course, in most instances the bourgeoisie managed to keep us out of the struggle under various formal pretexts. Still, we found opportunities for running our own candidates: in 1970, for instance, we nominated our party's General Secretary as a candidate and he was elected.

For many years, we constantly made it known that the party was there and active, and the people saw this. We carried on a sustained struggle for democratic rights and civic freedoms. We decided not to hide, not to close in upon ourselves, but gradually to pave the way for the party, to address the public and the masses in full view of the police and the government. People gradually got accustomed to seeing our newspaper sold openly in the streets. We began selling it through the commercial network and as a result it was gradually established as yet another Costa Rican newspaper.

Consequently, our party won its legal status in the course of a struggle over many years, a struggle which we consciously directed and organized. We carefully considered our every step, taking account of the country's democratic traditions and of our people's mentality and character, and also of the fact that the rulers of a

country like Costa Rica had perforce to reckon with these factors, whether they liked it or not, as otherwise they could not pursue their policy and would run into grave problems.

Our participation in the electoral struggle has now changed in that in the past we had to act illegally, and now we are working legally. But this is nothing new for the public because the party's legalization was in the nature of normalization, confirmation of what already existed in fact. This did not bring about any great changes in the party's day-to-day activity, but new aspects have undoubtedly appeared in our practical work.

The task we now set ourselves is to influence the consciousness of the masses, of the broadest and most diverse sections of the population. This means not merely winning over to our side a *part* of the masses, attracting new members into the party ranks and canvassing more supporters at elections, although that is extremely important, but also carrying our ideas and proposals for solving the various concrete problems to the *whole* differentiated mass of the population — both those who now support the party, and those who oppose it. This is in broad terms the task of exerting an influence on men's minds in Costa Rican society and winning public opinion over to our side. At the same time, this is also a more concrete and more local task, the task of creating a front of progressive forces to promote democratic transformations in our society. This is also what inspires our party's practical activity.

During the run-up to the election we held talks with the representatives of other left-wing forces in the country. The immediate outcome of these talks was the establishment of an alliance between the People's Vanguard Party and the Socialist Party and the Working People's Party, the formation of an electoral coalition called United People, which nominated its candidates for the posts of President and Vice-President of the Republic and which aims at having its candidates elected to the Legislative Assembly and all the municipal councils in the country.

Everyone knows that the bourgeois parties spend vast amounts of money on their electoral campaigns, and on the strength of that alone we are fairly well aware that we may just about be crushed by the huge propaganda machine: they have two or three hundred times more funds available for the electoral campaign than we do. Imperialist propaganda keeps up its brainwashing day and night, makes use of every means, including graft and financing of splinter groups taking a 'leftist' stand.

As our party has emphasized in a statement, the United People coalition could counter the millions at the disposal of the parties of the big bourgeoisie with a high level of organization, a spirit of self-sacri-

fice, boundless generosity on the part of thousands of party members and sympathizers, and also of broad masses of people, explaining that there is now no alternative except a victory of the popular forces for a solution of the grave problems facing us.

But our talks with the left forces resulted in more than the establishment of a coalition. We got to know each other better, told each other, quite frankly, what we think, and discussed problems of theory and various aspects of the program and tactics.

We have always maintained contacts with the Socialist Party, in whose ranks there are intellectuals, university lecturers, students and civil servants, and which controls one of the chief civil servants' trade unions. However, in the past these contacts were sporadic. We now want them to become regular.

We also seek mutual understanding with the representatives of the ultra-left forces. They are not at all homogeneous. In Costa Rica, these are very small groups, including some who advocate resolute and instant revolutionary action. Even in times of the most acute disagreements between us and these groups, we have had to admit that most of them are fairly loyal, bold and sincere. Just now many of them are engaged in a deep and self-critical analysis of their acts and positions, admitting that they had acted wrongly in attacking us, often on issues on which they were not at all clear themselves, as they now say. They admit that our party bears most of the responsibility for developing the revolutionary struggles in the country and believe that they allowed themselves to make various assertions because they did not feel any responsibility or massive support behind them.

At present, many have got down to a serious study of Marxism and have been acting more soundly. Besides, several splits have occurred among the ultras, and most of the former members of these groupings have already joined the ranks of our party and of our Youth League. Characteristically, it is mainly the young people who are attracted to these groups, but it is precisely the young who crave for knowledge and seek to study Marxism, and who, having studied it, come to understand that what the ultras are doing is sheer madness. That is when they leave these groupings and come over to our side. Many of our cadres — good cadres — come from the ranks of the 'leftists' and these people are now fine young communists.

Emphasizing the importance of the established electoral coalition, our party said that such unity, which goes well beyond the framework of the three parties, could develop, as practice has shown, into the broadest unification of the people. The development and improvement of cooperation among the left forces warrants the assumption that this unity will grow stronger and have an ever more important

part to play in intensifying the people's struggle against U.S. imperialism and the national oligarchy.

We also maintain contacts with the bourgeois parties, with their progressive forces, and have, in a sense, cooperated with the country's biggest party, the National-Liberation Party. Of course, we have no alliance with it, but on many issues we have acted in a united front. Thus, we acted together on the question of establishing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Let me add that in Costa Rica a number of progressive reforms have been put through. In some cases, we supported these measures, while openly declaring that they fail to provide any substantial solutions for the problems.

Of course, it is easy to criticize this policy of ours from the angle of the ultras and other groupings alleging that the communists agree with the bourgeoisie, hold talks with it, and so on. That is precisely the criticism they levelled at us at our recent talks. But we were absolutely sincere and frank when we told our opponents that it was not at all easy for us to carry on this kind of work with the representatives of the bourgeois parties. It would have been much easier to declare flatly that we were on this side of the line, and the bourgeoisie, on the other, as something united and whole, an enemy to be shot at. Evidently, that kind of policy does not call for much wisdom, but then it will not yield any useful results either. Our view is that we are responsible to the people of Costa Rica for establishing and extending democracy in our country, and it is up to us to fortify the party and the popular forces. So we must seek to create the necessary conditions, including an effort to maintain and develop the country's best democratic traditions in which our party could develop, in which the struggle for social change could go forward not only in Costa Rica but in other Latin American countries as well.

That is why we seek mutual understanding and cooperation with all the progressive forces. We remain clearly aware of what we want to achieve in pursuing such a policy, conducting a principled line in practice, without sacrificing the goals of our struggle and, of course, never foregoing the people's interests.

*Q.* Practice shows that in the conditions in which fresh opportunities are opened up for united action by all the progressive forces, one special problem is the party's independent position, the need for the masses to be able to see exactly what it stands for in a broad coalition. Have you this kind of problem?

*A.* Let me say, first of all, that the masses undoubtedly draw a distinction between our party and the others. Of course, everything is simple in this sense when it comes to the bourgeois parties. As for the left groups, things are somewhat more complicated. It is true that the ultra-leftists have their own organization with a military structure and

military methods, and the people also see the difference between what they say and propose and what we say and propose, despite the fact that the ultra-leftists, as I have said, have undergone some evolution and now, for instance, direct some trade unions, carry on mass work and exert much effort in this direction. Still, with their tenets they differ from us fairly distinctly. By contrast, the socialists at first sight appear to stand for the same ideals as we do, especially for someone who is not well informed. They have no clearly formulated program and they are inconsistent in their acts and choice of tactical approaches, but over the long term their propositions are close to ours. The party has been doing much to show their distinctive features and the substance of their theoretical propositions, explaining to the people the road we have taken and just why we have taken it. Here our newspaper, which has a circulation of 20,000 copies a week, a fairly large figure for a country like Costa Rica, is highly important.

Some representatives of the left forces declare, as I have already said, that we have been plodding along in the wake of the National-Liberation Party. Indeed, some people even in the bourgeois parties who want to annoy us claim that the communists have been doing what the National-Liberation Party tells them. This has naturally tended to disorient the masses. That is why the question of the party as an independent force is certainly vital and meaningful. In this context, its principled stand and consistency are highly important. As for the National-Liberation Party, in particular, we have publicly declared at our Congress and in our documents that we regard it as a right-wing Social-Democratic party, and have exposed the reformist character of its measures, while showing the people the real perspectives before them.

We have our own program, and it does not coincide with the program of any other party; we have our own rules, and we have been pursuing our general line without wavering. Our independent pursuit of our political line and the establishment of the party's influence among the masses should correspond to our organizational independence, and that is how it is in actual fact.

Just now, in the course of the electoral campaign, we have once again stressed the danger of opportunism and the need to carry on an active ideological struggle so as to disengage the masses from the influence of the parties of the big bourgeoisie, and to make the working people aware that their destiny has nothing in common with the destiny of those who make use of the state apparatus in the interests of the latifundists, the commercial and industrial magnates and the multinationals. The party seeks to invigorate its work in

rousing the people to struggle for democratic transformations in Costa Rican society.

*Q.* You have set the task of extending your representation in the Legislative Assembly and the municipal councils. What is the party's view of the role of its representatives in these organs of power?

*A.* We use the parliament and the municipal councils, which are also a kind of parliament, as a rostrum, as Lenin said, to spread our ideas among broad strata of the population and to attain definite, fully realistic goals, which help to advance in various fields. Here is one example. We have put before the Legislative Assembly the draft of a deep-going agrarian reform, fully aware that in the present conditions it will not be passed. But it is a bill which we would put through if we came to power at any time. The very discussion of this bill in parliament and its circulation among the working people shows them this: here is what the communists would like to do if they took over. Does the bill meet the peasants' interests? Yes, it does. The bourgeoisie has rejected it, but the peasants have a bill for which to fight.

Let me give you another example. Our Constitution had an article legalizing some contracts concluded with the imperialist corporations. Such contracts, which were enacted into law for the benefit of a great number of imperialist enterprises, allowed the unhampered and rapacious plunder of the country's natural resources. This article of the Constitution was invalidated two years ago thanks to a bill motioned by our deputies.

*Q.* In the 40s your party was in the government, and that is when a number of radical measures were taken in the social sphere. What is the masses' view of these measures and do they associate these in their minds with the communists' activity?

*A.* The party was connected with the government for six years, from 1942 to 1948. In these six years, a social security system was introduced, and this was organized mainly by the communists. The Social Security Act was passed earlier, but it was the communists who set it in motion. A chapter on social guarantees was written into the Constitution: the right to work and the protection of the basic rights of the working people, women and the young. This is a highly important chapter of the Constitution and it was the basis for the adoption of the Labor Code, at that time the most progressive in the whole of Central and a part of South America, and also a number of laws on social reform. These were reforms, but they brought the people considerable benefits and today people associate this directly with the communists' activity. Quite naturally we make use of this in our propaganda work.

*Q.* If you found yourself in the government in the present con-

ditions, would your work differ from that which you carried on in the past?

*A.* I think it would. If this happened, the difference would be the same as that between reform and revolution, because, I think, what *was done* in that period corresponded to what *could be done*. At the time it was an alliance in which we supported the government and its attitude within a world alliance against fascism. I hope — and have a right to hope — that if we were to re-enter the government we would, of course, do our best in the new situation to bring about changes in the economic structure, in society's economic basis, in addition to changes in its superstructure.

The process now going on in Costa Rica is one of mustering forces and publicizing our ideas. Ours is still a very small party operating in a small country encircled by dictatorial regimes. This means that we must be realistic. We must muster forces, disseminate our ideas, win over public opinion and strive for the growth of the party, the trade unions and other organizations.

*Q.* How do you go about building up the system of measures, or the mechanism, helping to implant communist ideals in the minds of the masses?

*A.* I think the primary factor is our party's program as the basis on which the 'mechanism' operates. Our program calls for the accomplishment of the revolution in two interconnected stages. The first stage is the democratic, anti-imperialist stage paving the way for the transition to socialism, or the second stage of the revolution. We make it clear what these two stages mean for the peasants, workers, students, housewives, mothers and children, what they mean for each of them. These objectives are served by the mechanism of our propaganda, by the work of our party organizations and the trade unions, by the politicalization of the unions. We strive in the course of economic struggles to raise the political standard of the masses, that is, to arm them with a theoretical weapon and, moreover, to give them a true idea of the actual benefits which the first and second stages of the revolution will bring them. We have specific projects showing how this or that change will influence people's lives, on what terms the peasants will be allotted land, how its transfer will be effected, how cooperatives will be set up, in what way the benefits of modern science will serve the peasants, how public education, culture, health care, and so on, will be promoted.

Our draft laws, our program, our propaganda and weekly newspaper indicate how the social consciousness of the workers and peasants can be fostered in the course of specific struggles and through educational work. To be sure, the chief problem is to create a strong, disciplined party, an organization of theoretically and cultur-

ally trained people; it's one of the most important tasks facing us. What we must do first of all is, I would say, to make the communists themselves communists, that is, to educate those who join the party, train them and then ensure that non-communists follow the communists on the road charted by program. Needless to say, we attach paramount importance to the example set by every member of the party, by its leaders, for people also educate themselves by looking at their image in the communist 'mirror.'

Some aspects of our activity have to do with establishing the party's prestige and expanding its influence among diverse population groups.

To begin with, there is our work among youth, for Costa Rica is a very young country, most of whose inhabitants are below 30. We have succeeded in forming a youth organization, which comprises numerous workers and other working people and is now the country's strongest and most authoritative youth organization. We constitute a large force in the bigger of Costa Rica's new universities, which has 35,000 students, and have won a leading position in the other. Our youth organization is working in close unity with other youth organizations of the country. This unity manifested itself, for instance, in the political song festival held in solidarity with the Chilean people. The event drew 12,000 young people and this in so small a country as ours, and was most meaningful politically. Now our youth organization is actively preparing for the World Festival of Youth and Students to be held in Havana.

A very important aspect of our activity is to extend our party's sphere of influence among the workers, first of all in big modern enterprises. The proportion of workers in the party is as high as 51 per cent. But closer analysis reveals the notable fact that in the capital the proportion of workers in the party is only slightly over 30 per cent. This means that most of the worker members come from banana plantations. As for the party organization in the capital, it is not strong enough and this is serious because there are numerous skilled industrial workers in the capital. As Secretary of the City Committee of the party, I'm concerned about this state of affairs. How are we to reach the capital's factories?

We are working on the problem right now and encounter numerous difficulties. We are in the presence of a new, very young working class. Industry in Costa Rica sprang up a mere eight or nine years ago. Younge people who worked on coffee plantations for low wages have since gone into industry and now earn three or four times as much as before. Many of them imagine at first, and sometimes for years, that they have struck gold. Besides, they are employed in modern, well-equipped enterprises, where the workers are treated more or less

decently. However, those who attempt to form a trade union or who show the slightest sympathy for the communists are promptly sacked. They get severance pay, their dismissal is registered according to the law and they are thrown out. At present we seek contact with the workers and have already established links with them at 100 enterprises. We've set up embryonic trade unions and party branches at the enterprises. The comrades who have joined them know full well that their daily bread is threatened thereby, for they may be discharged at any moment. Every month and every week we get word of the dismissal of 20 workers at one factory, 30 at another, and so on. This certainly frightens people. And so we consider that we must devise working methods that will enable us to reach the factories without endangering the people we approach. This is very hard but we are doing our best to find the right methods.

I would also like to point out the need for a modern approach to problems, the need to perfect the party's working methods. We've done much to improve the functioning of our leading committees at both national and regional level, as well as the functioning of branches, and the entire party structure. We've been trying to strengthen the weaker echelons and to popularize up-to-date methods of work, study and propaganda. The party Executive has considerably improved its work of late and has distributed the various functions more reasonably. We now have a planning commission in charge of proper organization of our activity. My feeling is that we are gradually improving our party by helping it to assimilate the new knowledge resulting from progress in modern sciences. Unless we try harder to introduce modern working methods and take a scientific approach to contemporary problems and phenomena we may find ourselves unable to understand what is going on in our society, let alone to cope with our tasks.

Let me give a typical example. Many of our party members are experts in electronic computers. They have a vast amount of information on the most diverse problems of the country, such as its population, economy or agriculture. They ask us how this wealth of information can help the party. Yet the party is unprepared to take the information they offer, for to take it does not mean sorting out batches of cards but setting up a system for the processing and use of information.

If we don't do our best to bring our work into line with present-day requirements we will be unable to picture, say, the operation of many modern enterprises. As it is, we don't always know how they operate and so can't understand the problems facing their employees. This undoubtedly detracts from the effectiveness of party work, above all the work of party branches. My own experience suggests that the

standard of their work is much higher now than, say, 17 years ago, when I joined the party. However, I'm leading a city committee, the party Committee of the capital, and I can see that often our branches use the same methods as were in use ten to 15 years ago. That, of course, doesn't make it any easier to solve so important a problem as that of expanding the party's influence among the skilled workers and other social strata. I must say that our youth organization is more efficient in this respect. It has in its ranks young engineers, skilled workers, young men and women between 20 and 24 who introduce many new ideas. Young people plan their activity quite well and work in an organized fashion. I think they are ahead of us on many points.

The task of meeting present-day requirements calls for serious effort to carry forward the party's theoretical work, specifically with regard to the interaction of internal and international factors. We are operating at a time when dictatorial regimes in several Central Amercian countries are stepping up repression and accentuating the despotic character of their rule. The bourgeois democracy existing in Costa Rica rests on the country's democratic traditions and is not very stable in the present situation. Central America is going through a complex and contradictory integration process which U.S. imperialism is striving to channel according to its interests. We Central Americans must study and analyze all that has to do with imperialist economic, political and military plans. The party must have an in-depth knowledge of problems of vital importance to the masses so as to offer them correct guidelines.

It's a question of very small countries interacting closely, having a largely common history and interlinked at present by economic integration. Whatever occurs in one country immediately finds reflection in others. Assuming that a revolution takes place in one of them, it's easy enough to imagine how difficult it would be to retain and defend power or to solve such economic problems as those of accumulation and reproduction. This may be the reason why over the past 15 years Central America's parties have met more often than others to discuss common problems.

I believe we must study methodological problems of the revolution in Central American countries more deeply and discuss them more frequently. As regards our party, some time ago we worked out a plan for research into problems of the Costa Rican revolution as linked with other countries of the isthmus. I think this kind of work, that is, examination of methodological problems of the revolution in Costa Rica within the framework of Central America, would be very valuable. Our present program, which analyzes our problems and indicates Costa Rica's road, makes a point of taking into account the situation in neighboring countries. However, in this respect as well,

we still have many unsolved problems and, regrettably, our approach is rather primitive.

In working among the masses and striving to increase our influence on diverse population groups, we must, of course, bear in mind how people react, not only to every step taken by our party or to the evolution of the struggle in our country, but to the revolutionary experience of other countries.

The social consciousness of the masses and the revolutionary movement in our country have benefited especially from the Cuban revolution, which gave both a tremendous spur and prompted the masses to ponder on socialism and study what went on in Cuba. People perceive a 'Spanish-speaking' socialism and a revolution which has triumphed a mere 90 miles from the citadel of imperialism, not as a remote example, but as a perfectly attainable reality. The Cuban experience aroused the masses' sympathy for our party and new people joined our ranks. All this has a most favorable effect on our work.

On the other hand, we did not immediately realize the impact of the Chilean events on people's minds. For some time we advanced slogans which the people no longer accepted, due precisely to the Chilean coup. Today we see that many people are just frightened. Often when we discuss this matter with them they say to us: 'Do you want the things that happened in Chile to happen here?' We have an impression that events of this nature affect above all women. They also affect men, of course, but women are affected more strongly by virtue of their place in society, their dependence and material insecurity. They are highly sensitive to change, to every development tending to undermine their sense of security. Naturally, we must remember this in our propaganda and everyday work.

However, this is no easy task. We often discover that we don't really know a given problem and must study it properly in theoretical terms. It so happens that we communists often confine our tasks in combating bourgeois ideology to the examination of ideological constructions, to criticizing the premises and conclusions of bourgeois ideology, and to carrying forward and perfecting our ideology by formulating new theses, advancing new arguments, and so on. But what about the very object of our influence, the working people's thinking and sentiments? How does social consciousness vary from one class or population group to another? We try to answer such questions much less often. Yet we can hardly expect serious gains in the ideological struggle without answering those questions, without constantly giving close attention to the basic characteristics of the social consciousness of the masses.

We know how very important it is to study the class consciousness

of the masses as something integral and yet differentiated according to strata or groups. But it's obvious that questions as important as these should be analyzed on a scientific basis, which can only be done by experts or perhaps whole institutions. As for a small party like ours, it is a serious problem because we lack such capacities. Perhaps communists of various countries could help us through collective efforts. There is no doubt that in different societies these questions present themselves differently. But exchanges of experience, opinion and the methodology of studying problems of this nature, as well as scientific information on the subject, could be very helpful. I think *World Marxist Review* could do much to this end.

We try to make our work and struggle as fruitful as possible. Our aim is to pave the country's way for socialism through a democratic, popular, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. And we will advance to this goal by building up our influence among the masses, creatively putting Marxism-Leninism into practice and using the experience of the world revolutionary movement while at the same time taking objective account of national peculiarities.

*Note of the Commission for Exchange of Experience in Party Work and the Commission on Problems of Science, Culture and Sociological Research*

A joint meeting of the two commissions has decided that Francisco Gamboa has raised a highly topical question by stressing the need to study problems relating to the characteristics of the masses' social consciousness and to the methods and forms used by communist and workers' parties to win over the working people, educate them in a revolutionary spirit, and help them to assimilate the ideas of democracy, peace and socialism. This is an important task also because our time requires a largely new approach to the presentation and solution of a number of problems traditional for Marxism-Leninism. Furthermore, there arise fundamentally new problems bearing on the functioning of social consciousness and on the communist parties' activity aimed at bringing their ideas to the masses.

In line with these requirements, the journal plans an extensive discussion on 'Communists and the Social Consciousness of the Masses.' The discussion could deal, in particular, with the following points:

— the nature of various types of social consciousness with which all the political (ideological) forces of today, including the communist and workers' parties, have to deal;

— ways of formation and strengthening of the social and class consciousness of the working class;

— ways and means of increasing the impact of the ideology of the

proletariat on the social consciousness of other classes and strata of society (among allies and opponents of the working class);

— methods of studying the state of the mass consciousness (including public opinion) and of taking it into account in the parties' political practice.

It is planned to organize a round table meeting on 'Communists and Public Opinion.'

The proposed discussion is expected to take, both in the journal and at the round table, the form of *theoretical* contributions concerning the philosophical, sociological and psychological aspects of the overall theme, and contributions revealing the experience of the communists' *practical* (ideological and organizing) activity among the population.

---


**New Rates for**

**World Marxist Review**

***Effective January 1978***

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

**Write to:**
**PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE**
**71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor**
**Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6**

viewpoints

# National and class aspects of the Arab liberation movement

*Faik Warrad*
First Secretary,
CC Jordanian CP

Recent events produced by the Middle East crisis have again highlighted and aggravated the difficulties experienced by the Arab national-liberation movement. They are above all else a result of machinations by imperialism, which is backed by Arab reactionaries and constantly brings pressure to bear on the ruling circles of certain countries of our region, primarily the 'front-line' countries, which are directly affected by Israel's aggression. To get a proper idea of the nature of these difficulties, one should recall the Middle East situation as it had shaped by 1967. Its distinguishing feature was that the Arab national-liberation movement had in the main gone beyond the bounds of struggle for political independence and the establishment of sovereign states and that the emphasis was gradually shifting to the social and economic sphere. The tasks facing the Arab peoples at the new stage made it necessary to choose the road of development to be followed. The search for this road tended inevitably to exacerbate the class struggle in the countries concerned.

With this struggle going on, anti-capitalist trends began as early as the mid-60s to predominate in such countries as Egypt, Syria and Iraq. And a major aim of the Israeli aggression was to create in these countries a situation that would check the further growth of progressive trends and consolidate the position of forces favoring a capitalist orientation.

The June 1967 war and the continuing occupation of Arab territories created a state of protracted military confrontation between the Arabs and Israel. This put a tremendous burden of spending on the Arab countries attacked by the aggressor. In these circumstances, the main internal contradictions centered on two questions: one, the distribution of wartime hardships among the various classes and strata of society, or, in other words, the issue of which classes should meet the cost of the state of war; and two, ways and means of freeing the territories occupied by Israel. The planners of the aggression expected, therefore, that the problem of furthering a socialist orienta-

tion by carrying out anti-capitalist reforms would be shelved, or would even 'disappear' altogether, allowing full scope for capitalist spontaneity. From this point of view, the evolution of the situation in Egypt, a major Arab state and one of the states directly confronting Israel, was, of course, particularly important.

As regards the first question, while Gamal Abdel Nasser was leading the country, the burden imposed by the state of war was distributed in one form or another among all the various classes. This policy expressed itself in such aspects of the official economic policy as the restriction or outright prohibition of imported luxuries and the appropriation of funds to maintain low prices for necessities. By and large, that policy met the interests of the people and was in keeping with the need to muster forces against the occupation while maintaining the economy at a fair level in spite of the state of war. Until 1972, Egypt's balance of payments deficit remained within reasonable bounds, hardly ever exceeding 200 m. Egyptian pounds.[1] The foreign debt in 1972 was set by the World Bank at $1,500m. (without the war debt, estimated at $2,500m.)[2]

The replacement of Nasser's progressive policy by an open-door policy was accompanied, on the one hand, by granting various privileges to private capital and by flooding the Egyptian market with imported luxuries, and on the other, by an attack on the incomes of the poorer classes, in particular by cutting off government subsidies for consumer goods. In view of the need to fight against the occupation, this meant putting all hardships on the working people's shoulders and at the same time virtually renouncing serious preparations for fighting; it meant weakening, exhausting and ruining Egypt and pushing it toward a complete breakdown. The open-door policy increased the balance of payments deficit, which in 1976 exceeded 1,500m. pounds.[3] Coupled with other factors, this led to a tremendous increase in the foreign debt,[4] slower economic growth and an escalating rate of inflation that reached 40 per cent in 1976. This policy also resulted in the steady growth of parasitical elements lacking any patriotic or national impulses among the bourgeoisie and was accompanied by the growth of social inequality at a rate unprecedented in Egypt's modern history.

What the second question amounted to was whether there should be confrontation or surrender in the matter of freeing the occupied areas. This question is dialectically connected with the first, the question of distributing the war burden, and largely determines its political content. Success in the confrontation with the imperialist-Israeli alliance is unthinkable without the support of the masses, without their mobilization and effective participation. However, those social forces that contrived to dodge their share of the economic

burden imposed by the state of war by putting it on the working people's shoulders consider — from their own class standpoint, of course — that active participation by the people in the fight against the invader and his imperialist patrons would inevitably affect the internal alignment of class forces. Hence their evident fear of the masses, and their attempts to bar them not only from the fight against the occupation, but from all participation in politics, and to find a way out through suspect partial settlements.[5] The 1975 Sinai agreement was only too obvious a proof of the existence of this trend.

Subsequent events showed that this agreement was only the first in a series of actions that brought the Arab liberation movement to its current state of deep crisis. The salient features of this crisis are, first, the division of the Arab countries' united front against imperialism and the Israeli aggression; second, the capture of the initiative by Arab reaction, primarily the rulers of Saudi Arabia; and third, a marked deterioration — due to Egypt's unilateral moves — of relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, which amounts to refusal to rely on the Arab peoples' loyal allies in the struggle against imperialism and, indeed, to a renunciation of this struggle by Sadat and his associates.

The crisis of the Arab liberation movement largely facilitates the implementation of imperialist-Zionist conspiracies and brings tangible political dividends to the Arab people's main external enemies. For instance, many positive results of the 1973 war, which had offered real opportunities to remove the effects of the Israeli aggression and guarantee the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, were nullified. The tension existing in the region was preserved and is still being exploited to increase pressure on the Arab liberation movement and undermine it. The more or less sharp conflicts arising internally and between states throughout the Arab region, many of which are due to a deliberate playing up of various communal, religious, nationalist, territorial and other differences, operate in the same direction.[6]

The effort to loosen Arab solidarity, on the one hand, and, on the other, to form such blocs as the Cairo-Khartoum 'axis' backed by Saudi Arabia, was pursued under the obvious influence and in the interest of imperialism. This is also true of the feverish attempts to set up, under the control of Saudi Arabia and Iran, so-called security blocs in the area of the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea aimed at safeguarding imperialist and reactionary domination and at undermining every progressive movement or regime in these strategic areas. Actions of this nature are already under way against the Ethiopian revolution, Democratic Yemen, the liberation struggle in Oman, and so on.

Lastly, there is the virtual involvement of some Arab countries in measures against anti-imperialist movements and regimes in the context of the new alignment of international forces, which prevents imperialism from using its own military means. The events of Shaba Province (Zaire) and the Egyptian aggression against Libya were indicative in this respect.

U.S. imperialism is stepping up its pressure on Arab countries to make them retreat still farther or even to force them into complete surrender to imperialist and Zionist schemes in the region.[7]

Against this background the Arab peoples were particularly distressed both by the refusal of the Saudi rulers to use oil once again as an anti-imperialist weapon and by Cairo's stubbornly repeated contention that the key to a Middle East settlement is in Washington's hands.[8] (This means that the Egyptian regime has openly tried, and is still trying, to debar the Soviet Union, and also the Palestine Liberation Organization, from the settlement of this problem.) We are in the presence of an agreed pro-imperialist policy clearly prompted by the narrow class interests of the reactionary rulers of the Arab countries in question.

Small wonder, then, that the Arab reactionaries' policies have lately shown a direct link with the Israeli authorities' policy of aggression. The effective role which Israel played in supporting right-wing isolationists in Lebanon and in the struggle against the progressives of that country and the Palestinian resistance forces is well known. It was admitted by none other than the Israeli Prime Minister, Begin.[9] When, in the spring of 1977, the Egyptian authorities decided to launch hostilities against Libya, Tel Aviv informed Egypt that it had 'no intention whatever of using the Egyptian-Libyan events to infringe the disengagement agreements between the Egyptian and Israeli sides.'[10] Shortly before, Israel's militarists and Arab reactionaries had found themselves in line together in suppressing the popular rising in Zaire's Shaba Province.

Today the Israeli authorities are taking specific and by no means ineffective steps to coordinate policy with reactionary Arab regimes, especially Saudi Arabia's, in the struggle against the Communist Party of Israel, which is backed by the majority of the country's Arab population.[11] This coordination is being effected in line with the decisions of a narrow Arab summit which met in Riyadh after the ceasefire in Lebanon and emphasized the need to curb communist activity in the region, above all in the occupied Arab areas and among the Arabs living in Israel.[12] In conformity with these decisions, feverish attempts have been made of late to isolate the Jordanian Communist Party's section on the occupied territory, the Communist Palestinian Organization, primarily by undermining the Palestinian

National Front, in which our comrades play an outstanding role. This is a rightist, reactionary class policy.

Of course, relations of mutual support and coordinated action between the Israeli authorities and the Arab reactionary camp are nothing new in themselves.[13] The new element is the unprecedentedly outspoken form these relations have taken in the recent period, and the considerable expansion of their sphere among the right-wing Arab forces, which have virtually given up all pretense of fighting against the Israeli occupation. It was confirmed by Sadat's visit to Israel, which dangerously deepened the split in the Arab world.

In view of the polarization of forces in the region and of phenomena born of the crisis of the Arab liberation movement and determining the character of this crisis, the following questions arise: Has not the Arab peoples' main contradiction, and hence their main tasks, shifted from the sphere of the struggle against imperialism and the Israeli occupation to the sphere of social relations? Is the crisis a sign of disintegration and abatement of the Arab liberation movement, or is it due to passing circumstances?

These questions are answered by the actual situation in the Arab countries. Imperialism was not at all happy about recognizing their political independence, which was won not so long ago and which it has been doing its utmost to undermine. This is attested by the three-power aggression against Egypt in 1956, the landing of U.S. troops in Lebanon and of British troops in Jordan in 1958, and the Israeli occupation of vast Arab lands, which has persisted for more than ten years. In addition, the Arab countries are still an object of intensive imperialist exploitation, which is practised by well-known neo-colonialist methods and adds to their economic backwardness.[14] All this objectively evokes strong resistance to imperialism and Zionism, and determines the nature of the historical period the Arab world is passing through.

We must, of course, bear in mind, first, certain changes in the motive forces of the Arab liberation movement resulting, on the one hand, from the increased role of the working class and, on the other, from the establishment of 'partnership' relations between the neo-colonialist circles of imperialist powers and certain sections of the Arab bourgeoisie; and second, the fact that at this stage a certain intertwining of the national and social tasks of the liberation movement is inevitable. There can be no doubt that what comes to the fore wherever political independence has been achieved and consolidated is the problems of social and economic development, whose nature and methods of solution are intimately linked with the balance of class forces and the struggle between them. The Arab countries, including those directly confronting Israel, are no exception. However, social

and class contradictions in these countries center, as has been said, on various aspects of the general national, general Arab problem, which has to be solved if there is to be any intensification of the fight for socio-economic progress proper.

This primacy of the national aspect tends to slow down the social evolution of the Arab liberation movement. Indeed, given a normal international situation in the region, that is, in the absence of Israeli aggression, the social aspects of the movement would probably be of fundamental, decisive importance, especially since, as has been pointed out, these aspects were becoming crucial as far back as the 60s.[15] In reality, the most important thing today, in our opinion, is the national, general Arab tasks, the tasks of struggle against imperialist-Zionist policy in the region.

Paradoxical though it may seem, the imperialist-Zionist circles and the domestic reactionaries, including the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, who are virtually in league with them and generally declare for social harmony in the developing countries, now do all they can to stress the social and class contradictions in the Arab world. There is no paradox, however. The Arab peoples' enemies realize that artificial aggravation of these contradictions exhausts the liberation movement, diverts it from the main, decisive battle — the battle against the occupation and imperialism — and generates a tendency to exclude large sections of the national bourgeoisie from the patriotic liberation struggle and turn them into a prop and a stand-by of the imperialist and reactionary camp. Furthermore, all this is creating a favorable situation for doing away with progressive social gains that are in the interests of the masses, and for achieving imperialism's strategic goal in the region, which is to impose a capitalist road on the Arab countries.

The crisis of the Arab liberation movement imparts exceptional importance to the subjective factor, that is, the role of revolutionary parties and organizations, especially the parties of the working class, in the solution of the problem of providing conditions without which it is impossible to end the crisis and set about completing the national democratic revolution. These tasks may, in our view, be listed as follows:

First, exposing and isolating the right wing of the Arab liberation movement because it has renounced further struggle against the occupation and imperialism. The right wing must be isolated and the masses rid of its influence primarily where it has lately held strong or even leading, decisive positions in the state, as in Egypt.

Second, countering the defeatist line of the right wing with a revolutionary alternative leading to the resumption of the liberation struggle on the largest possible scale at a new level and on the basis of a

national alliance having a definite, clear-cut objective, namely, struggle against the Israeli occupation, imperialism and its monopolies.

Third, foiling all designs aimed at disuniting the Arab world and distracting its peoples from the effort to accomplish their main tasks.

The above, be it noted, does not rule out a struggle between the classes and social strata that would rally together in national fronts. The difference in class interests and positions is bound to manifest itself in differing degrees of consistency and firmness in the fight for national goals. The growing working class and other working people, and all the poor of the Arab countries, that is, the staunchest and most reliable forces, are moving into the forefront as this struggle gains in intensity.

The class struggle unfolding in the course of the main struggle against the occupation and imperialism is governed by objective laws. In the future, when the Arab liberation movement has carried out its basic national tasks in the political and economic spheres, the social confrontation will inevitably rise to the stature of the main contradiction. It is therefore essential to watch vigilantly for various deviations which are a reaction to the betrayal of the national and patriotic cause by the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, first of all the parasitical bourgeoisie, which is particularly indifferent to the problems of national liberation.[16] It is an open secret that some Arab revolutionary currents already regard the ideological hegemony of the working class as a condition for the solution of the present crisis of the liberation movement in the region. However, their position merely tends to aggravate the crisis. Jordan's communists are certain that the ideological hegemony of the working class will be established, but only as a natural result of the Arab people's struggle over a long period in which the working class will play an increasing role.

The contemporary history of the Arab liberation movement shows us its vitality and makes us ever more confident that it will overcome its present crisis, no matter how sharp, that it will gain new strength, become radical and attain revolutionary dynamism. Since the end of World War II this movement has fought several major historical battles for political independence and the withdrawal of foreign troops; it fought against aggressive military blocs, resisted the imperialist-Israeli alliance on the battlefield, and manifested itself in social and political revolutions and insurrections that substantially altered the antiquated structures of many Arab countries.

The chief result of these battles was that the liberation movement gained in quality and grew in depth and breadth. In the course of the struggle, more and more sections of the people and their political vanguards were drawn into patriotic activity and acquired important experience as fighters. The revolutionary parties and organizations,

especially the parties of the working class, were in the thick of the struggle; they joined in every major battle and played a part in every important gain of the Arab liberation movement.

A great achievement is the emergence of anti-imperialist regimes in the Arab world, although they have not yet evolved a realistic platform that would allow them to become the center, the hub of the mobilization and solidarity of the patriotic forces and to capture the initiative from reaction.

Our optimism is also based on the fact that the Arab liberation movement has powerful and loyal allies — the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. The international climate created by continuous changes in the alignment of world forces in favor of those who are fighting for peace, détente, freedom and progress, is favorable to the attainment of the Arab peoples' national goals.

Moreover, numerous reverses of the policy of Arab reaction and the liberation movement's right wing, which tends to link up with reaction, increasingly reveal the hopelessness of this policy and the inevitable and complete failure in store for it. This was confirmed specifically by the momentous events in Egypt on January 18 and 19, 1977, when the people emphatically rejected the open-door policy toward U.S. imperialism. Another proof was the miscarriage of Egypt's armed aggression against Libya — an action which further isolated the Sadat regime in the region — the deterioration of the situation in Egypt and, last but not least, Sadat's visit to Israel, which he undertook not only before any withdrawal of Israel's troops from the occupied Arab territories and realization of the Palestinian people's legitimate national rights, but in the absence of any promise by Tel Aviv to do anything in this respect.

Thereby the Egyptian President disrupted the united front of Arab states and strengthened the positions of the Israeli aggressor. His visit also revealed the depth of the Egyptian regime's crisis and its readiness to surrender completely to the will of the U.S. imperialists and Israeli rulers, who want to impose on the Arab countries a 'settlement' for reshaping the situation in the region according to their designs, that is, forming a pro-imperialist bloc composed primarily of Israel, Saudi Arabia and Egypt to put the whole region under U.S. neo-colonialist control and protect the interests of its monopolies, particularly in oil.

Our peoples are emphatically against every attempt to ignore their will and their anti-imperialist aspiration for a fair settlement in the Middle East, the essential principles of which are complete liberation of the Arab lands occupied in 1967 and recognition of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to found an

independent state. Without this a stable peace in the Middle East is impossible. And this must be achieved at the Geneva Conference with the participation of all interested parties, including the Soviet Union as its co-chairman, and the PLO as the sole lawful representative of the Arab Palestinian people.

Our peoples reject defeatism and separate deals made behind their backs to please imperialism and Zionism. This was forcefully demonstrated by the powerful 'No' to Sadat's November visit to Israel and the subsequent attempts to sign separate and defeatist deals, an answer which swept across the Arab world like a hurricane.

*Mid-December 1977*

1. *Al Tali'a,* February 1977. One Egyptian pound equals $2.364.
2. *Al Yasar al Arabi,* No. 4, September 1977.
3. *Al Tali'a,* February 1977, (In 1976 one Egyptian pound equalled $2.555.) Significantly, consumption in 1976 exceeded the gross national output by 2 per cent *(ibid.)*.
4. Official statements set Egypt's external debt in April 1977 at $15,000m. *(Al Yasar al Arabi,* No. 4, September, 1977).
5. It was fear of the masses that prevented full use of the opportunities provided by the October war of 1973.
6. The situation thus created in the Arab world was one of the factors that brought the Likud ultra-right bloc to power in Israel.
7. Note the recent efforts of imperialist propaganda to stress the increased military power of Israel and thus intimidate the Arab countries. On May 30, 1977, *Time* magazine reported a substantial qualitative and quantitative growth of Israel's armed forces since the 1973 war. It said Israel was already in a position to call up 480,000 troops as against 300,000 in 1973, that it had 6,255 tanks and armored carriers against 2,025 in 1973, and that the situation had changed similarly in other armed services through replacement of relatively obsolete weapons by more sophisticated up-to-date U.S. armaments.
8. After his trip to Israel in November 1977 Sadat affirmed just as stubbornly (and boastfully) that he had taken that 'key' into his own hands.
9. *The Times,* August 22, 1977.
10. Quoted from *Tariq al Sha'b,* July 25, 1977.
11. This was seen in the latest general election in Israel, in which the Democratic Front headed by the Communist Party won the majority of the Arab vote.
12. For 30 years Arab reaction persecuted the communists under the pretext of the state of war with Israel and the fight against Zionism. Now it intends to do this, while openly collaborating with the Zionist leaders of the same Israel.
13. As early as 1966 David Kohen, then Chairman of the Knesset's Commission for Foreign Affairs and Security, said that, although it might sound incredible, the Israeli army 'protects the regimes in Jordan and Lebanon and may possibly assume the defense of Saudi Arabia.' (Proceedings of the Knesset sitting on May 23, 1966.)
14. The Arab countries account for 3.5 per cent of the world's population but supply less than 0.05 per cent of the world industrial output. (See *Roz el Yusef,* December 27, 1976).
15. It may well be that the aggressors took account of the social and political heterogeneity of the Arab world in analyzing the Arab countries' ability to coordinate their efforts against Israel.
16. These strata of the bourgeoisie play an influential and even predominant role in such countries as present-day Egypt.

# For Panama's complete independence

*Ruben Dario Souza*
General Secretary,
People's Party of Panama

The international response to the signing of the treaties on the future status of the Panama Canal in September 1977 was contradictory, for it had been assumed that the talks between the governments of Panama and the United States on the U.S. colonial ownership of the Canal Zone could end only in an agreement that would hardly be relevant to the cause of the country's liberation.

Interest in the outcome of these talks was further quickened by the abundance of contradictory reports at the closing stages. The fierce opposition to the new treaties coming from the most reactionary quarters of U.S. imperialism, and President Carter's support for the treaties; the presence at the signing of the treaties in Washington of Latin American political and public figures as different from each other as President Carlos Andres Perez of Venezuela or the outstanding Colombian writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez, on the one hand, and the murderer Pinochet or the Guatemalan satrap Laugerud, on the other; support of the treaties by Cuba, Vietnam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the simultaneous attacks by the leftists, who claimed that the treaties amount to surrender. All these and many other facts drew universal attention to the outcome of the protracted negotiations between Panama and the United States. In these complicated conditions, tremendous importance attached to a national plebiscite held in Panama on October 23, 1977, when the overwhelming majority of our people voiced their support for the new treaties.

The question that arose with the signing of the treaties was: which of the parties had more to gain from them? To answer this question, one has to recall what the continued U.S. ownership of the Canal Zone meant for each party.

The Canal Zone (1,432 sq. km.) is a U.S. military-economic complex* lying in the heart of the Republic of Panama. This means that

*Under the November 18, 1903 Treaty imposed on Panama, the United States got the right to build and subsequently to operate an inter-oceanic canal in the 16-km wide zone running across the whole territory of Panama, and also to use its armed forces to guard the Canal and auxiliary installations. — *Ed.*

the Panamanian people are deprived of full independence. The presence of the colony is one of the chief causes of the antagonism between the Panamanian people, who strive fully to exercise their right to self-determination, and U.S. imperialism. Panamanian patriots regard the Canal Zone as the last barrier on the way to the country's territorial and political integrity.

For the U.S. government, representing as it does the interests of the monopolies, the Canal Zone is a means of controlling the passage of ships between the Pacific and the Atlantic. Possession of the Canal has enabled the United States to expand its foreign trade, to bring its national production closer to the sources of the raw materials in the dependent countries, and to accelerate the turnover of U.S. goods on the international market. Besides, ownership of the Canal Zone has enabled the United States to dominate a large section of the communications between the two oceans, to integrate this strategic point with the worldwide military system of U.S. imperialism, and to keep a tight grip on Latin America as its backyard.

The substance of the talks, which began after the popular uprisings on January 9, 1964, and ended over 13 years later, was determined by the antagonism between the interests of the Panamanian people and U.S. imperialism.

Under the new treaties, the Canal Zone area belong to the Republic of Panama. In other words, the U.S. government has been forced to recognize the Panamanian state's sovereignty over it. To appreciate the full importance of this fact one must bear in mind that the present status of the Canal Zone, as defined by the 1903 Treaty, gives the U.S. government 'in perpetuity' powers over the territory adjacent to the Canal as if it were the sovereign. In other words, we have here a colonial state which is under U.S. jurisdiction. The existence of the colonial enclave in the heart of Panama has become an obstacle to its development.

Considering that the United States has agreed to eliminate this colonial enclave, there is no doubt that the treaties are advantageous to the Panamanian nation, which has in consequence the possibility of completing the process of its territorial and political unification. However, this success cannot in any sense be seen as complete. The struggle for Panama's liberation has been going on for years, and it is still to be carried through to the end. While the elimination of the colony does help to restore the country's territorial patrimony and consolidate the national Panamanian state, it does not yet amount to complete national independence, because the country continues to be an objective of economic exploitation by the U.S. monopolies still plundering its natural resources.

Moreover, the colony is not to be wound up all at once. Under the

new treaties, we shall have to wait another 23 years (until the end of 1999) for ownership of the Canal to be transferred to Panama and for the last foreign soldier to leave our soil. Consequently, although the new treaties do immediately discontinue the condition of the Canal Zone, the Canal itself remains U.S. property, which is to be managed through an enterprise called the Canal Commission. In addition, until the end of the century U.S. armed forces will maintain five of the 14 military bases now located in the Canal Zone. When the treaties enter into force, the Panamanian government is to take possession of 70 per cent of the Canal Zone area, and will obtain jurisdiction over the whole area within the subsequent five years. But even then the Canal Commission will retain some juridical powers over the Canal property and the U.S. citizens operating this waterway.

Another relic of the colonial epoch is reflected in the Treaty of Neutrality, which restricts the Panamanian people's right to proclaim the neutrality of the Canal. The point is that the U.S. government has managed to get a clause written into the treaty concerning its role as a 'co-guarantor' and the right of free passage along the Canal for U.S. warships and auxiliary vessels. This clause goes beyond the framework of the treaty, which determines the abolition of U.S. ownership of the Canal.

The agreement reached by the Panamanian and U.S. governments means that the colony is not being eliminated but is gradually to be dismantled. This is the method used by imperialism to substitute for obsolete forms of relations with oppressed countries other forms which are more acceptable in the present conditions and which do not harm its basic interests. However, it would be wrong to regard the signing of the new treaties as a shred move by U.S. imperialism instead of a victory for the Panamanian people.

The elimination of the Canal Zone affects the interests of the U.S. monopolies which have struck deep roots in that colonial possession and which had come to feel so secure that they had never even entertained the idea of a change in the situation. A few years ago, it appeared inconceivable that the U.S. government would agree to the replacement of the 1903 Treaty by a new one annulling the article on colonial possession in perpetuity. The fact that the United States was forced to negotiate with the Panamanian government is a victory for Panama and the result of the popular uprising against the U.S. army in January 1964.

In the course of the ten-year negotiations, the United States proposed three fettering draft treaties which were rejected because of the Panamanian people's resistance and the firm stand taken by the patriotic government of General Omar Torrijos. In 1974, the negotiations were resumed on a new basis. For the first time, the U.S.

government agreed to discuss Panama's basic demand: the return of the Canal Zone and the Canal itself to the Republic of Panama, their true owner. That was another achievement for Panama in the run-up to the conclusion of the treaties in 1977. Those who ignore these events and facts could draw the wrong conclusion that the Torrijos-Carter treaties are a generous concession on the part of the U.S. government. The same mistake will be made by those who take in earnest the show staged in Washington at the signing of the new treaties and the statements made on the occasion by White House spokesmen in order to justify themselves before the right-wing diehards in the Senate, who accused the Carter Administration of getting down on its knees to the Panamanians' demands.

The truth is that despite the fact that the new treaties do not signify an end to the oppression, their conclusion will effectively help the Panamanian people to carry their struggle to full national independence. That is a legitimate triumph for the Panamanian people, who seek to secure the strategic goal of our intricate liberation process, which is to destroy colonialism in the Canal Zone. That is why our strategic victory simultaneously signifies a strategic defeat for imperialism, despite the neo-colonialist character with which the United States sought to invest the new treaties. The historical truth is that the existence of the colony in the Canal Zone is coming to an end, and that we are moving closer to the completion of the national-liberation process in Panama, although considerable difficulties still lie ahead.

We live in an epoch in which imperialism is losing ground. Its positions are growing weaker and it has suffered one strategic defeat after another in many parts of the globe. The imperialist structure is being rent asunder at various levels, and one example is the disintegration of the colonial system.

Let us note that the difficulties now faced by imperialism stem not only from the fact that it has outlived itself, and is being eroded by its internal crisis. They are also the result of the crushing blows by the progressive forces, which are growing stronger all over the world and which are inspired above all by the socialist community, headed by the Soviet Union, which sprang from the Great October Revolution and which has blazed for mankind the trail for triumphant national liberation and social emancipation. The potential accumulated by the world revolutionary movement and the active, mighty, sustained, systematic and vigorous struggle of all the anti-imperialist forces of the globe are the main reason for the weakening of the positions of imperialism. In the new historical conditions, it no longer has any firm ground anywhere. In all its possessions, far or near, which imperialism once found it easy to maintain, the firm ground everywhere has been converted into shifting sands.

Imperialism has suffered upheavals on the various continents. Latin America has ceased to be a reliable and docile domain. In this part of the globe, developing and diverse national-liberation and social processes are aimed against the U.S. monopolies' greed and oppression.

This is the overall historical context in which one should consider the elimination of the Canal Zone. The powerful anti-colonial movement in our country, which involves the overwhelming majority of the people and the government, forced the United States to agree to wind up the colony. This became even more obvious after the heavy reverses suffered by the forces in the United States which sought to safeguard their interests by colonial means. I have in mind the forces which opposed peace in Vietnam, which master-minded Allende's overthrow in Chile and supported the CIA's most heinous crimes, which torpedoed the Helsinki understandings on détente, which spur on apartheid in South Africa and Zionism in the Middle East, and which insist on the blockade of Cuba. These forces were hit by the Watergate scandal, the investigations into the conduct of former President Nixon and former Vice-President Agnew and their subsequent resignation. This did tremendous moral damage to the prestige of governmental and political institutions. The same forces suffered a defeat in the latest presidential elections in the United States. This defeat also led to the collapse of the idea of maintaining colonial rule over the Canal Zone.

Carter's stand on the Canal Zone issue reflects the realistic attitude of some U.S. circles to the antagonistic problems they have to face in the modern world. From the standpoint of these circles there is logic in the accord with General Torrijos: the United States is no longer able to impose the existence of a colony on us, but then it cannot give up its basic interests in Panama either.*

As for Panama, the agreement to wind up the colony in the Canal Zone is a source of satisfaction among a broad majority in the country and has genuine popular support. It is an effective means for eliminating the basic obstacle on the way to Panama's national development, especially considering the political situation in the country.

Over the past few years, the Torrijos government has been moving toward progressive positions step by step. Apart from the fact that the

*According to Panamanian press reports, an anti-government plot has been uncovered by the country's security agencies. The aim was to kill Omar Torrijos, the head of the government. The inquiry showed that the plan had been hatched by the CIA in Miami. He was to have been attacked on one of his tours of the country. Among the plotters was one-time CIA agent F. Fiorini, a U.S. colonel stationed in the Panama Canal Zone, L. Martinez, and his Brother P. Martinez, former president A. Arias, and a group of Cuban counter-revolutionaries from Brigade 2506, specially trained in the United States for subversive operations and terroristic acts. — *Ed.*

government has given a lead in the anti-colonial struggle, it has also effected important transformations in the country. The incipient forms of popular power, the emergence and development of a state sector, the significant democratic changes in the agrarian structure, the support for the cooperatives, the nationalization, even if it did entail payment of compensation to the U.S. monopolies, the important measures in public health and education, the foreign policy designed for joint action with the Third World and closer relations with the socialist countries, and firm support for a program for peace, and also the struggle against racial discrimination — all of these testify to the government's clear evolution toward a more radical anti-imperialist stand and more profound social transformations.

Consequently, our country's decolonization is connected with the development of the political situation at home, which is marked by a radicalization of the national-liberation struggle.

In other words, the country's successes with the new treaties help the anti-imperialist oriented Torrijos government and all the progressive and revolutionary forces supporting it in implementing the national-liberation program.

The character of the property which is to pass to Panama with the return of the Canal Zone is highly important for the prospects of further development. Its estimated value comes to several billion dollars and includes the infrastructure, facilities, industrial installations and international ports. If these are taken over by the Panamanian bourgeoisie and the U.S. monopolies, there will be regress, because private enterprise will be in possession of economic instruments to entrench capitalism in Panama. But if all this property, and the land above all, passes to the state, this will create the crucial premise for Panama's development along the non-capitalist road. That is why one of the aims of the struggle in the near future is to have this Canal Zone property taken over by the Panamanian state.

These perspectives require that Panama's anti-imperialist forces should raise the struggle to a qualitatively new political and organizational level in order to fulfill the tasks before them: to frustrate the plans for neo-colonialist penetration and expansion of local capitalism, and to work for full national liberation. To do this, there is a need to extend and fortify the popular power; to pursue a firm policy on the transfer of the Canal Zone property to the state; to secure the passage of a law formalizing the changes in the agrarian structure, and to deepen the program of social transformations; in the international arena, there is a need to strengthen our ties with the socialist countries and develop relations with progressive Third World countries; in the financing of the economy, there is a need, whenever possible, to put an end to the U.S. 'tutelage.'

The country can develop along this course only if the present Panamanian liberation movement has a clear-cut program for national liberation. Conditions are ripe for forming legal political parties representing the main anti-imperialist trends that are taking part in the process of decolonization. (This does not in any sense imply a revival of the old oligarchic parties and the re-establishment of the positions of the oligarchy itself.)

These parties could provide a basis for an anti-imperialist political front with a coherent program for attaining national liberation and helping to establish a truly popular power. Its mission would be to achieve the country's complete liberation and the earliest eradication of the survivals of imperialist rule, which remain in the country under the new treaties.

Consequently, the struggle for complete liberation will continue even after the Canal Zone is abolished.

---

# Structure of monopoly capital power in Canada

*Alfred Dewhurst*
Member of Central Executive Committee and CC Secretary, CP of Canada

The facts show that today the entire Canadian economy — extraction of natural resources, energy, manufacturing, transportation, distribution and finally, but not least, finance capital — is controlled by a mere handful of huge corporations. Their all-penetrating influence is an excellent example of what Lenin called the '*economic* essence of imperialism.' 'Monopoly,' he wrote, 'manifests itself in trusts, syndicates, etc., in the omnipotence of the giant banks, in the buying up of raw material sources, etc., in the concentration of banking capital, etc. Everything hinges on economic monopoly' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 23 p. 42).

At the same time, due to specific historical conditions the rise of monopoly capitalism in Canada was not the result of only, say, 'internal' processes. The beginning of its industrial growth coincided with the period, when in many countries where capitalism had already started its gradual transition to imperialism 'the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional

importance' (*Ibid*, Vol. 22, p. 266). Fully in keeping with the law of the uneven development of capitalism discovered by Lenin, Canada rapidly became an arena for a concerted offensive by foreign investors. The logical consummation of this process has been the influx of foreign monopolies that have such a harmful effect on the entire life of our country.

Foreign capital has always played an important role in the development of the Canadian economy. Following upon Confederation (1867)[1] foreign capital, mainly British, financed the building of the railways, roads, canals and other public utilities, development of mineral deposits, forestry, fishing and manufacturing industries.

Prior to the First World War foreign capital constituted a higher proportion of capital employed in the economy than any time since. However, despite this heavy reliance on external capital, foreign control of Canadian business, outside of railways, did not assume the decisive importance it has reached today, because much of it came in the form of bonds and loans and not ownership. The situation changed after the outbreak of the war. The United States replaced Great Britain as Canada's supplier of external capital.

U.S. capital investment in Canada is markedly different from that of British capital. While in the beginning U.S. investment (like British investment) was chiefly portfolio capital,[2] by 1930 direct investment (ownership) amounted to 26 per cent of the $4.6 billion of U.S. capital in Canada. By 1950 direct investment exceeded portfolio and loan capital by 3.5 per cent of the $28 billion of U.S. capital in Canada, which total accounted for 80.6 per cent of all foreign capital invested in the country.

The government of Canada publication *Foreign Direct Investment in Canada* (1971) points out that between 1945 and 1967, the book value[3] of U.S. long-term investment in Canada rose from just under $5 billion to $28 billion, with the direct investment portion increasing from close to $2 billion to $17 billion. About half the increase in this direct investment during this period was for the development of natural resources. A large proportion of the investment in resources exploitation reflected the needs of U.S. monopoly for raw materials for U.S. manufacturing plants.

These captive export markets were a particularly important factor in a number of areas of production, as the very heavy costs involved were difficult to justify without assured markets for the output. As for instance, the iron ore fields and newsprint, for sufficiently large markets were not then available in Canada.

This type of development is termed 'backward vertical integration' by the authors of the above-mentioned government publication, meaning the integration of the earlier stages of the productive process

with U.S.-based processing and manufacturing, which had the practical impact, states the government publication, 'of reducing the likelihood of further processing activity of Canadian natural resources in Canada.'

'Backward vertical integration' became official policy of the Canadian government. In 1947 the government introduced, without benefit of parliamentary debate, the Abbott Plan,[4] essentially a program for the integration of Canada's economy with that of the United States, with Canada's role being the supplier of raw materials and energy for the U.S. manufacturing plant. It is of interest to note that the introduction of the Abbott Plan corresponds in time with the ascendancy of U.S. direct investment capital in Canada over U.S. loan or bond capital.

The Abbott Plan followed shortly on the heels of the public launching of the cold war by the wartime Prime Minister of Great Britain Winston Churchill in his Fulton Missouri speech in 1946, in which he called for a worldwide drive of the imperialist countries under the leadership of U.S. imperialism to contain communism and to roll back the new frontiers of socialism that emerged following the Second World War.

The Abbott Plan was an integral part of the drive of U.S. imperialism for world mastery. It was a clear reflection of U.S. foreign policy in both the general conception and details. The Plan served to emphasize the readiness of the then Canadian government to involve Canada in the provocative preparations of the time for a third world war. The policy of integration of the Canadian economy with that of the United States has not been abandoned by U.S. state-monopoly capital or by the pro-U.S. monopoly groups in Canada. Today it is known as *continentalism*, and is facilitated by the multinational corporations dominated by U.S. monopoly capitalism.

The concentration of monopoly capital is growing at a rapid rate in Canada. This can be seen even over such a short period of time as four years. Between 1968 and 1971 corporations with over $100 million in assets increased their total assets from 53.3 per cent to 57.7 per cent. Their share of sales increased from 24.3 per cent to 27.5 per cent during the same period of time.

Two giant companies, International Nickel and Falconbridge, produce 99 per cent of Canada's nickel. Four companies produce 88 per cent of the copper. All of Canada's mining and smelting is carried out by nine corporate complexes. The petroleum industry is concentrated in the hands of a few huge oil monopolies like Imperial Oil and Gulf Oil. Three electrical firms, General Electric, Westinghouse and Northern Electric, account for 44 per cent of the industry's sales. Three U.S. automobile companies, Ford, Chrysler and General

Motors, have an octopus grip on auto production, while six companies produce 90 per cent of all farm machinery bought in Canada. The steel industry is virtually the preserve of three giant steel firms. Canadian Pacific Investments and Power Corporation own virtually all of the transportation industry, outside of Air Canada and the Canadian National Railway which are state owned. The news media are also highly monopolized, including the press, radio and television and telecommunications. Meat packing and food processing corporations such as General Foods, Canada Packers and Burns Foods through monopolization of the market are able to dictate the price of products they buy from the farmer and the price to the consumer. Five huge marketing chains account for the great bulk of food products sold.

Monopoly in production and the marketplace goes hand in hand with the existence of conglomerates. Some of the corporations already mentioned have diversified into fields unrelated to one another. For instance, Falconbridge is the mining nucleus for U.S.-owned Superior Oil. The Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company is a subsidiary of Canadian Pacific Ltd., which has interests in all modes of transportation, steel, forest products, pulp and paper, oil and natural gas, pipelines, real estate and hotels. Dominion Stores is a subsidiary of Argus Corporation which has extensive interests in iron ore production, farm machinery, pulp and paper, broadcasting.

There are 18 corporate companies in Canada with assets of more than a billion dollars and 23 financial institutions in the same category. The top financial institutions are all chartered banks, namely, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia and the Toronto Dominion Bank in descending order. The Royal Bank is the largest corporation of any kind in Canada with assets of almost $21.7 billion. It is five times bigger than the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, which in turn has more assets than any non-financial institute in Canada with two exceptions. The Royal Bank is four times bigger in assets than Canadian Pacific Ltd., and three and a half times bigger than Bell Telephone of Canada. The combined assets of the five largest banks are twice those of the next 25 largest financial institutions and twice those of the combined assets of Canada's 30 largest companies.

There is a substantial number of Canadian-based multinationals, some of which rank high in the hierarchy of international corporations. Companies such as Falconbridge, International Nickel, Canadian Pacific Ltd., Aluminium of Canada and the Royal Bank are notorious for their exploitation of developing countries, particularly in Africa and Latin America. A high proportion of Canadian multinational development is in the USA. And, on the other hand, a

substantial number of Canadian-based multinationals are controlled by U.S. capital.

The U.S.-based and owned multinationals have penetrated Canada to a degree most dangerous to Canadian independence and sovereignty. For instance, in 1971 Canada's Gross National Product was $117 billion. Out of this the total sales of Canadian subsidiaries of U.S.-owned multinationals amounted to $56.5 billion, one half of the Canadian GNP!

An examination of intercorporate ownership and intercorporate directorships shows a dangerously high degree of foreign, mostly U.S. ownership of the commanding heights of the Canadian economy. Representatives of U.S. corporations sit on the boards of Canada's banks. Interconnections exist between Canadian and U.S. monopolies as well. Both domestically and internationally there are interlocking directorships.

In 1947, the year the Abbott Plan was inflicted on the Canadian people, the book value of foreign direct investment in Canada was $2,986 million. U.S. investment accounted for 85 per cent of that total. In 1973 foreign direct investment totalled $32,783 million, of which 79.4 per cent was U.S. The decrease in the U.S. share does not indicate a decline in U.S. corporate influence. What it does indicate is that Japanese and European corporate interests have improved their financial and political positions in Canada.

U.S. direct investment is decisive in terms of *where* it is invested. In 1968, 58 per cent of all Canada's manufacturing assets were owned by foreign capital, mostly that of the USA. Foreign-owned firms accounted for 63.4 per cent of profits, 55 per cent of sales and 62.4 per cent of taxable income. The greatest amount of foreign ownership was in natural resources; almost 100 per cent of oil and natural gas, 55 per cent of primary metals, 52 per cent of non-metallic minerals. And in manufacturing: 81 per cent of chemicals and chemical products, 93 per cent of rubber, and 87 per cent of transport vehicles. When other industries are taken into account, foreign interests constitute 61 per cent of the ownership of Canadian corporate assets.

An examination of U.S. financial activity in Canada shows that Canadians actually finance the loss of control over their own economy. During the 1960-67 period, $3,361 million of direct capital investment and $373 million of portfolio investment entered Canada. During the same eight-year period, U.S. corporations raised $17 billion in Canada, which was largely used to finance their investments in Canada. In addition these same corporations between them remitted profit income to the United States amounting to $5,869 million, for a capital loss to Canada of $1,865 million for that period.

Ownership of the commanding heights of the economy by U.S.

monopolies creates distortions in the structure of the Canadian economy. Foreign ownership of the country's natural resources has meant underdevelopment of the processing and manufacturing industries associated with them. This is detrimental to the creation of new jobs in Canada.

There are over 6,000 U.S. controlled firms in Canada, many of which are among the country's largest firms, including a number of Canadian-based multinationals. The cumulative impact of the normal political activities of these firms through their Canadian executives and shareholders gives the United States corporate view a very important voice in the Canadian political scene. For instance, these firms play an important part, along with pro-U.S. Canadian monopoly interests, in shaping the advice which various levels of government receive from the monopoly-controlled corporations, through their participation in such bodies as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. U.S. owned or controlled firms play an active part in various government advisory committees such as the National Advisory Committee on Petroleum and the Business Advisory Committee, and indirectly through the Economic Council of Canada.

In addition to the political pressure for the purpose of advancing the interests of U.S. imperialism in Canada and in world affairs, political pressures are brought to bear upon the Canadian government from within the country through the medium of U.S. subsidiaries in Canada. In areas such as trade relations with other countries the conduct of Canadian foreign relations is affected considerably by the large degree of U.S. economic control in Canada. The extent and concentration of U.S. direct investment in Canada has negatively affected Canada's image abroad as an independent country pursuing policies based on its own distinct requirements and interests. Many countries, the United States included, tend sometimes to regard Canada as somewhat of an extension of the USA.

The Canadian capitalist class has benefited from U.S. capital investment in Canada, both direct and indirect. It is true that the lion's share of profits from the development of Canada's raw materials export industries has gone to U.S. monpolies. Nevertheless, a substantial share of the profits has accrued to Canadian monopoly.

Canadian finance capital has grown stronger and the process continues, with the result that Canadian monopolists have their own particular interests which they constantly strive to advance. 'This,' states the program of the Communist Party, *The Road to Socialism in Canada,* 'is expressed in the determination of Canadian finance capital to maintain control over banking, transportation and com-

munication industries, and the extension of this control over other vital industries' (pp. 8-9).

The growing strength of Canadian finance capital has resulted in the Canadian capitalist class confronting the U.S. monopolies in the competitive imperialist struggle for Canada's resources. Our program states that this conflict is the most important element of imperialist contradictions in Canada. It is directed, however, to achieve maximum profits for Canadian monopoly, not to establish genuine Canadian independence. It reflects growing rivalry over who will get the bigger share of the profits through the intensified exploitation of the Canadian working class.

In defining the relationship existing between Canadian and U.S. monopoly capital the party's program says: 'Canadian monopoly is more than a junior partner of U.S. imperialism. It is an integral part of the world imperialist system whose interests are interwoven with those of U.S. and British finance capital, the securing of market outlets for raw materials, manufactured goods and investments. Its partnership with U.S. imperialism is an antagonistic partnership, that of being simultaneously collaborators and competitors' (p. 9).

The central fact of political life in Canada is that state power is in the hands of monopoly capital. Canadians constantly feel the pressure of the political superstructure whose emergence, Lenin warned, signified a 'turn' to political reaction. 'Political reaction,' he underscored, 'corresponds to monopoly' (Vol. 23, p. 43).

Through its domination of the economy, the state apparatus, the media of mass communication, book publication, and educational materials, culture and entertainment, monopoly exerts a steady pressure on every phase of people's lives. It squeezes out the small producer, farmers and small business people. It thwarts the growth of the arts and sciences and of all aspects of cultural life. It turns more and more professionals and intellectuals into servants of the big corporations. It subjects the health of the working people to constant and increasing strain.

The Canadian ruling class closely linked with U.S. monopoly interests has made Canada dependent on U.S. imperialism. Since the Second World War this has led to far-reaching measures of military integration of the Canadian state with the war establishments of the USA. This betrayal by monopoly of Canadian independence further deepens the contradictions between the ruling monopolists and the vast majority of the Canadian people. The interrelations of the fight against monopoly and for genuine Canadian independence is a major feature of Canadian political life and class struggle.

The Communist Party has repeatedly warned the working class and its democratic allies that if U.S. imperialism gets its way, more and

more Canadians will be forced out of work, the economy will further decline, and Canada will suffer a further loss of its sovereignty and independence. It bases all its practical work in the fight for genuine independence on two main concepts.

1. The struggle for genuine Canadian independence, for national self-determination and for voluntary unity of the two nations in Canada, French and English-speaking, and for jobs, are all integral parts of one and the same struggle.

2. The fight for genuine independence can only be led by the united working class of the two Canadian nations.

Only in this way can the people exercise their sovereign right to determine their own destiny. And, the working people can only defend and advance their positions by curbing, and then putting an end to the power of monopoly.

The multinational corporations are instruments through which U.S. imperialism exercises its domination over the Canadian economy. They are the Trojan horse of U.S. imperialism in Canada. The impact of the multinational corporations in Canada has placed in jeopardy the sovereignty of our country. The multinationals interfere with our national priorities, distort consumption patterns, income distribution, and redistribution of the national income. They have the capability of affecting monetary, fiscal and trade policies. Through research and development financed with funds through taxation of the working people and taken from the public treasury, the multinationals are able to develop technological and scientific discoveries into commercially viable products and processes.

The corporations use their extensive power to attack the living standards, democratic rights and interests of the working people. They raise prices at will, and generally pursue policies inimical to the public interest and the all-sided development of the Canadian economy. As a consequence the anti-monopoly classes and groups, in defense of their own economic and political interests, are compelled to fight back against the power of the monopolies, much of which is exercised through state channels.

The small business and industrial enterprises are likewise victimized by the corporations as the concentration of capital proceeds apace. The economic viability of small and medium business and industrial enterprises, indeed their very existence, is threatened by the policy of accumulation followed by the big banking and industrial corporations. The increasing foreclosures and bankruptcies of enterprises where concentration is relatively low are manifestations of a definite trend in the economy to oust small and medium ownership as a factor of reproduction.

Monopoly operates in agriculture as it does in industry. Financial

and industrial monopolies control and exploit the agricultural economy. Land and capital tend to become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. This tendency operates as well in large urban centers where big corporations amass land banks large enough to influence land and housing prices in a scandously inflationary way.

Whether the big corporations are U.S. or Canadian owned and controlled this question has to be put: are these huge concentrations of capital and production means to continue to serve only the profit interests of the corporate élite, or are they going to be used to serve the interests of the community as a whole?

At the present time in Canada there are no adequate safeguards to protect the public interests from the results of corporate concentration and avid profit-taking. The Communist Party says that the state must intervene to bring an end to this situation and assert its sovereign control over these corporations and conglomerates, in order to uphold the public interests and the independence of Canada.

We communists demand that the government must undertake measures that will begin the process of breaking up the multinationals and to prohibit the operation of conglomerates. As a first step in this direction we propose the Combines Act be amended to include measures to forbid mergers and takeovers which undermine Canadian sovereignty and the public interests. And, that failure to comply with such measures be met by nationalization of the holdings in Canada of the offending parties. We propose also that the Canada Development Corporation, a public corporation, be authorized to act as a vehicle through which public ownership of offending corporations be carried out.

The Communist Party sees the foregoing measures as only the first steps toward the breaking up of the giants and super-giants of the corporate community. We demand the government policy be directed toward placing the monopoly corporations under strict Canadian ownership and control, i.e., control bodies fully representative of the public community, backed up by the appropriate government regulatory measures to protect the public interest. Failure to comply with such measures to be severely dealt with, up to and including nationalization of the offending corporations.

The reactionary and pro-U.S. forces are opposed to any controls over monopoly and the multinational corporations. Equating state intervention with socialism, they are striving to rally the small capitalists and middle class strata in defense of 'free enterprise' in a bid to consolidate the positions of the right-wing political forces. In the face of the concerted attempts of reaction to achieve these ends the working class and democratic forces cannot afford to be disunited. To help create unity of the democratic forces the Communist

Party at its 23rd Convention (October 1976) pointed out that the way forward lies through cooperation of the working class and democratic forces in a democratic alliance around a common program of action for a democratic alternative to monopoly control and policies. For its part, the Communist Party declared it is prepared to cooperate with the New Democratic Party (social democrat), the trade unions and farm organizations in helping to bring into being such a democratic alliance.[5]

In a long-term concept, the Communist Party advocates nationalization of all multinational corporations as a first step toward the nationalization of the banks, trusts, insurance companies and the credit system to secure the necessary capital for the planned balanced development of the economy under public ownership and control serving the public interests.

The Communist Party is not opposed to bigness as such. What we are concerned with is: *who* owns the bigness and *whose* interests does it serve. Centralization and concentration of capital in the hands of a small group of huge corporations, which in reality constitute a government within government, is an objective process under capitalism. The history of capitalism in Canada is development from laissez-faire capitalism and the free market to monopoly and its control of the market, to state-monopoly capitalism. Lenin had good reason to emphasize that 'state-monopoly capitalism is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung on the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs*' (Vol. 25, p. 359).

We are well aware, however, that the maturing of objective and subjective conditions for socialist revolution at the imperialist stage, does not automatically mean the collapse of capitalism. Capitalism will not leave the historical scene on its own free will. Lenin's analysis of imperialism helps us, Canadian communists, to get a clearer view of the future and outline more precisely the goals and tasks in the struggle to abolish this exploiting system.

1. In March 1867 the British Parliament passed the British North America Act, proclaiming the formation of united provinces, which were granted the status of a dominion with a federal state structure. The Act became a law on July 1, 1867. — *Ed.*

2. For purchasing stocks and bonds (as distinct from direct investment, for purchasing property). — *Ed.*

3. Nominal investment volume. — *Ed.*

4. Douglas Charles Abbott, Finance Minister at that time. — *Ed.*

5. See *Convention 76.* 23rd Convention Communist Party of Canada, Toronto, October 9-11, 1976.

## THE SOUTHERN PIVOT OF THE STRUGGLE

The *WMR* has interviewed the presidents of the national-liberation organizations of three countries of Southern Africa — *Oliver Tambo,* African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), *Sam Nujoma,* South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO — Namibia), and *Joshua Nkomo,* Zimbabwe African's People Union (ZAPU). They described the changes in the general situation in their countries since the summer of 1976 marked, particularly in South Africa, by the notable events in Soweto,[1] and stressed that their peoples' struggle today has risen to a new level and entered a crucial stage. Tambo, Nujoma and Nkomo also answered our correspondent's questions.

### SOUTH AFRICA AFTER SOWETO

*Oliver Tambo*
President, African National Congress of South Africa

The events in Soweto and other parts of South Africa have become a significant milestone in the development of the liberation struggle. To assess these events and their impact on the future of our movement we must first consider them as one of the manifestations of the new revolutionary level to which the confrontation with imperialism has risen not only in South Africa itself, but in Southern Africa as a whole.

For the liberation movement in South Africa, in addition to the armed and unarmed struggle led by the African National Congress, the collapse of Portuguese colonialism has been of decisive importance. This applied particularly to Mozambique's winning of independence, the emergence of an independent progressive state directly on the South African border, and the victory of the MPLA in Angola over the aggressive forces of the South African regime. This victory had a tremendous mobilizing impact on the masses in South Africa. In the same period the national-liberation movements of Zimbabwe and Namibia, which are waging an armed struggle for independence, have increased their striking power and are bringing ever greater pressure to bear on the racist forces of Smith and Vorster.

The events in Soweto and other areas fit into the context of this

new stage that has arrived for the national-liberation movement in Southern Africa, and correspond to its demands. It may be claimed that since Soweto our struggle in South Africa has been at par with other countries of Southern Africa that have not yet freed themselves. It should be noted that the number of fighters who have perished in our country in clashes with the regime in the 18 months since the Soweto events is approximately equal to the number of guerrillas who died the death of the brave in the same period in Zimbabwe and Namibia.

Our struggle has developed in two basic directions. The main one is mobilization of the masses, workers, peasants and young people. The other is stepping up of armed action. In South Africa in 1977 mass action with workers and young people participating was combined with actions by the military formations of the African National Congress, and both types of action were obviously coordinated in time. This demonstrates, on the one hand, the support of the masses for the armed struggle that is needed to bring ultimate victory, and on the other, the reliance of our underground organizations on the support of the mass of the people.

For many years the Vorster regime tried to prevent such coordination, such an alliance, resorting to various repressive measures, imposing long terms of imprisonment without trial, to assassinations and shootings, the victims of which were often young people. However, the scale and intensity of the struggle grew inexorably. In the autumn of 1977 the Vorster regime was confronted for several weeks by a mounting popular offensive. Realizing that the activities of the masses confronting the government were getting out of hand, Vorster imposed additional restrictions. He banned a number of moderate organizations and newspapers, prohibited the political and social activity of certain individuals, and later arrested some of them. Vorster must have known, of course, that such actions were bound to evoke the condemnation of international opinion, further isolate the regime, and force even the imperialist powers, verbally at least, to dissociate themselves from him.

But declaring political and other public organizations illegal means forcing them to go underground and leaving them no alternative but to take up arms against the Vorster regime. So intensified repression leads to intensification of the struggle, which in its turn evokes even more brutal repression. Despite all this, however, we still regard such a situation on the whole as a positive factor: the enemy is in considerable disarray. There are increasing opportunities for stepping up the struggle at all levels and in all spheres. More and more people are being drawn into it. A radical change is occurring in the people's mood in South Africa.

The ANC now has to put all its weight into maintaining the momentum of the struggle, the offensive against the regime. Armed action must be intensified, blows must be struck at the enemy from every possible direction. In this connection it must be stressed that we attach the greatest importance to international support, particularly in the form of material aid.

Although the situation favors us, the enemy is far from beaten. In South Africa vigorous attempts are being made to divide and weaken the forces that are working for revolutionary change. For instance, for the first time in the history of exploitation of an indigenous population the ruling regime is encouraging and is building up a black bourgeoisie, both in the rural areas, where the so-called bantustans[2] have been set up, and in the cities. This is nothing less than an attempt to create a 'shock-absorber' for the blows that the working class strikes against the capitalist system in South Africa.

The bantustan system, as we know, is calculated to divide the oppressed and exploited masses, who are forced into economically and politically weak ethnic formations, the idea being to facilitate exploitation of the whole people, with the 'independent governments' of the bantustans acting as its direct instruments.

Pursuing the same aims of splitting the exploited masses, the regime of the white minority is planning to create separate 'parliaments' (inferior and helpless, of course) for South Africans of Indian origin and 'colored people' (mixed blood). But to carry out these plans, Vorster needs time.[3] His imperialist supporters also need time to adapt to the changes caused by the rapidly developing revolutionary offensive in South Africa. This is one more reason why the African National Congress regards the intensification of the struggle as an absolute necessity at the present stage.

The ANC is also quite certain that the revolutionary movement in Zimbabwe and Namibia will press forward with the offensive against the racist forces and in the near future lead the peoples of these countries to final victory. And this is yet another factor contributing to our confidence in the ultimate triumph of our people's struggle for liberation.

*Q.* Couldn't the plan for setting up 'parliaments' for the Indians and Coloreds mislead the people belonging to these communities?

*A.* Of course, even among the exploited and oppressed there are traitors. Of course, even among the Indians and the Coloreds one can find people ready to collaborate with the enemy for personal gain, who will support Vorster's policy of perpetuating the enslavement of their peoples. Others, perhaps, may think, this is better than nothing at all.

However, people representative even of these Indians and Col-

oreds of South Africa who are working 'within the system' — I am not referring at the moment to participants in the revolutionary movement — cannot remain indifferent to the problems of their peoples and the revolutionary currents in their country. And they have already rejected Vorster's plan. They say quite rightly that it would perpetuate the domination of the white minority and help to stiffen racist policy. Vorster's plan is designed to separate, to isolate the Indians and Coloreds from the majority of the population. This would naturally put them at the service of the racist minority.

I am sure that the racist and imperialist puppets will agree with the Vorster plan, but the mass of the population will not. All the organizations representing Indians and Coloreds are exposing this plan. It is being fought not only by the ANC, but also, for example, by the Coloured Labour Party, which operates legally. Coloreds and Indians are taking part in the national-liberation and working-class movement of our country. Their opposition to racist policies is obvious. They are against any and every kind of ethnic and racist 'state' formations.

*Q*. What about the granting of so-called 'independence' to the bantustans?

*A*. Well, what is meant by 'independence' of the bantustans? It means privileges for a few — big houses, cars, and so on. But such 'independences' gives the masses nothing. The people who live in the bantustans are usually unemployed and with a very few exceptions are unable to find work locally. They have to go to the cities, which belong to the white minority. But even there they are often unable to find a job and, if they do, the conditions amount to semi-slavery. The bantustans cannot help the people living in them to overcome poverty, give them an education, and meet their other needs. On the contrary, in formally becoming 'citizens of independent states,' the people in the bantustans lose all rights in South Africa — their citizenship, right to travel, and so on. They are subjected to new, unprecedented restrictions. They are herded together in quite small territories, whereas before they were at least able to travel anywhere in the country. The 'citizens' of Transkei, for example, are severely restricted beyond the Transkei borders, which means throughout the rest of South Africa.

But there is another important side to this situation. The policy of worker migration pursued by the South African regime means that every year thousands of Africans are driven out of the cities into rural areas, while thousands more are forced into the cities. So the rural areas are being steadily enriched with the political experience of proletarian struggle. Today the Africans living in rural areas have become semi-proletarianized. They actively oppose the bantustan

system and this is a significant factor in the development of the revolutionary struggle in our country.

*Q.* A lot is said in so-called liberal circles about the 'moderate leaders' of the Black population, who could help to reduce the tension, act as a safety valve, so to speak.

*A.* They are yet another shock-absorber that the regime is trying to create. But they have thought of it too late. The 'moderate leaders' will be swept off their feet by the mighty tide of revolution, and this is already happening. On the other hand, some of the moderate leaders who had been so highly praised by the South African liberals were arrested in the autumn of 1977 because, in the view of the regime, they could not be moderate enough in the present situation.

In general, South African liberalism is in crisis. It has lost its self-given mandate to speak for the oppressed and exploited masses. Today they speak for themselves, by their actions and often at the cost of their lives. And the politicians who want to build their careers on 'defense of the grievances of the oppressed,' now find themselves out of a job. Hence the confusion in the ranks of the South African 'reformists,' the disappearance of one of their parties and the formation of new parties that are also doomed to split and disappear. Amid the working people's mounting struggle for national and social liberation, the contradictions in the ranks of the exploiters become even more acute.

*Q.* The press in the imperialist countries writes a lot about South African businessmen who because of their need for a steady flow of new manpower have an interest in some relaxation of apartheid and might bring pressure to bear on the government. What is your view on this point?

*A.* The hopes of the so-called liberal South African businessmen are pinned on certain minor reforms that could, so they believe, help to put things right and lift some of the restrictions of apartheid. They think that this would satisfy the people enough to hold back the revolution. But it is unrealistic today to imagine that the actions in Soweto were intended to achieve only partial improvements and reforms in minor matters. If this were so, it would have been all over in one day, after the first shooting. But the staunchness, the unbending will shown by the people proves that they are fighting for complete liberation, and not against 'petty-apartheid,' not for 'pleasant exploitation,' but against all exploitation of man by man.

The social content of the national-liberation movement in South Africa has now come much more clearly to the fore, because the regime's racist policy means that the most exploited are those who are most oppressed in the national sense. This is what has determined the social content of our national-liberation struggle.

*Q*. The murder of Steve Biko[4] and the banning of a number of moderate organizations in South Africa was followed by a big uproar in the press of the imperialist powers and some government leaders spoke out against the regime. Does this signify any real change in their attitude toward Vorster?

*A*. The growing power of world progressive opinion, which opposes racism and supports the struggle for national liberation, tends to isolate the imperialist powers that are helping the Vorster regime. Their role as accomplices in the racist crimes against the peoples of South Africa is becoming increasingly clear. World opinion is concentrating the fire of its criticism on these powers as the force that is behind the executions in Soweto and other crimes of the Vorster regime. The masses of the people in these countries do not want to see their governments on the side of the regimes of the white minority.

Even the argument that South Africa must be defended as an anti-communist bastion does not hold water nowadays, although the South African regime clings to it for lack of anything better. The South African racists have sung the anti-communist tune for a quarter of a century and are still singing it. But in the present situation there is hardly anyone anywhere who takes it seriously.

These factors compel the governments of the imperialist powers to present matters as if they are siding with world opinion with regard to the South African regime. So the protests against the murder of Steve Biko and other repressive measures do to some extent express the feelings of ordinary people in these countries, which are similar to those of ordinary people the world over. And this is certainly a sign of the growing power and influence of the progressive forces on the world scene.

And there is another aspect to all this. Imperialism today is incapable of crushing the revolution by force, as it did in the past. But it is trying to control and contain it. And if imperialism starts speaking the 'language of liberation,' some see this as a 'change of flag.' But experience has shown that one can attack apartheid in the fiercest terms and call it a crime against humanity — and still give it military, economic and political support. So the loud protests that we have been hearing lately from a number of government leaders in the imperialist countries do not necessarily mean the end of these countries' support of the racist regime in South Africa.

# NAMIBIA AT THE THRESHOLD OF INDEPENDENCE

*Sam Nujoma*
President, South-West Africa People's Organization
(SWAPO), Namibia

Political developments in Namibia have reached a crucial stage. This is evident, first of all, in the intrigues and maneuvers to which South Africa's racist and fascist regime resorts, with support from the principal imperialist states, to save the situation. Another factor is the growing struggle in Zimbabwe and South Africa inasmuch as the fight for a free Namibia cannot be isolated from the liberation struggle of our brothers and sisters in the other countries of Southern Africa. The racist regimes, for their part, invariably back one another. In Zimbabwe, the Smith regime has been able to defy the people for so long only because it has always been aided economically, politically and militarily by South Africa.

The imperialist powers support the Vorster regime's maneuvers and intrigues in their own economic and strategic interests. Namibia has a coastline about 1,000 miles long, which is of strategic significance and is washed by waters rich in fish. Its inland areas abound in diamonds, uranium and other minerals. All this is exploited by transnational corporations belonging to imperialist powers. They therefore help the Vorster regime as best they can, in particular by supplying it with arms and ammunition. France, for one, is the main supplier of arms for South Africa, which it has provided with helicopters of various types, Mirage fighters and submarines. Other imperialist powers do the same.[5]

The imperialist powers which supply Vorster with arms assert that they do so to enable South Africa to defend itself against 'attack from without.' Yet Namibia's experience shows that the helicopters and fighters obtained by the Vorster regime are used, not for defense against the mythical 'attack,' but against the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), the military arm of SWAPO, that is, for putting down a popular movement which demands self-determination and independence for our country.

At this crucial hour SWAPO, a national-liberation movement, has no alternative but to step up its struggle. Faced with a fascist regime like Vorster's, which is backed by imperialist allies, we must use armed force as the only dependable way of ending the illegal occupation of our country.

The liberation struggle in Southern Africa was crowned not long ago with victories for the peoples of Angola and Mozambique. This changed the geopolitical situation in our region and provided more favorable conditions for the liberation effort in countries still oppres-

sed by racist regimes. The primary task if we want to effectively combat colonialism, fascism and racism is to break the backbone of its main force, the Vorster regime.

For as long as Angola and Mozambique remained under Portuguese colonial rule, the Caetano regime put them at South Africa's service to fight against liberation movements in other countries of Southern Africa. South Africa seemed to be the continent's most powerful military might unchallenged by anyone. The point is, however, that it used the two territories as buffer zones against the tidal wave of the liberation struggle. By now this wave has swept to the frontiers of South Africa itself and this has changed the situation in both Namibia and Zimbabwe. SWAPO's courageous guerrillas daily win new victories over the enemy. Our brothers in Zimbabwe, in turn, are intensifying their struggle. The South African regime, driven by despair and fear, is becoming more and more violent. It realizes that it is directly threatened with liquidation.

In Namibia, too, the Vorster regime is stepping up repression. Thousands of people are moved at gunpoint from their home villages, especially those skirting the Angolan frontier, to places that are called 'fortified villages' but are nothing short of concentration camps. Namibia is still under a state of emergency reinforced by martial law. Under this law even new South African recruits are allowed to open fire and kill anyone they suspect of being 'terrorists' or concealing the whereabouts of 'terrorists.'

But we are now in a position to strike back. SWAPO guerrillas are operating in the northwest, north and east of the country. And we are extending our operations to the central and southern parts. Racists have also been attacked in Windhoek, the capital, and vicinity, as well as in Grootfontein, Tsumeb and other cities.

Our party, SWAPO, enjoys popularity all over the country. There is no denying, of course, that certain elements, mostly tribal chiefs, were misled or bribed by the South African regime. They were inveigled into attending the deceptive Constitutinal Conference in Windhoek. However, many of the misled have since stopped backing the 'conference' and joined SWAPO. They have come to realize that there are only two opposed forces in Namibia: SWAPO and SWAPO-led PLAN, which are fighting for national independence and an end to South African colonialism, and South Africa's racist regime, which wants to preserve its colonial domination and perpetuate the oppression and exploitation of the Namibian people.

We are certain, therefore, that we will achieve final victory very soon with the support of primarily the socialist countries, African states and progressives the world over.

*Q.* But the Vorster regime affirms that the SWAPO-led armed

struggle in Namibia is restricted to a small area known as Caprivi Strip.

*A.* In 1966, when we started our armed struggle, we did confine our operations to the Caprivi Strip adjoining the frontier of Zambia, then the only independent African state neighboring on Namibia. This is why South Africa kept sizable forces in the Caprivi Strip. We, however, used it to infiltrate our forces into Namibia and supply our forces operating there. The fact is that at the time neighboring Angola was still dominated by the Portuguese colonialists, who made common cause with the South African regime and were backed by it. This made the situation anything but easy although we had cooperated with the MPLA in the past as well, using its bases and positions in Angola to a certain extent. But now that Angola has won independence, we are able to operate deep inland and to score gains.

The political consciousness of the Namibian people is growing. PLAN is joined by young people — students, workers, peasants. When, in 1966, the armed struggle began we had no more than platoons at our disposal, but now we have battalions. Our army's fire power has increased and the racists are finding it harder and harder to counter us. This is acknowledged even by the official press. The *Windhoek Advertiser* carried the story of a South African army commander who had served in the Kantimamuri camp, in the north of the Caprivi Strip. That big land and air base of the South African army had been attacked by PLAN units using up-to-date guns and bazookas.

We are resolved to carry on our armed struggle until our country is completely free from the forces of fascism, oppression and capitalism. We see this as the only road to the formation in Namibia of a revolutionary government based on scientific socialism.

*Q.* How would you comment on the talks which the ambassadors of five imperialist powers[6] have been having with Vorster on a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem?

*A.* In the late 50s, when SWAPO was formed, we began to organize strikes, demonstrations, boycotts and other actions. We appealed to the common sense of our South African oppressors in an attempt to bring about a peaceful transfer of power to our people. But or peace initiative proved fruitless and was, indeed, countered with armed force.

In 1959 we carried out a boycott and strike campaign in protest against the forcible removal of Africans from an old township of Windhoek to a new settlement built in line with the apartheid policy and separated from the homes of whites by a buffer zone 500 to 1,000 yards wide. We organized a peaceful demonstration but the South African police sent tanks against the demonstrators and opened fire.

Twelve persons were killed and numerous others wounded. Nor was that a unique incident. As there was no hope of settling the problem by negotiation SWAPO formed a military organization to free the country.

The imperialists and Vorster now realize that Africa's peoples, in particular the people of Namibia, are determined to fight to total victory. So they are trying to confuse people by alleging that they favor peace talks and want no 'racist bloodshed' in southern Africa, including Namibia. It is indicative, however, that the same powers simultaneously block the adoption of economic sanctions against South Africa by the Security Council.

What peaceful means of solving the problem can there be in these circumstances? They do exist, of course; they are envisaged by the UN Charter, in particular Chapter VII and Articles 39, 41 and 42.[7] However, the imperialist powers in question have nullified the opportunities provided by the Charter.

It is our opinion that diplomatic and political activity is supplementary and complementary to military operations. We consider that the basic form of action for the liberation of Namibia should be armed struggle. However, we will continue to take part whenever possible in various diplomatic and political struggles. This is precisely why SWAPO has agreed to the main imperialist powers searching for a peaceful settlement in Namibia. We favor such a settlement. But we consider that it should be conditional on the withdrawal of all South African occupation forces from Namibia. In the meantime we will carry on our armed struggle along with our political and diplomatic activity to isolate the South African racists and free our country.

There can be no doubt about the necessity for diplomatic and political activity. For instance, the South African regime cannot at the moment take part in the deliberations of the UN General Assembly because the credentials committee concerned refuses to recognize that regime's credentials. SWAPO has an observer status at plenary meetings of the General Assembly. This means that we can speak out and present the case of Namibia's oppressed people to world opinion.

All this is important, of course. However, the main thing is still armed struggle and we are set on continuing it, just as the Namibian people are set, we are sure, on overcoming difficulties and making still greater sacrifices to eliminate South Africa's colonial rule in our country and achieve genuine independence in democratic conditions.

*Q.* But the imperialist press has claimed that the plan adopted by the Windhoek Constitutional Conference and flatly rejected by SWAPO subsequently underwent favorable changes under pressure from the ambassadors of the imperialist powers mentioned earlier.

*A.* I don't think the ambassadors of the imperialist powers should

be given credit for Vorster's renunciation of the idea of an interim government,[8] which he had wanted to impose on our people following the Constitutional Conference. Vorster had to give up that sinister plan because the liberation struggle was intensifying and there was mounting opposition to the plan inside the country, an opposition led by SWAPO supporters. The 'conference' itself was very unpopular. The tribal chiefs who had attended it feared liquidation of their own people. At present they are under the protection of South African police and troops.

It follows that credit for the rejection of plans unacceptable to us is due to the Namibian people, who have made sacrifices to do so. Our people are resolved to fight on under the leadership of SWAPO until they are in a position to decide their affairs as they see fit. This aspiration is supported by the whole of progressive mankind.

*Q.* What about the split in the white community of Namibia, in particular the breakaway of the 'Liberal wing' led by Dirk Mudge.

*A.* Mudge is by no means a liberal. He was a deputy of Namibia's South African administrator, that is, a representative of Vorster's repressive machinery. But he was unable to achieve the results he had wanted to present to Vorster. SWAPO thwarted all his attempts. As a result, he became unpopular among the whites and lost his post in the leadership of Vorster's ruling National Party. And then he formed the so-called Republican Party, whose aim is to win over a number of whites and reactionary Africans, especially tribal chiefs who attended the Constitutional Conference, such as Clemens Kapuoo, Cornelius Ndjoba and others. Mudge wants to rally them together in a common fight against SWAPO. However, he has not a single member of the oppressed people on his side. In other words, his party hardly represents anybody and is bound to be completely defeated in any truly democratic election.

*Q.* The imperialist press oftens contends that in the event of free elections in Namibia, SWAPO would only win in Ovamboland, in the north.

*A.* There is not a word of truth in that. Right now it is clear to anybody that the whole south of Namibia is fully controlled by SWAPO.

To be sure, we concentrated at a definite moment on the northern district bordering on Angola. We had to mobilize the masses because there was a danger of the South African regime trying to set up a Transkei type of bantustan there. Vorster had chosen that district as a showcase — he wanted to make the UN believe that the idea of bantustans could also be put into effect in Namibia. And so we turned the country's northern part in to the main arena of action against treacherous plans to divide the country on the ethnic principle. As a

result of our struggle, the very first man appointed by Vorster to be 'chief minister' of Ovamboland was rejected by the people, and in the end was liquidated. After all, the people saw him as a representative of the Vorster regime's repressive machinery. It is not accidental that the state of emergency and martial law were first imposed precisely in Ovamboland. However, even that proved useless.

Today SWAPO enjoys popular support throughout Namibia. Everybody knows this. They also know that the struggle under the leadership of SWAPO is the only way to win real independence and freedom for Namibia.

*Q.* What do you think of South Africa's intention to keep Walvis Bay?[9]

*A.* SWAPO regards Walvis Bay as an inseparable part of Namibia. In the colonization period Walvis Bay was a British enclave in South-West Africa — a German possession. But we refuse to recognize German, British or Boer colonialism, now or in the future. We are fighting to rid our territory of every manifestation or vestige of colonial rule. Vorster is free to delude himself and his white minority fascist regime by claiming that he will keep his hook in Namibia with the help of Walvis Bay. We will go on fighting to victory, to the day when the last inch of Namibian soil is free.

*Q.* How do you visualize the future of Namibia?

*A.* Our chief task at the moment is to abolish South Africa's colonial rule in our country and win national independence. It is a priority task. Its accomplishment will be followed by an economic and social reorganization of the country, so that Namibia's resources may be protected and used for the good of all its people. We intend to end once and for all the economic exploitation of our country by foreign monopolies, as well as the exploitation of man by man. We are going to end the domination of transnational corporations owned by imperialist powers, which are now sucking the Namibian people's blood. We are fighting to bring about a people's government that will serve the whole population irrespective of race or origin.

*Q.* How would you define the connection between the movement for national liberation and the movement for social emancipation?

*A.* The struggle for liberation from foreign domination is prompted by the desire to achieve social justice. This implies that the means of production must be controlled by the people themselves, through the mechanism of the state. We plan to establish a system of social justice on the basis of scientific socialism. This is the only way, as we see it, to carry out social changes beneficial to our people. I think this is true of any country which has freed itself from colonial domination.

Capitalism is like an incurable cancer. If it is allowed to establish itself in Namibia, our people's sufferings will never end and they will

be exploited, as in the past, by foreigners who deny them basic human rights. Unless capitalism is rejected, the Namibian people will remain a slave of foreign capital.

*Q.* What do you think of the future place of an independent Namibia in the international anti-imperialist front?

*A.* SWAPO is the vanguard and leader of the Namibian people's national-liberation fight, an inseparable part of the anti-imperialist forces of the world. We support all people on earth who are fighting against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and fascism.

Our country will be a member of the Organization of African Unity. This is natural, for we support its Charter and feel that Africa can really be free from colonial intrigues only if united, politically free and economically independent. Africa cannot be strong if divided, as it regrettably is today.

Namibia is a small part of Africa. If it became independent but isolated itself from other countries it would be manipulated by imperialists, who would use the method of economic coercion and strangulation. They would go on exploiting us as they exploit a number of nominally independent African states, which are entirely at the mercy of imperialists.

Our country will also be a member of the UN so as to contribute its modest share to the progress of mankind. The UN plays an important role in the struggle against colonialism and exploitation. Its progressive member nations will always lay bare imperialist exploitation of other countries, and this is very important.

Needless to say, we will also participate in the non-aligned movement. It is a very authoritative movement helping the countries that have gained freedom to resist colonial and neo-colonial exploitation.

Thus Namibia will be a component of the world anti-imperialist front.

*Q.* What is your opinion of the international solidarity of progressive forces with your struggle?

*A.* We would be unable to carry forward our armed struggle without the practical and concrete material aid which our people get through SWAPO. I mean, first of all, arms supplies, without which it is impossible to wage a liberation war. We are very grateful for this to our friends, primarily the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, the Organization of African Unity, national and international democratic organizations of capitalist countries, and the governments of some of them, such as Sweden, Norway and others. These governments supply us with humanitarian aid, medicines, food, clothing and other necessities.

We feel that we are not alone but have powerful forces, first of all the socialist countries, backing us. All this makes us confident that we

will very soon be able to achieve final victory over our enemy. And then we will have a progressive state which will be part of progressive mankind.

## ZIMBABWE: A TURNING POINT

*Joshua Nkomo*
President, Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU);
leader, Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe

The liberation struggle in Zimbabwe has taken a very serious turn. After all, at the time of the Geneva Conference, which then proved to be a fiasco,[10] we made it quite clear: if the conference failed it would mean war to the end. And this is a natural stand to take, for it is rooted in the whole history of the liberation struggle in our country.

Whenever we tried to negotiate with the colonialists, the white minority took steps to strengthen its position in Southern Rhodesia. That is what happened back in 1940-45, before Smith's unilateral declaration of independence (UDI), and then in the 50s and the early 60s, when our party was banned and its leaders arrested. We had to spend long years in prison. Meanwhile, Smith continued further to usurp the country for the benefit of the white minority and proclaimed his 'independence.'

When we were released from detention in 1974, we tried once again to negotiate, and this we did even after Smith had tortured us for 11 years. We expressed our readiness to negotiate, also because our brothers in the front-line states believed that after 10 years of war the Smith regime was prepared to talk. We tried to negotiate in Vorster's presence aboard a train on the bridge across the Zambesi River and in Salisbury, and finally at Geneva in the presence of the British. But we discovered that U.S. imperialism was operating behind the scenes. The then Secretary of State Kissinger tried to save Smith, and in particular to get us to help Smith to secure recognition of UDI.

When the Geneva Conference opened, it seemed as though the British were talking the same language as we were, but it later became obvious that they were trying to force us to share power with Smith. That is why the collapse of the Geneva Conference was inevitable, and we said there and then that the outcome would be a struggle till final victory. This called for a step-up in the armed operations above all, and that is what we have been doing since January 1977.

We have called on the young people of our country to join in the armed struggle. They responded to our call and have been flocking to our ranks in growing numbers.

We urged our friends in the world to cooperate with us and to

supply us with weapons. Socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, responded to our call as usual and are helping us.

Meanwhile, the imperialist powers have continued to help Smith and pretend to be offended when we say so. But it is a fact which everyone knows: Western financial institutions — banks and insurance companies — broadly collaborate with the South African fascists, which also means helping the fascists in Southern Rhodesia. It is also common knowledge that there are secret agreements between the Western oil companies and the Smith and Vorster regimes, and under these, oil is being supplied to the Smith regime via South Africa, in defiance of the UN economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The governments of the United States, Britain, France and Holland prefer to turn a blind eye to the facts, which show that their companies have been supplying Smith with oil. Despite the declarations of support in the United Nations for the liberation movement, the imperialist powers have continued to help Smith in the war which is raging between him and our people.

It is clear, therefore, that we are fighting not only little Smith but also the powerful imperialist concerns, the Western governments.

The military situation is now such that the British imperialists can no longer stand by and watch, because they realize that we mean business and that 75 per cent of Rhodesia's territory now consists of what the military call 'operational areas,' where the war is being fought round the clock. Nor are these only rural areas. They also include Salisbury, Bulawayo and other major cities.

The British imperialists feel that they must intervene for fear of the situation completely turning in our favor. They are aware that if we do carry the struggle to the end, we shall establish a government of the Zimbabwe *people*, and that is something they don't want to see. That is why the British government now says: we are prepared to give Zimbabwe an independent government elected on the 'one man, one vote' principle in democratic elections after a six-month transitional period. But a close look at their proposals[11] makes it quite obvious that they merely want to 'hijack' our independence because they realize that we are about to win it. They want us to accept the transitional arrangement that would give Britain absolute power in the country for six months. Give the imperialists six minutes, and they will rob you of everything that you had imagined you had won. Give them six months, and you may be quite sure that you are giving them enough time to rig the results of any 'democratic elections' held at the end of six months in their favor.

Britain is now prepared — and there is no doubt at all on this score — to set up a 'Black government' in Rhodesia but not a people's government, merely a Black government.

The imperialists realize that it is impossible to maintain a white government in a country in which almost 97 per cent of the population is Black. They intend to set up a Black government on their pattern.

In the past few years, the imperialist powers have suffered a number of major defeats. We have in mind the U.S. defeat in Vietnam and the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire, which was the major link in the system of exploitation of the peoples of Southern Africa. The imperialist powers now feel themselves to be vulnerable in Africa, which is why they have been regrouping their forces in an effort to mount a counter-offensive and to retaliate for the round they have lost. They want to form Black governments in Zimbabwe and Namibia, but imperialist, neo-colonial-type governments. If they manage to set up two such governments they will feel themselves to be a real force in Southern Africa, and from that bridgehead they will mount a war of revenge against Angola and Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana, against all the countries neighboring on the South African 'bastion.'

Such is the problem we are facing: the war, which outwardly appears to be purely local, is in fact an international one. Our enemy enjoys the support of the big Western powers.

*Q.* The imperialist press keeps spreading rumors about a split in the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, between ZAPU and ZANU, between Nkomo and Mugabe. Will you comment on these assertions?

*A.* This provocative campaign, fanned by the imperialist press, is led by the British newspapers and the BBC. For them, there will never be any Patriotic Front. For them, it was divided even before we began to work to unite ZAPU and ZANU. For the imperialists this kind of unification spells disaster, for it kills their hopes. After all, they have always played up any differences among the people of Zimbabwe. But when they saw the prospect of unity, they began to shout about a split, even before we signed our agreement.

I can assure you that ZAPU and ZANU have agreed to work as an alliance of two organizations for the purpose of pooling our armed efforts to storm the Smith regime, to liberate Zimbabwe and to administer it after the victory is won, and we are sure that we shall win: this is now a matter of months.

Of this the imperialists are aware, and are prepared to clutch at anything and invent anything you like so as to convince the world that ZAPU and ZANU are divided in the Patriotic Front. They will quote their own visions and dreams as revelations. They dream that Mugabe and I have fallen out, and then slap great headlines on the front pages of their newspapers: 'Nkomo has quarreled with Megabe.' But, as I say, that is just so much wishful thinking.

In the autumn of 1977, the imperialist papers carried a statement

which they attributed to Mugabe. They quoted him as saying that the meeting in Lusaka between Smith and President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia was also attended by Nkomo and that this meant a split in the Patriotic Front. But the imperialists know that they are lying.

Because I happened to be in Zambia when Smith and Dr. Kaunda met, they jumped at the opportunity of insinuating that I had attended that meeting. But the imperialist propagandists should know that I am not in the habit of doing things under cover. If I had attended that meeting, I would have said so. When I met Smith in Salisbury, I met him openly and said as much. I did that to find out whether Smith was actually a sane man with whom it was possible to negotiate. After two months of negotiations I told the world that he was mad. I also added that henceforth I would meet Smith only on the battlefield. That is what is happening just now. But if Smith decided to surrender, I would be prepared to meet him to accept the surrender — and nothing more.

That is why those who have visions of a crack in the Patriotic Front are mistaken. They claim that that is what Mugabe said, but when Mugabe has something to tell me he does not have to turn to the press. He and I are together in the same organization. What he has to tell me, insofar as it has a bearing on the Partriotic Front, he tells me when we meet or in letters addressed to me. This did not happen on that occasion, and various people, in fact, spread about rumors launched by the imperialists, above all the British press, rumors which gladdened their hearts.

Everyone knows that since then Mugabe and I have met, and together met the Presidents of the front-line states, as leaders of the Patriotic Front. So where is the threat to it? This is an illusion, a dream. The imperialists will never have the satisfaction of seeing this happen.

*Q.* What is the present stage of unification of the ZAPU and ZANU armies?

*A.* For us it is more than just a unification of the armies. We are working to unite ZAPU and ZANU within the Patriotic Front, with the view to setting up one political party. Some of the things we have been doing are not publicized for the time being, in particular those concerning the structure we are working on. We have made it quite clear that we are starting out as an alliance of two organizations and seek to set up one party. We are advancing along this path and will say in the not too distant future where we are.

*Q.* In its commentaries, the imperialist press frequently suggests that Nkomo is a more moderate leader, who is more suitable to the Western powers, as contrasted with Mugabe. Similarly, it is suggested that President Kaunda is a moderate African leader, as

contrasted with, say, Samora Machel, a 'leftist.' What do you think of this?

*A.* How is it possible to hand out tags like 'moderate' and 'leftist?' President Kaunda's country is firmly confronting the Smith regime and they call that moderation? That is the language of the imperialists. Everyone else needs to be very careful to avoid falling into the trap of such claims by means of which the imperialists try to pigeon-hole people.

President Kaunda has sacrificed his country's economy and the lives of his citizens in defense of the rights of the Zimbabwe people. Who will dare say that he is a moderate? That is nonsense, and it only deserves contempt.

Nkomo, a moderate? I was in detention for 11 years for moderation. This sounds good, doesn't it? Who says that I have to be acceptable to someone in the West, or to anyone else? Is there anyone in general who wants to be acceptable to the West, or to be assessed by it.

They lay claim to assessing me. But I will be assessed only by the people of Zimbabwe. And if I do lead my country this will be only because my people have decided so, and not because a decision had been taken by someone outside the country.

*Q.* You have rejected the above-mentioned Anglo-American plan for settling the Zimbabwe problem. But it was not rejected by the five front-line Presidents, or by the UN Security Council. Could you explain your stand on this.

*A.* That is a contradiction. The Presidents of the front-line states cannot either accept or reject something that has to do with Zimbabwe. Their stand is clear: they support the Zimbabwe people's position. Their role does not consist in accepting or rejecting decisions which have to do with Zimbabwe. That is the role of the Zimbabwe people. The Presidents of the front-line states can merely express their standpoint like everyone else. It is up to us, it is up the people of Zimbabwe to take the decisions. And we have clearly expressed our stand in the document adopted at Maputu and signed by Mugabe and myself. The Presidents of the front-line states voiced their opinion.

Nor has the United Nations the task of agreeing or disagreeing with what the Zimbabwe people want. In this case, the Security Council clearly emphasized that the appointment of a UN representative in accordance with the Anglo-American plan did not in any sense mean the Security Council's endorsement of the proposals contained in the plan.

The import of all these steps was to create a mechanism, which we in the Patriotic Front decided neither to accept nor reject, a

mechanism making it possible to discuss the character of the transitional structure proposed by the Anglo-American plan. We said: let it be created to show how serious Britain's intentions were about decolonizing our country. If it turned out that it agreed with our proposals for a transitional structure, this would mean that it was aware of the real situation in Southern Rhodesia, that it was aware that it was up to the people to decide the country's future. If Britain rejected what in our view was the right plan, it would show that it was trying to mislead the world, and it would then be exposed by means of the very mechanism it wanted to set up.[12]

*Q.* What are the present positions of Bishop Muzorewa and the Reverend Sithole? How popular are they among the people of Zimbabwe, as the imperialist press has been strongly suggesting?

*A.* Who now talks about the popularity of this or that Zimbabwe leader? A war is being fought in the country, and we do not talk of political games but of war. In order to carry on the war, there must be men fully resolved to give their lives, not thoughts, emotions, or dreams, but life itself, their very blood, and do this to make the country free. Everyone knows that men will not give their lives for something they do not believe in.

The relatives of the young people fighting in our ranks will not allow them to give their lives for what they do not believe in. Our country's population will not sacrifice hearth and home, or risk their lives, helping the guerrillas, unless they believe in their cause.

There are thousands of young men now fighting on our side, giving their life and blood — and that is popularity in the struggle! It is demonstrated by the influx of thousands of young men into the ranks of the guerrillas. It is shown by the resolve of people who help them to leave the country to train for the struggle, and who provide them with food and shelter upon their return. These people are being arrested in their hundreds and publicly hanged and publicly shot for supporting the guerrillas. But the population has continued to support the guerrillas, because it believes in their cause.

That is the popularity in the struggle!

If someone does want to seek popularity in the streets of Salisbury, where people wave to Muzorewa upon his return from yet another trip to the United States or some other place, that is not important.

What is important is when men give their lives, and that is just what is called popularity in the war.

*Q.* What is your view of the future of an independent Zimbabwe?

*A.* It will be a society of the Zimbabwe people, a state of the Zimbabwe people in the modern world.

We are a people with a past. We are a people with traditions, with our own language and culture. And our future will be based on our

people's foundations and traditions. But we live in the modern world. We shall adopt from the world, that is, from other people, from other states, that which suits our people.

Our people are socialist by nature. They do not believe that individuals should have possession of, say, the land. By its very nature, the land is the people's social property. The land and everything in it belongs to the people. That is the basis on which we in Zimbabwe will build our future state. ZAPU has a program — The Party's Ideological Concept. We shall make it known to the people and urge them to abide by it.[13]

*Q.* How important is international solidarity with the Zimbabwe people's struggle?

*A.* It is very important. We are waging a war and we need support, we need real assistance in weapons, in ammunition and military equipment. We need the cooperation of the whole world, of all the countries. To win, we need friends at home and abroad. All the progressive forces, wherever they may be, are fighting against imperialism. This means that they are fighting against the same evil: fascism, racism and exploitation. They are fighting because the bearers of this evil want to live by the blood of other people.

The imperialists have always sought to oppress people and to suck them dry. That is how the blood of the Russian people was sucked before the October Revolution, and in this context I should like to emphasize the great significance of the October Revolution, which showed the way to the oppressed peoples all over the world. It helped them to understand that they can win freedom and independence and work for the common good. Consequently, we are fighting one and the same evil. It is the same evil against which the world fought from 1939 to 1945, in the war against fascism, which wanted to rule the world. Then the whole human race rose up against it. It is a lamentable fact that now that we in the south of Africa are confronted with the same enemy, the Western powers support the South African fascists. They do this because from there they get their earnings and dividends and exploit South Africa's wealth. But fascism is, after all, always fascism, and those who support it are, in fact, its accomplices.

We have said as much to the representatives of the above-mentioned powers. We told them that that is the same enemy with the same character, and one may call things various names, but one should not forget that the same evil is still there.

*Q.* What is the importance of international détente for the national-liberation movement?

*A.* Détente means peace and coexistence. But coexistence does not mean accepting an evil. It means coexisting with the evil and fighting it with methods other than military ones.

The socialist countries have been pursuing their policy of détente and peaceful coexistence, while helping the forces in the world fighting against exploitation and fascism. Consequently, the socialist countries have themselves been fighting against these evils. Détente and peaceful coexistence do not mean that the evil is accepted and then condemned. In pursuing their policy of détente and peaceful coexistence the socialist countries block the way for truly devastating wars. But they support the forces in various regions and parts of the globe which are fighting to destroy the evil. Of course, it could have been destroyed in a world war as well, but only at the cost of tremendous calamities for the whole of mankind.

*Q.* Will you comment on the relationship between the ideals of the national-liberation movement and the international communist and working-class movement.

*A.* What is the communist movement? 'Communism' is a word imperialist propaganda has tried to denigrate in every possible way, presenting it as a terrible beast, a monster. But going below the surface of the word itself you will find that communism means everything that is good. Communism means that men live side by side as brothers, working together, not exploiting each other, living in peace, harmony and accord. The imperialists depict communism with a terrible face because they are afraid of the truth the word contains within itself.

What is the world national-liberation movement? We are not engaged in a struggle for its own sake. We are fighting to secure for the people that for which the communists work, fight and die. This is a question of words, but for us they mean the same things.

This has terrified the imperialists. If communism seeks to destroy their system of exploitation, they naturally want to depict communism as an evil. They will always try to scare people with 'world communism,' but if one explains what this means, people begin to understand. Here is one example of how the imperialists present communism in their propaganda. My people are aware of the goals of our struggle — self-determination and independence — a struggle to return to the people their land, their rights, their human dignity, and so on, and also all the 'little things' which mean so much to the common man — and I mean the fields, goats, fowls, and so on. Our people are aware that that is what we are fighting for. And so our enemies, the imperialists, keep saying: 'Nkomo, the Zimbabwe liberation movement are inspired by world communism. They are communists.' Our people reply: 'If these men fighting for what we want are communists, then they must be good men.'

After all, simply saying 'communist' does not mean very much. The main thing is what the communists stand for! If they stand for

what my people want, they my people have the right to say: 'The communists are good men, they want the same things as we do.'

That is what the imperialists fail to understand; they do not understand that in a sense they themselves acted as propagandists for communism, as the ideology of a superior type which struggles for human rights.

I don't put trust in an ideology for its nice sounds, but for what it really brings to the people.

1. Youth uprising that signalled mass and continuing action against the Vorster regime. For further details, on these events see *WMR*, August 1976 and April 1977. The last series of interviews with ANC, SWAPO and ZAPU leaders was published in *WMR*, June 1976.

2. Bantustans — reservations for African ethnic groups, which the Vorster regime has begun to proclaim 'independent states.' — *Ed.*

3. On November 30, 1977, the regime held an early election, in which only the white minority may participate. Most of this white minority voted for Vorster's National Party. This allows Vorster to make the required constitutional changes. — *Ed.*

4. Steve Biko — an organizer of the Black Consciousness Movement, which advocated peaceful methods of changing the system. See *WMR*, January, 1978 — *Ed.*

5. In November 1977 the UN Security Council passed a resolution banning arms deliveries to the South African regime. However, press reports indicate that today South Africa manufactures the greater part of the arms it needs on licences from imperialist powers. — *Ed.*

6. The United States, Britain, France, West Germany and Canada. — *Ed.*

7. These articles list the measures which the Security Council can take to remove a threat to international peace and security, including economic and political sanctions, as well as a display of armed force, such as a blockade. — *Ed.*

8. On the understanding that South African troops would stay on in Namibia. — *Ed.*

9. Seaport and naval base. — *Ed.*

10. Called in late 1976 under the sponsorship of the United States and with the participation of Britain, various organizations of the African population in Rhodesia and the Smith regime. It failed because Smith refused to discuss African majority rule. — *Ed.*

11. The so-called Anglo-American plan proposed the establishment of a transitional administration in Rhodesia for six months with a Briton presiding. There was no provision to disband the Smith regime's racist army, as the Patriotic Front demands. Elections were to be held at the end of the period, after which power was to be handed over to an African government. — *Ed.*

12. After the present interview, Smith began talks on an internal settlement with representatives of conciliatory circles among the African population in Rhodesia. Accordingly, the Patriotic Front and the front-line states announced that the Anglo-American plan had become meaningless. — *Ed.*

13. See *WMR*, May 1973. — *Ed.*

# Political situation in Ecuador

*Rene Mauge*
Executive Committee member
CC, CP Ecuador

In February 1972, the armed forces of Ecuador staged a bloodless coup and announced the formation of a 'revolutionary nationalist government.' This had been preceded by a long period of rule by civilian governments and military dictatorships, all of which catered for the local oligarchy and toed the line of U.S. imperialism.

The new government declared itself anti-feudal and anti-oligarchic. It promised to end social, economic, political, military and ideological dependence and effect radical structural changes for accelerated development and a higher standard of living in Ecuador. Measures to meet the interests and aspirations of the masses were announced. Specifically, they were designed to strengthen sovereignty and independence, protect national resources, curb monopoly superprofits, cancel privileges for certain socio-economic groups and carry through an effective agrarian reform to liquidate the unjust system of land ownership. Provisions were also made to invest more in the country's development from the funds obtained through the sales of oil, to involve the masses in running the country, and so on.

These targets of government policy and the restoration of the 1945 Constitution, the most democratic in the country's history, were welcomed by the masses, supported by the communists and members of other revolutionary parties and movements which had been engaged in the unabating struggle against the corrupt regimes that had ruled for decades.

Why then did the Ecuadorian military, whom the Pentagon had trained for years to perform police functions, choose this path? The explanation lies in various causes, national and international.

Among the numerous international factors mention should be made of the impact made on political developments in Ecuador and other countries by the changes in the world balance of forces and the growing role of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The victorious Cuban revolution, the major political event in

present-day Latin America, offered new prospects for our peoples. Its impact inevitably extended to all social groups, including the military. The defeat suffered by imperialism in the Bay of Pigs also had impressive consequence.

The ideological views and political stance of the Ecuadorian military were largely influenced also by the emergence of the progressive government in Peru under Velasco Alvarado, which had launched deep-going social and economic reforms, and by the victory of the Popular Unity nominee, Salvador Allende, in the presidential elections in Chile.

As for the domestic causes, the views of the military were influenced by such adverse effects of the social, economic and political system of that time as poverty, cultural backwardness and rapacious exploitation of our country by imperialism.

Recent decades saw a certain upturn in the economy. But the upturn was of a capitalist nature overshadowed by imperialism and persisting feudal survivals. Its fruits were reaped by a handful of capitalists and landlords, and also the foreign monopolies that dominated the country.

The key positions in the economy are still held by foreign capital, especially North American. Big multinationals are draining out our oil and gas. Fish resources are plundered by North American flotillas. The output of bananas and other farm produce, and also mining, are controlled by U.S. monopolies. Imperialist banks and their branches penetrate throughout the economy, recasting it to suit themselves.

The industrial progress in recent years, such as it was, contributed exclusively to the interests of foreign companies. Industrial workers are paid niggardly wages, and the purchasing power of their earnings is sliding. There is a growing army of unemployed.

The overwhelming majority of peasants, mostly Indians, have to live in conditions unfit for man and are deprived of all political and social rights. To this should be added the country's chronic political instability, which became especially pronounced in the 60s.

The development of oil fields started in 1964 to mark a major turn in the entire economic activity of Ecuador. In the past our economy, mainly agrarian, produced bananas, cacao, coffee, rubber and rice.

The situation has radically changed. Ecuador has become an oil exporter. In the past imperialism's investments in Ecuador were rather meager, whereas our country has now been given much prominence in the strategic and economic plans of U.S. imperialism. U.S. investments in Ecuador's economy have grown accordingly.

Our people's never ending struggle and democratic traditions, and our party's unrelenting efforts to give a scientific explanation of the national problems and work out a program for their revolutionary

solution, have always affected and continue to affect in one way or another the attitude of the army's rank and file and officers.

These are, in brief, the foreign and domestic economic and political factors that influenced the position of the military government. The class composition of the Ecuadorian army is also significant. Coming mainly from urban and rural middle class strata, many servicemen understand the concerns of the popular masses and are aware of social injustice. All this accounts for the change in the sentiments among the military and the new course taken up in 1972. It also goes to explain the vacillation of the government, its inability to act with decision and consistency.

In the eventful six years since 1972, our party has supported all the positive steps in the country's development, all the achievements that we must now defend and consolidate to make them irreversible.

Noteworthy in this context is the positive oil policy, especially in the period when the post of the Minister for Natural Resources was held first by Rear Admiral Gustavo Jarrin Ampudia and then by Colonel Rene Vargas Pazos. Of great importance also was the transfer under state control of Port Balao, formerly a Texaco-Gulf possession, and the return to the nation of 80 per cent of the lands earmarked for geological prospecting. Other major events include the increase of royalties paid for the growth of oil output and a transfer to the Ecuadorian State Petroleum Corporation, formed by the government, of 37.5 per cent of the shares formerly held by Gulf Oil in the Texaco-Gulf consortium; the creation of a state-run tanker fleet; Ecuador's entry into OPEC; its active role in setting up the Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE); the carrying out of the electrification program; formation of the public sector in industry and protection of the 200-mile zone of territorial waters.

We communists view the government's foreign policy on the whole as positive. This particularly refers to expanding diplomatic and trade relations with most of the socialist countries, its participation in various international organizations and its oil policy, which today is the pivot of all economic activity in the country.

But there are also negative aspects, above all in its foreign policy: virtual abandonment of the agrarian reform, leaving intact the decrees inimical to the interests of the working people, enactment of the national security law which is reactionary in character and was obviously inspired by the Americans, refusal to comply with the demands of the masses, who protest against escalating prices and insist on better conditions for the people as a whole, etc.

The process that started in 1972 has intensified the class struggle and promoted the political awareness of our people and their better understanding of the pressing problems confronting the country. The

working people show more and more determination to join the struggle for revolutionary change and increasingly oppose the vacillating policy of the government, which has failed to hold back inflation, preserved the power of the oligarchy intact, frozen wages and is now adopting decrees levelled against the trade unions.

The growth of revolutionary consciousness is promoted by the continuing high cost of living and hard working conditions, the deepening economic crisis of the world capitalist system (imperialism shifts its consequences onto the peoples of dependent and backward countries like Ecuador), and also the unending conspiracies organized by the oligarchy and imperialism, which are out to hamstring any positive initiative of the government.

As all anti-imperialist, democratic and patriotic forces increasingly strive for unity, the effort of the Communist Party is to concentrate their action and draw up a joint program of struggle for a stage-by-stage change, without which progress is impossible.

This powerful drive for unity is expressed in the common stand of the three main national trade union centers, in their major joint actions, like the general strike in November 1975, which paralyzed the entire country.

This year's militant May Day actions, the successful general strike called on May 18, a strike joined by teachers, who did not resume work for more than 20 days, defying repressions and the enactment of legislation banning the National Teachers' Union, and the growing unity drive among the working class — all this has shown the need to set up one center for the working people of Ecuador to guide them in class battles for revolutionary changes and in defense of their vital interests. Similar processes are under way in the peasant movement. Throughout the country the peasants are for united action and a common platform and for setting up a Peasant Center. In the course of these actions the worker-peasant alliance is being forged as the core of the liberation process under the guidance of the Communist Party and other left forces.

The campaign to retrieve oil resources has stirred Ecuadorian society. The Patriotic Front for the Nationalization of Oil has been set up under the aegis of the three main trade union centers, peasant associations, universities, the University Students' Federation, the Federation of Secondary School Pupils, the National Teachers' Union and other organizations. The broad popular masses of Ecuador strive for unity, freedom, progress and independence. In this they are supported by some of the Catholic clergymen and the military.

The mounting tide of struggle scares the reactionaries, the local oligarchy and its imperialist patrons, and causes wavering among the military. The process of change that started five years ago, said the

CPE Central Committee at its plenum in May this year, has been checked and some new measures even damage what has been achieved for the good of the people. After General Rodriguez Lara was removed from the presidential post last year* the armed forces announced their decision to abdicate power with the purpose of a 'juridical restructuring of the Ecuadorian state' and a corresponding plan was drawn up.

Before the plan was made public our party took part in a dialogue, together with other political and social forces. Our position was clear: there should be no return of power to the oligarchy and imperialism, and the armed forces should keep their word and effect the promised economic, social and political changes. The Communist Party called upon the government to carry out joint actions of the patriotic-minded civilians and military, thereby securing support from the masses and, backed by organized mass action, to crush the resistance of the oligarchy and imperialism. It is against this background that a broad front of the left has been formed, its program being the struggle to safeguard the chief gains of recent years and energize the present stage of the national-liberation revolution.

In this way we are implementing the main tactical slogan proclaimed by our party at its Ninth Congress, which called for the unity of anti-imperialist, democratic and patriotic forces in the struggle for social and national freedom. To achieve this goal it is necessary to step up the struggle for national interests, for the interests of the people, foil the reactionaries' attempts to take the offensive, and advance along the path of revolutionary change in accordance with the minimum program advanced by the party:

— remove the economic and political roots of imperialist domination; nationalize the entire oil industry; carry through a democratic agrarian reform; democratize public life; improve the living standards of the people; advance the national industry, above all the public sector; pursue a sovereign, independent and peaceful foreign policy.

This path is not going to be smooth. Apart from such obvious enemies as the oligarchy and imperialism, the revolutionary forces are opposed by the treacherous ultra-leftists, especially the Maoist groups, which are trying to split our ranks. Fortunately, these groups have been exposed and now find themselves in ever deeper isolation.

Our immediate task is to explain to the masses the program of the national-liberation revolution as a stage preceding the transition to socialism, and rally all patriotic, anti-imperialist and democratic forces in a united front.

*Rodriguez Lara resigned in January 1976. Power passed to the Supreme Ruling Council headed by Rear Admiral Poveda Burbano. — *Ed.*

the press

# Weapon of the truth

*Georg Polikeit*
Board Presidium member,
German CP, Editor-in-Chief,
*Unsere Zeit*, organ of the GCP

## EXPERIENCE OF THE GCP

The question of the role and significance of the communist press and its efficacy has perhaps never been posed so urgently and under such unique conditions as today. When we, the communists of the FRG, speak of this we bear in mind not only the fact that the opinion-making influence of the mass media is growing steadily throughout the world, including the FRG. Our point of departure is that the struggle to win more influence among the masses is the basic target of the GCP; this was laid down in the decisions of the party's Bonn Congress in the spring of 1976.

Of course, parallel with oral explanatory work — the thousands of talks that our party members daily have with non-communists at the place of work or study, with neighbors, with those whom circumstances have made companions in the search for employment — a large contribution to the fulfillment of this task is made by the press and other printed matter stating the GCP's stand on various questions of social life.

In our country big capital has a huge political and ideological apparatus, unprecedented means of misinforming the masses and manipulating public opinion. The ruling circles are improving and diversifying the technology of deceit and making every effort to enhance the influence of bourgeois ideology over the masses. Imperialism's propaganda machine is endeavoring to conceal or distort the truth about existing socialism, whip up anti-communist and, particularly, anti-Soviet prejudices, kindle nationalistic feeling, prevent détente from influencing opinion in the capitalist countries, spread right and 'left' opportunist views in the working-class movement and undermine the prestige and impact of the policy of peace and friendship among nations pursued consistently by the socialist countries.

Reaction is skillfully coordinating its actions, and it is helped in this by the concentration of the bourgeois mass media. Although the bourgeois press tirelessly extols 'pluralism' as an indisputable 'indica-

tion of democracy,' it is itself controlled by a steadily diminishing circle of people. In our country, for example, more than half of all the dailies, with a circulation of at least 50,000 copies each, are owned by only five corporations, the largest of which, the ultra-reactionary Springer Concern, supplies the market with 26.9 per cent of the total printing of daily newspapers. As regards a key mass medium such as television, the total absence of representatives of the working class and progressive democratic elements in its management and program-making bodies gives its broadcasts an orientation that fully meets the interests of the ruling circles. A perceptible shift to the right in the political content of broadcasts and the selection of editors is taking place under the massive propaganda pressure of the reactionaries headed by the CDS/CDU and directing the campaigns against the alleged 'left influence' on FRG television.

In this situation one can well appreciate how important it is to bring out printed matter stating the communist view and supplying information without the ideological twist given to it by big capital. It is by no means easy for the communist press to carry out the task facing it in this area. Neither in the FRG nor in other capitalist countries can the communist press match big capital's colossal financial, technical and manpower resources. There is, consequently, a considerable gap between the objective demands on the communist press and its modest economic and technical possibilities. This still further accentuates the problem of *which of our inherent advantages* can and must be used by the communist press in the struggle for the masses, against opinion-manipulation by the bourgeois mass media. We feel that here a broad exchange of experience by the communist parties and their press organs can be of immense benefit.

When we, the communists of the FRG, speak of consciously using the inherent advantages of the communist-oriented press in the struggle for broader influence among the masses, we have in mind mainly that this press cannot follow the road trodden by the commercial press, that we should not adapt ourselves to its established and accepted journalistic style and presentation.

Needless to say, we must write in a language understood by the working people, and effective and popular presentation must be our aim. In this context, we must take into consideration the present reading habits and requirements of the working people in our country. In the make-up of our newspaper we strive, for instance, to take into account the fact that the reader wants speedy, businesslike, concise and, at the same time, clear information, that he wants photographs illustrating life and he expects the material he reads to be diversified and interesting.

However, it would be wrong to believe that we would have

achieved greater influence and efficacy, that we would have attracted more readers, if we had chosen to create a sort of 'communist sensational press,' if we had imitated the bourgeois press with its hunt for sensation or had blindly copied many other fashionable methods evolved by bourgeois journalism, encouraging and playing up to petty-bourgeois sentiments, and using propaganda clichés even if they have taken root in people's minds. Of course, the very fact of the existence of such views must be taken into consideration. However, we feel that to be led by them would mean departing from the principles of our world outlook, to narrow our political identity and independence and, ultimately, to make the mistake of opportunist time-serving and concessions, thereby renouncing what distinguishes the communist press and the policy of the Communist Party, from the policy and practices of the parties preaching and practising class conciliation.

In the capitalist countries the communist press is able to set itself the task of successfully fighting the bourgeois propaganda machine. This is due, above all, to the fact that on its side it has truth, the truth of history, the objective laws of social development. Not even the most refined manipulation of public opinion by the bourgeois mass media can eliminate the vices implicit in the capitalist system, put an end to social antagonisms and blunt the acuteness of capitalism's general crisis.

In other words, a correct and clear-cut political orientation is, in our opinion, the key condition for effective work by the communist press, whatever the concrete forms in which it conducts this work. The GCP holds that its press can give prominence to questions that actually worry working people and answer these questions convincingly and patiently only if it bases its work on precise knowledge of the concrete national and international conditions of the class struggle and takes into account the prospects for the development of that struggle, only if it clearly sees the objectives it has set itself. The influence exercised by our press on the masses depends chiefly on how lucidly, accurately and convincingly it answers the questions worrying millions of people.

As we see it, the communist press is an *extraordinary* phenomenon in the capitalist system. This is due mainly to the fact that it neither conceals nor embellishes the vices of the capitalist system, as does the monopoly press, but on the contrary exposes these vices. Also, this extraordinary character lies in the fact that only the communist press is able to assess the processes in social life from the standpoint of the interests of the working class and champion the vital rights of the working people consistently, with partisan frankness. It alone is in a position to give prominence to the demands and actions of the

working people, show what unites all the anti-monopoly, democratic, progressive forces of society and call upon them to act in unity. Further, the extraordinary character of the communist press is that it not only speaks of socialism in its theoretical aspects and shows its historical inevitability but in unremitting struggle against anti-communist propaganda, drawing on concrete facts and in a militant style, disseminates the truth about existing socialism and proves its incontrovertible superiority over capitalism.

It is our firm belief that conscious and effective use of all these possibilities springing from the political make-up and clearly expressed partisanship of the communist press is the decisive condition for the growth of its influence on the masses.

In the capitalist countries millions of working people are today feeling the burden of the crisis, which affects their lives and gives rise to uncertainty and deep fear of the future. In this situation people are feverishly looking for a way out of the day-to-day hardships and, at the same time, for the cause of these hardships. Only the communist press can give the masses the correct, substantiated answer to these vital questions and adopt an unambiguous, militant stand. In precisely this sector it can most forcefully prove its advantages over the press serving the monopolies.

In order to realize these advantages we must go on seeking ways of improving our work and resolve some extremely difficult problems of editorial practice. We, journalists of the GCP, are doing our utmost to improve our professional skill. Although the reader is aware that the material and technical resources of the communist press are limited, he nevertheless counts on its carrying intelligible and accurate information. We strive to write about events and problems in a language understood by the masses and to master all aspects of journalism. Lastly, we attach great importance to enlarging the communist press network, to coordinating all its elements and to promoting cooperation with other progressive, democratic and socialist newspapers, journals and publishing houses.

In the FRG the communist press is represented by the daily newspaper *Unsere Zeit* (with a larger weekend edition) and several hundred newspapers published by primary party organizations in towns and residential neighborhoods, at industrial enterprises and at institutions of higher learning. Moreover, we have the journal *Land-revue,* which is published once in two or three months and deals with rural problems.

Further, we attach great importance to the pamphlets published under the general heading Individual Programs, which state the GCP's stand on various questions (for instance, the situation in public transport, public health and education; the party's attitude to youth

problems and to the women's movement; its attitude to the agrarian question and environmental protection; its proposals for social and tax policy).

In addition to newspapers and periodicals, the GCP makes wide use of other forms of printed information. Most of those are centrally or locally printed eye-catching leaflets, posters and 'special issues of the GCP.' 'Letters to Neighbors' are a specific form of printed information that has proved to be effective. By means of such letters, which contain photographs and the address of the author, one or another communist writes to people living in his neighborhood and states his views on the most urgent local and general political problems.

Today we are confronted by two closely interrelated tasks. One is to improve the contents and dissemination of *Unsere Zeit,* and the other is to invigorate the work of the party newspapers issued at industrial enterprises, population centers and institutions of higher learning. In our work on these tasks we proceed from the decision of the GCP Board on the publication of the central party newspaper, in which it is slated: 'Being a daily, *Unsere Zeit* must develop as a popular, mass-circulation newspaper of the workers and the masses. Hence, from the standpoint of content, subject matter, journalistic presentation, language and style it must be a newspaper that appeals directly to public opinion, chiefly to working-class readers interested in politics. While preserving its mass character, one of this daily newspaper's major aims must be to provide the activists of progressive movements in the FRG, notably members of our party, with accurate political information, orientation and arguments.'

In day-to-day activity it is of course not easy to be a newspaper giving party members information and orientation and, at the same time, addressing itself directly to the masses and satisfying the most diverse reader requriements. It is even less easy in view of the fact that, as we have already noted, our newspaper's resources are limited. However, we strive to keep both these aspects of our work constantly in sight. Over-emphasis on any of these aspects would, in our view, prevent our paper from carrying out its tasks effectively.

The role played by *Unsere Zeit* was praised at the Bonn Congress of the GCP, which noted that the newspaper 'is the most effective means presenting our party's policy.' Moreover, the congress called for a greater effort to win more readers and subscribers, improve distribution and promote regular sales in the streets by party organizations. Although many organizations and members of the GCP are already today regularly and, it must be said, successfully popularizing the newspaper — without this it would simply have been unable to exist — this work must be intensified and as many communist and

primary organizations as possible drawn into it. The Bonn Congress also noted that there was room for further improvement.

What does it mean in practice to make a newspaper like ours more readable? Our experience shows that it would be wrong to consider that since we want the newspaper to become more popular the principal way is to carry more photographs and, as far as possible, print only short, 'streamlined' articles with 'snappy' headlines, and give prominence not only to 'big politics' but also to sports and the world of entertainment. Although all these are elements that help a newspaper to attract a large circle of readers, while the absence of one of them may reduce circulation, people are not going to buy or subscribe to our newspaper just because it carries wide sports coverage, prints entertaining articles and has snappy headlines.

The prime condition for our newspaper's success among the masses is, as we have already underscored, that it writes on subjects and problems that are of current importance for the working people, and that it does this in a convincing, businesslike manner and answers the questions posed by life. In order to pursue this line we must, first and foremost, improve the political level of our editorial work, study the party's political guidelines and apply them creatively. This means that each staff member should have extensive political and professional knowledge and that collective forms of editorial work should be employed consistently.

Since our communist publications, notably *Unsere Zeit,* are brought out in an ocean of bourgeois newspapers and journals, we consider that it is our duty to show readers whom the bourgeois mass media serve. For this purpose *Unsere Zeit* carried on concrete and critical discussions about radio and television broadcasts and exposes the activities of big capital's propaganda centers. That is why we strive to conduct a systematic and uncompromising argument with the bourgeois press on big public issues — the FRG's place in the modern world, its economic position, inflation, unemployment and the class struggle, to mention only a few.

One example was our article, 'Does Capitalism Still Exist in the Federal Republic?' Its publication was prompted by an article in *Frankfurter Allgemeine,* which stated: 'People with any knowledge of economic problems are well aware that capitalism no longer exists in the western part of Germany. On the contrary, the present social, free economic order that has replaced the "capitalism" known to everybody, is exceptionally viable because it has become the economy of all the working people. The struggle of the proletariat is becoming an illusion where the working class itself is disappearing together with capitalism.'

Reproducing this pronouncement in bold type and supplementing it with a statement by Chancellor Schmidt, namely, 'We no longer have a class society,' *Unsere Zeit* cited statistics on the growth and influence of the capitalist monopolies, telling readers of the fabulous profits of the corporations and where these profits come from. This clearly illustrated who actually rules the FRG and what sort of society we live in.

The article made it clear that the capitalist system in the FRG was in the grip of a crisis, that small enterprises were going bankrupt and that production was declining. It drew attention to the growth of the army of unemployed, of those denied the means of subsistence. We compared these data with statistics characterizing the economy of socialist countries, and gave the reader the facts and figures enabling him to assess the 'dynamic character' of our society, which has now reached the brink of despair.

Practically every issue carries on its front page a column headed 'Comment,' in which we reply to articles in the bourgeois press. Quite recently, for instance, the Springer *Bild* had to admit that in the GDR most services are cheaper than in the FRG. However it gave even this fact an anti-communist twist by alleging that the GDR government was artificially keeping prices down. To this our paper replied: 'In the free market economy existing in our country and in the "free west" generally, there is a freedom to invest billions of marks to artificially keep prices high! That is the difference! And we think it is not at all bad for the people in the GDR.'

In other words, while explaining the party's basic aims, our press, notably *Unsere Zeit,* wages a constant struggle against bourgeois fraud, against the anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign of our adversary, and, by quoting the example of existing socialism, shows the advantages of the socialist social system.

The numerous party newspapers brought out at industrial enterprises, institutions of higher learning and in small towns comprise another major element of the mass-distribution communist press. Another sign of its effectiveness is the bitterly hostile attitude of the ruling circles toward it.

We believe that the potency of these publications lies mainly in the fact that they are close to the day-to-day interests of the working people. Naturally, the largest influence is enjoyed by a newspaper that raises questions directly affecting the given enterprise or region and proposes plans and projects consonant with the interests of workers and large strata of the population.

We firmly believe that these publications are justified only if they are the work of the primary party organizations themselves. Of course, higher party bodies can and do help them. However, we feel

that nobody should supplant the direct collective work of a primary party organization in the publication of a newspaper. As a matter of fact, the decision of a primary organization to bring out a newspaper at a factory or in a residential district is frequently the beginning of systematic political and other work by that organization to resolve the production and local problems worrying the working people.

Newspapers brought out by party groups strive to link the day-to-day interests of the working people, concrete production and local problems with explanations of the GCP's policy. In other words, by moving from the specific to the general publications help the working people understand that their difficulties are caused by the rule of big capital, that they can improve their condition only by joint struggle, and that it is imperative to limit this rule in the interests of the people and ultimately secure a radical restructuring of social relations.

The party, naturally, strives to continue enhancing the efficacy of these papers. We are making every effort to ensure their uninterrupted publication (at least monthly) and enlarge the number of primary party organizations putting them out. The bulletin *Dienst für Betriebs und Ortszeitungen* published by the Party Board is a good aid in the work of these publications. Besides cartoons, photographs, articles and elements of layout that may be used by local editorial offices, it contains advice on how to deepen the political significance of published materials and disseminates accumulated experience.

As a party of the working class, as a party of socialism, Herbert Mies, our party Chairman, said at the Bonn Congress, the GCP has in recent years 'learned to conduct a more effective struggle in defense of the social and democratic gains of the working people, suggest realistic ways out of the profound crisis affecting capitalism, and substantiate the need for far-reaching social changes.' A large contribution to this has been made by the communist press. In its efforts to extend the party's influence among the masses, our press will continue to develop and improve the forms of its work. In this lies the foundation of our further successes.

---

## THE CHANGING WORLD

Julio Laborde, *El destino del Tercer Mundo,* Editorial Perspectivas, Buenos Aires, 1977, 128 pp.

For some time a growing number of terms defining 'worlds' have been coming into political use: the 'third world' has been added to the worlds we already know, and some people are now speaking of a 'fourth' and even 'sixth world,' writes Julio Laborde, a noted Argentinian journalist and CC member of the Communist Party of Argentina, in *Destiny of the Third World,* a book recently published in Buenos Aires. He considers the basic problems of the topical and pressing issue of the perspectives opening up for the new nations that has risen on the ruins of imperialism's colonial system. His analysis is mainly of countries that have won political independence but are still enmeshed in financial, economic and, in many cases, diplomatic and military dependence on imperialism. He writes of countries that are for the time being on the sidelines of world development economically, technically and, to some extent, culturally, but which are today trying to adjust to the tempo of social progress and the scientific and technological revolution, these historic achievements of humankind.

Laborde justifiably notes that humanity is a broad concept, and whereas part of humankind had stepped from the pre-history of its development to the genuine history ushered in 60 years ago by the October Revolution, there are still large groups in the world that have been unable to break out even of primitive societies, while in a large part of the world the crisis of the capitalist system, with its exploitation of man by man and the pillaging of other nations, is eroding the culture accumulated in the course of centuries.

As Laborde points out, in our indivisible world, which is so manifold from the social point of view, the term 'third world' that has come into use in world sociological and political literature is not scientific.

Moreover, it is given the most diverse meanings. On the extreme right they speak of the 'third world' as of the 'diabolical threshold of collectivism,' asserting that 'these countries are sheep without a shepherd, or sheep that have wandered away from the rest of the flock,' that it signifies an 'intermediate stage,' a 'national projection of destitution and being satisfied with one's own poverty.'

Also, there are some who speak of the 'third world' from bourgeois-nationalistic positions, depicting it as a 'third way,' 'free' of the choice of the alternative between capitalism and socialism. This interpretation of the 'third world' is ultimately a philosophy of class

reconciliation, when the class concept and the class struggle are assessed as artificial and outworn.

On the other hand, from the standpoint of spokesmen of petty-bourgeois revolutionism, the 'third world' is the global vanguard of the revolutionary process, in which the proletariat no longer plays the leading role, it is a 'world village,' which alone sends out a revolutionary impulse. In other words, instead of seeing the unity of the epoch's three revolutionary currents — the socialist world system, the revolutionary working-class movement and the national-liberation movement — as springing from the historical and social development begun with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and given its further impetus with the formation of the socialist world system, the proponents of this theory endeavor to counterpose the national-liberation movement to existing socialism.

Taking the Marxist-Leninist analysis of imperialism as his point of departure, Laborde consistently applies Marxist-Leninist principles to his survey of the course of the world revolutionary process. Needless to say, he rightly accords an outstanding place to the nations fighting imperialism in that swiftly changing zone of the world, which consists of new countries that have 90.4 per cent of the territory of Africa, 56.6 per cent of the territory of Asia and 27.2 per cent of the territory of America, of countries that as late as the turn of the century were still colonies of the imperialist powers, including the USA. 'In humankind's new epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism,' Laborde writes, 'scores of new countries have emerged in Africa, Asia, Europe and America.' And he adds that 'a point to be emphasized is that the new type of countries are the result of the revolutionary victory of progressive classes and strata' (p. 45).

The fact is that an assessment of the character, role and place of each specific state must be based on an analysis of the class interests it represents, expresses and upholds. Here Laborde recalls Lenin's precept that the existence of transitional regimes must not be ignored.

The author underscores the role of the Soviet Union and the socialist community, the might and existence of which are a factor enabling every patriotic government to break the bonds of dependence on imperialism (p. 64) and to distinguish the correct path from the wrong at the crossroads. He evaluates the collective efforts being made to safeguard the natural resources and interests of developing nations as a new specific feature of their struggle.

The nations that have won political independence, Laborde writes, have to decide how to advance socially and economically and achieve actual liberation by putting an end to all dependence on imperialism. To achieve this, 'it is vital, in addition to making full use of one's own resources, to cooperate with industrialized nations that have reached

a high level of scientific, technical and economic development' (p. 95). Further, this entails a class, strictly scientific analysis, and this is exactly what Laborde does when he urges a sustained polemic to refute this specious concept that divides the world into 'rich and poor nations,' into the 'industrialized North and the agrarian South' without taking into consideration the social system in each given country.

Concepts of this kind, Laborde writes, pursue the aim of discrediting the community of the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, to conceal the main contradiction of the epoch and, consequently, prevent the developing nations from taking the socialist road. In the final analysis, these concepts are nothing less than an attempt to prevent the countries fighting for democracy, economic independence and social progress from using the vast possibilities that have been opened up for them by the socialist world system. In this connection Laborde exposes every shade in the false concepts of anti-Sovietism. He devotes an entire chapter to a critical analysis of the anti-Marxist, Maoist 'theory of three worlds' in combination with the theory of 'two imperialisms' that comprise the foundation of anti-Soviet chauvinistic, aggressive policy.

This book, in which the author uses a mass of facts from the life of Latin American countries, particularly Cuba and Argentina, allows answering the question of 'what road will be followed by third world countries' (p. 123).

In the case of Argentina, Laborde analyzes the processes taking place in that country and defines the character of the tasks being set by the democratic, anti-latifundist and anti-imperialist revolution, tasks without whose fulfillment no socialist perspective is conceivable. The author draws the conclusion that the realization of imperialism's plans of subjugating Latin America generally and the southern cone of that continent in particular is not fatally inevitable.

'In this huge part of the planet,' he writes, 'the situation is complex indeed. A bitter struggle is raging in some of its zones. This situation will continue for a long time. However, it is important to know what trend is predominant,' and for this 'there is nothing better than to compare the situation today with the situation that existed in the world prior to November 7, 1917' (p. 126).

*Alberto Kohen*

---

# The cost of health under capitalism

The domination of private medicine in capitalist countries is having a disastrous effect on the working people's living standards. Where considerations of profit reign supreme the misfortunes of some are inevitably turned into a source of enrichment for others.

In October 1977, the *Financial Times,* which speaks for big business in Britain, published an article claiming that health care in the developed capitalist countries belonging to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development was experiencing practically a golden age. In support of this assertion the paper cited official data on increasing allocations for health in these countries.

It is true that in Britain, the oldest capitalist country, which has a long tradition of stubborn class struggle for improvement of the working people's social conditions, health care is run on a better basis than in a number of other West European countries. Since the creation of the national health service in 1947 the British workers have been able to obtain free medical treatment. Such achievements, which are due not to any touching solicitude on the part of the capitalist system, but to the long class battles waged by the working people, are to be found in other capitalist countries too.

All this, however, does not alter the general, far from optimistic picture of the health care scene in the developed capitalist countries.

In the United States, private citizens' spending on medical attention climbed from $25,900m. in 1960 to 160,000m. in 1977. In other words, it increased sixfold, and now amounts to more than $700 per person. But this should not be taken as evidence that people's health in the USA has improved. The increase is due to the steep rise in the cost of medical attention. Here are some specific facts: removal of the gall bladder cost an American $361 in 1950, $660 in 1960, $1,397 in 1970, and $2,208 in 1977. Between 1950 and 1977 charges for hospitalization rose tenfold and now run at $158 per day. According to

Survey prepared by the *WMR* Reference and Research Department on the basis of press reports and WFTU statistics.

the *New York Times,* 'with costs escalating 15 per cent annually the time when hospital beds will cost $500 a day is just a few years away.' (Quoted from the *International Herald Tribune,* May 2, 1977). At a Washington conference on U.S. health care problems held in 1977 one of the speakers, Kate Gater, stated that she had received a bill for $44,000 for treatment of her daughter. Or another example. After two months in a New York hospital a patient was presented with a bill for $22,147. Just how typical of the U.S. these cases are is shown by the fact that one visit to the doctor costs from $125 to $150. Millions of dollars flow into the pockets of medicos who make money out of diagnosing non-existent diseases in unsuspecting patients.

So, as the *U.S. News and World Report* concluded (March 28, 1977), 'Americans are up in arms over soaring medical bills that are inflicting sudden misery, and sometimes life-long hardship, on millions of people every year. ... Crooked doctors, nursing-home operators, laboratory-owners and druggists are defrauding taxpayers of about 1 billion dollars a year.'

The cost of medical aid in Japan is steadily rising. In 1974 charges for medical attention in Japanese clinics and hospitals registered an average rise of 19 per cent, the cost of a second visit to a surgeon or occulist tripled, and that of visits to the doctors at 'inconvenient times' went up tenfold. In 1976 the cost of medical care rose by 10 per cent and the prices of medicines also went up substantially.

In France some doctors also make a lot of money out of the sick. Hospitalization in the surgical department of a state hospital costs 695 francs a day, with an additional 10 per cent for doctors' fees, biological tests and surgery. The charge in private hospitals is 869 francs a day plus 10 per cent for various items. Admittedly, some of these costs are covered by social insurance. But it is also a fact that huge sums are being made out of this system by dishonest doctors, who earn from 12,000 to 23,000 francs a month, not counting additional fees. For comparison, let us note that the official minimum wage received by hundreds of thousands of French workers in 1977 was 2,200 francs a month.

In the FRG the working people's contributions to the so-called 'hospital funds' have doubled since 1960. In 1976 they accounted for 12 per cent of the average wage. According to West German newspapers, if the present trend is allowed to continue, these contributions will amount to 80 per cent of the FRG citizen's income by the year 2000.

In Italy, although there are state hospitals where treatment is paid for by social insurance, the main role is played by private medical institutions. Here the 'medical barons' (doctors and professors) have set up power centers in medicine that bring them fabulous fees. For

example, in some of these clinics a patient pays 2 million lire to have an ulcer removed. Italy's former health minister Luigi Mariotti has stated: 'The demigod in a white coat earning millions of lire a day, whose bill for a visit is as absurd as his assurance of speedy recovery, must be abolished' (*Panorama*, January 14, 1976). Meanwhile, infant (first-year) mortality in Italy remains at the level of an under-developed country. It is 17 times higher than in Sweden and 5 times higher than in France.

The data on industrial injuries provide one of the major indicators of capitalism's offensive against the workers' health. The employers' policy is to step up the intensity of labor and cut costs on industrial hygiene and safety equipment. Speed-up, physical and psychological overstrain, division of the production process to a point where people become mere appendages of machines, all this taken together forms the grim background to the growth of industrial injury in the capitalist countries.

Here are some facts and figures.

According to the International Labor Organization there are nearly 100,000 fatal accidents in world industry every year.

In West Germany industrial accidents kill somebody every two and a half hours. Three hundred thousand people a year are incapacitated by industrial injuries. The rate rose in 1976 by 4.6 per cent compared with the previous year. Loss of hearing is one of the most widespread afflictions. According to the West German press, there are more than two million jobs involving excessive noise.

In France, official statistics (which do not show the full picture) indicate that in 1975 there were 1,113,124 accidents in industry, including 118,996 serious cases. As *l'Humanité* has noted (February 25, 1977), the official figure of 1,986 deaths should have had added to it the 1,309 cases of workers killed in accidents on their way to work. This means that more than 3,000 people were victims of the capitalist system of labor.

Over recent years the industrial accident rate in Italy has averaged 1,600,000 per year (or 10 accidents a minute), including between 4,000 and 5,000 deaths and 600,000 injuries resulting in total disablement. Between January 1970 and December 1975 nearly 23,000 working people (18 per day) died of occupational diseases.

Last summer figures were published on the accident rates in the metallurgical industries of nine West European countries in 1974. They show that accidents per million working hours (involving loss of work capacity of more than three days) averaged 105 in Italy, 90 in the FRG, 86 in Belgium, 79 in Luxembourg, 77 in France, 63 in Denmark, 45 in Ireland, 38 in Holland, and 29 in Britain.

This evoked the following comment from *L'Unita* (September 17,

1976): 'The process of capitalist accumulation and technical progress have up to now developed without regard to work safety. It is quite obvious that investment policy has made little provision for prevention of accidents (in production).'

And finally one must take into account illnesses that would appear not to be directly connected with production, but do in many cases qualify as 'industrial' diseases. These are the nervous and psychological disorders connected with loss of employment and the threat or fear of such loss. In the Western press one reads of a good many cases when people who had been thrown out of their jobs suffered grave emotional stress. For example, the French bourgeois weekly *Le Point* (No. 192, May 24, 1976) surveyed a group of 377 workers who had been hit by mass dismissals. While 87 per cent of them had been quite healthy, after they had lost their jobs 89 per cent began to suffer from nervous depression, plus insomnia, headaches and alcoholism. Considering the fact that at the close of 1977 there were nearly 17 million unemployed in the developed capitalist countries alone, one can readily appreciate how many nervous disorders are latent in this huge army of the dispossessed.

The facts cited here do not, of course, amount to a full-scale survey. They do, however, illustrate that in capitalist society the health of the working people is not the kind of 'asset' that is given priority in investment.

---

## Contrary to détente

Last year the countries in the imperialist NATO bloc allocated $166,352m. for military purposes — a sum unparalleled in the bloc's history. It exceeds the 1976 amount by $24,000m., or 16 per cent, and is much higher than the average inflation rate in the 15 NATO countries.

In citing these figures, *Interarma Military News,* an authoritative specialized journal, notes that the distribution of military expenditures between the U.S. and Canada, on the one hand, and the West European NATO countries, on the other, did not change in 1977 and was $109,160m. and $57,192m., respectively. The share of military spending in the NATO countries' GNP in 1977 was 4.5 per cent (against 4.4 in the previous year), according to the journal.

Decisions adopted at meetings of the defense ministers of the NATO countries in 1977 suggest that the bloc is stepping up the arms race. During the 'Atlantic Week' held in Paris last autumn it was

announced that in 1978 the NATO countries would be equipped with a further 47,000 anti-tank missiles, whose total number would reach 193,000.

*Interarma Military News* discloses that the naval forces of NATO will be equipped with a further 10 destroyers, 11 mine-sweepers, two submarines, five motor torpedo boats and 23 helicopters. NATO's ground forces are to be supplied with an additional 265 tanks, 1,370 armored carriers, 814 anti-tank missile launchers and over 14,000 anti-tank grenade launchers, and as for the bloc's air and air defense forces, they will get 122 fighters, 22 transport planes, 63 helicopters, 260 anti-aircraft guns and 213 land-to-air missile-launching systems.

However, it seems that the NATO strategists want more. Last autumn it became known that the permanent representatives of the NATO countries in Brussels were working on a long-term program for building up the bloc's armaments and armed forces. The program is aimed at modernizing nuclear forces, the navy and air defense, and envisages preparations for hostilities and the rapid transportation of reinforcements, the mobilization of reserves, and the deployment of new weapons.

Lastly, there is the fact that the NATO nuclear planning group met again in October 1977 in Bari, Italy. The meeting was attended by the defense ministers of the U.S., West Germany, Britain, Greece, Denmark, Belgium and Italy, as well as by NATO Secretary-General Josef Luns. It discussed in the greatest secrecy problems of the bloc's nuclear rearmament, in particular the problem of manufacturing the neutron weapon and stationing it in Western Europe. What makes this inhuman weapon particularly dangerous is that it is described as 'tactical' and all but 'harmless' in an attempt to efface the boundary line between conventional and nuclear arms and make the transition to nuclear war as inconspicuous for the people as possible.

Commenting on these NATO plans, the Italian daily *Unita* wrote on December 20, 1977: 'Many people are wondering whether the neutron bomb, which U.S. military leaders consider indispensable for increasing the deterrent capacity of NATO, is really justified, and more important still, whether equipping the bloc's armed forces with this bomb will not create new obstacles in the talks on a balanced reduction of armed forces in Central Europe.'

Millions in Western Europe and other parts of the world have come to see that the neutron bomb is a barbarous weapon. They protest emphatically against plans for its manufacture and stationing on the old continent. They demand an end to the new round of the arms race started by the NATO bosses and running counter to détente.

*L.N.*

Editions of the journal

# 'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

**EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:**

**(World Marxist Review)**
Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WCIX 8PS, England.

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

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

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

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

**FRENCH EDITIONS:**

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

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières
185 rue Ontario est
Montréal, Québec, H2X 1H5, Canada

**ARABIC EDITIONS:**

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St., Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Bagdad, Iraq.

**BENGALI EDITION:** Manisha Granthalay Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee St., Calcutta 12, India.

**BULGARIAN EDITION:** 'Russki' 6, 'Hemus', Sofia, Bulgaria.

**CZECH EDITION:** Artia, Praha 2, Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

**DANISH EDITION:** Förlaget Tiden, Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

**FINNISH EDITION:** Aikakauslehti Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

**GERMAN EDITIONS:**

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

'Globus', Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften 1200 Wien, Hochstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

**GREEK EDITIONS:**

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

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

**HEBREW EDITION:** Problems of Peace and Socialism, P.O.B. 9525, Haifa, Israel.

**HINDI EDITION:** Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

**HUNGARIAN EDITION:** Kultura, Könyv-és Hirlap Külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary.

**ITALIAN EDITION:** Libreria Rinascita, Via della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

**MALAYALAM EDITION:**
5 Rani Jhansi Road,
New Delhi 55, India.

**MONGOLIAN EDITION:** Ulaanbatar Mongol Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I. Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

**NORWEGIAN EDITION:** Boks 3715, Oslo 1, Norway.

**PERSIAN EDITION:**
P.B. 49034, 10028,
Stockholm 49, Sweden.

**POLISH EDITION:** RSW, 'Prasa-ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

**PORTUGUESE EDITION:** Revista Internacional, Av. Santos Dumont, 57, 30 Lisboa-1, Portugal.

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

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

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

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

**SPANISH EDITIONS:**

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

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

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

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

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

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

**SWEDISH EDITION:** Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

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

**TURKISH EDITION:** 1 Berlin 10, Postfach 100 229, West Berlin.

**VIETNAMESE EDITION:** S'o xuât nhâp khâu Sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam.