WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

ebruary 1979, Vol. 22, No. 2 · $1.00

Zimbabwe /106

World peace and the communists /27

Communists and world development /3

Norwegian communists against monopoly /93

First-hand report from Vietnam /70

Situation in Turkey /35

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

February 1979, Vol. 22, No. 2

Features

3 The construction of socialism and communism and world development
International theoretical conference

4 Socialism's historic mission
T. Zhivkov

15 The growing role of internationalist solidarity
H. Axen

18 Spreading the truth about the new society
F. Muhri

22 Existing socialism and its international significance
B. Ponomaryov

27 World peace and the communists
P. Boychuck

Party experience

35 Situation in Turkey
I. Bilen

48 The goals are set
H. Gauthier

59 Socio-economic development strategy
W. Klimczak

Viewpoints

70 Vietnam: freedom and independence are the supreme values
J. Lava, V. Rybakov

86 The Cuban revolution — a qualitative advance in the struggle of the Latin American peoples

93 Norway: communists against monopoly
H.I. Kleven

103 Political lessons of the latest local elections in Israel
T. Toubi

Continued next page

Continued

106 The prospects of our struggle
J. Nkomo

110 A sinister alliance
F.R.

Science, culture, ideology

112 Need for in-depth theoretical research
K. Kulczar

The press

122 An alloy of revolutionary thought and action
N. Shishlin

127 The armed forces and politics
L. Padilla

130 In a distorting mirror
O. Stanford

137 Valuable aids
P. Lautischer

138 Back in action
S. Sierra

Facts and figures

140 Multinational firms of Great Britain
J. Turner

143 In memory of Houari Boumedienne

144 In memory of a comrade

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

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

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

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

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

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

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

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

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

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

feature

The construction of socialism and communism and world development

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL CONFERENCE

An international theoretical conference on 'The Construction of Socialism and Communism and World Development' took place in Sofia from December 12 to 15, 1978. It was organized by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party in collaboration with *World Marxist Review*.

The conference was attended by delegations from the following 73 Communist and Workers' parties and revolutionary democratic organizations; Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, Communist Party of Argentina, Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of Bangladesh, Communist Party of Belgium, Communist Party of Bolivia, Brazilian Communist Party, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Chile, Communist Party of Colombia, Congolese Party of Labor, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, Communist Party of Cuba, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Dominican Communist Party, Communist Party of Ecuador, Egyptian Communist Party, Socialist Ethiopia, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, German Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Greece, Guatemalan Party of Labor, People's Progressive Party of Guyana, United Party of Haitian Communists, Communist Party of Honduras, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Communist Party of India, Communist Party of Indonesia, People's Party of Iran, Iraqi Communist Party, Communist Party of Ireland, Communist Party of Israel, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Japan, Jordanian Communist Party, Lebanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Luxembourg, Communist Party of Malta, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Progress and Socialism Party of Morocco, Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO), Communist Party of the Netherlands, Communist Party of Norway, People's Party of Panama, Paraguayan Communist Party, Peruvian

Communist Party, Communist Party of the Philippines, Polish United Workers' Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Rumanian Communist Party, Communist Party of El Salvador, South African Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Spain, Communist Party of Sri Lanka, Sudanese Communist Party, Left Party — Communists of Sweden, Swiss Party of Labor, Syrian Communist Party, Communist Party of Turkey, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of the USA, Communist Party of Venezuela, Communist Party of Vietnam, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin and Yemeni Socialist Party, as well as by members of the *WMR* Editorial Board. The participants included about 60 Chairmen and General (First) Secretaries, full and alternate members of Political Bureau and Central Committee secretaries of fraternal parties.

The conference chairman, Alexander Lilov, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC BCP, gave the floor to Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Central Committee, Bulgarian Communist Party, Chairman of the Council of State, People's Republic of Bulgaria, who opened the conference.

In addition to plenary sittings, the conference deliberated in the following sections: 'Existing Socialism and Social Development Trends in the World,' 'The Socialist Countries' International Policy and Its Impact on World Processes' and 'The Socialist Countries and the Problems of Strengthening the Solidarity of the Revolutionary Forces.'

In this issue we publish the speech by Todor Zhivkov and begin the publication of abridged texts of the speeches made at the conference.

SOCIALISM'S HISTORIC MISSION

Todor Zhivkov
First Secretary, CC, Bulgarian CP, President,
State Council, People's Republic of Bulgaria

We Bulgarian communists have always attached the utmost importance to the theoretical groundwork of our movement. Watching over the cradle of our party and guiding its ideological and organizational maturing was Dimiter Blagoev, a foremost Marxist theoretician of his time. It was none other than Georgi Dimitrov who led the party's rearmament on the basis of Leninist ideas, headed the violent class battles of September 1923 until the victorious September 9, 1944, and then guided the party's and the people's first major steps along the road of socialist transformation. In line with an old internationalist tradition, we follow the struggles of other contingents of the world communist movement with close attention and heartfelt sympathy,

learn from their experience, and adopt their contribution to the creative application and development of Marxism-Leninism. For 90 years now questions of revolutionary theory have been featuring on the agenda of the revolutionary struggle and work of the BCP, and our foremost concern has been the concern for theory, for studying it profoundly, developing and applying it creatively, and safeguarding it from distortions and misinterpretations.

This meeting is not a conference of communist and workers' parties; it is not going to pass any decisions. The Sofia meeting is a scientific conference, in the work of which many prominent political figures and scholars of the fraternal parties, eminent representatives of the theoretical thought of the communist movement, are taking part. It owes its immense importance to the theoretical, ideological, political, and practical significance of the cardinal question under discussion, namely, socialist and communist construction and world development.

What considerations moved us when, as the sponsoring party, we suggested the theme and character of this conference?

The task of deciding on the theme was not one of the most difficult. We had no intention of looking for something extraordinary, something original. On the contrary, we proceeded from the premise that the more comprehensively and thoroughly a theme expresses an actual social process, and represents a major problem of society's actual, not fancy-born, development, a problem whose solution, cardinal to the destinies of people and entire nations, history has laid on the shoulders of the present generations, the greater will be its attraction and usefulness.

Time was when our party, like every Marxist party, had to provide a theoretical answer to the question: What is socialism, and whether there is fertile soil for it in our country? The answer is now clear even to those young states which today embark upon an independent road of social and economic development.

Socialist and communist construction and world development, the new social system as a world reality and a reality of the entire world of tomorrow — this is the theme of the century, the paramount issue of our time. This is evident not only to the communists, not only to all other progressives; it is evident to our class enemies as well.

To say that this is the theme of the century is a high claim. Such a claim can only be made by a society and a movement that have solved or created opportunities for solving the global problems confronting humanity in our time: man's liberation from exploitation and social oppression, the liberation of nations from colonial bondage, the securing of peace, and delivering the world from the nightmare of war.

The world communist movement has every right to make that claim.

Socialist and communist construction and world development is the theme of the century because, for the first time in history, exploitation of man by man has been extirpated in existing socialist society, a new attitude to work and a new life style have been created, and man, free and dignified, with many-sided interests and requirements, has become the main value. Socialism is a society which exists and works for the sake of man, from man's well-being and happiness.

This is the theme of the century because existing socialism is the mainstay and vanguard of world social progress. Its example, its ideological and material strength are precisely that locomotive of history which accelerates revolutionary transformations in the contemporary world, facilitates the growth of the scale and scope of the international communist and working-class movement, and promotes its advance.

This is the theme of the century because socialist society and the international communist movement have been and remain the mighty fraternal shoulder on which the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have been leaning in their struggle for freedom and independence, in their efforts to consummate and deepen the national-liberation revolutions and safeguard their gains against the intrigues of neo-colonialism.

This is the theme of the century because existing socialism, staunchly supported by the world communist movement, the world's peace-loving forces, is the force which ensures international peace. By their power and Leninist foreign policy the countries of existing socialism have deprived imperialism of the possibility of imposing its will on nations through wars and military threats, and have made practicable, for the first time in history, the possibility of excluding world wars from the life of mankind, and of making peace and peaceful coexistence irreversible.

This is the theme of the century because the forces of socialism and communism are on the offensive in all countries and continents, in all spheres of public life. This finds expression in the impressive achievements of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, in which major and historically new problems are being tackled. It also finds expression in the powerful upsurge of the struggle of the communist parties in the capitalist countries against the monopolies, in defense of the vital rights of the working people, for democracy, peace and socialist orientation.

The advance of socialism and communism determines the trends of world development in our time. It is the main content of our conference. But we would not be equal to our calling as communists if we

were to consider that we could confine ourselves to the triumphs and achievements of this advance. The theme of this conference should consist mainly and above all of the problems generated by socialist and communist construction and world development, of the new phenomena and processes encountered by us in social practice and which set our theory questions.

Lenin warned that the communists did not know the road to socialism down to the last detail, that they knew only the direction of this road, and the class forces that follow it, and that the rest would come to light through the experience of the millions when they took things into their own hands (see *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p.281).

Six decades have passed since the October Revolution. For decades now socialist states have been in existence in different parts of the world. Hundreds of millions of people have travelled the long and fruitful road, enormous experience has been accumulated, basic principles have been confirmed by practice, and new regularities have been discovered. Nonetheless, Lenin's warning remains valid to this day. We, the communists of socialist states, are well aware of it when, in our practice, we run into difficult problems of the economy, politics, and human relations, and also into their complex and by far not crystal-clear solutions, when practical strength fails us in reaching one or another of the changes we wish for. Various common and specific difficult problems and solutions also face our brothers-in-arms in the non-socialist countries. Moreover, no distance in time exists between us and events as does between the historian and the past. We are duty-bound, as Engels said, giving the example of Marx, to 'grasp clearly the character, the import and the necessary consequences of great historical events, at a time when these events are still in progress before our eyes or have only just taken place' (Marx and Engels. *Selected Works*. In three Volumes, Vol. 2, p. 178). In this case, the scientific, theoretical perspective is invaluable and indispensable, and this fully applies to both the theme and the character of our conference.

We have viewed and now view our conference as a scientific, theoretical conference, in which we shall analyze new phenomena, processes, problem situations, and key, topical questions which social development puts before our theory. It is clear to us that practice will have the last say. But it is equally clear to us that this in no way diminishes, but rather enhances the significance of the truths already tested in practice and of the role of an intellectual test in scientific discussion, because we cannot proceed blindly and await the verdict of practice. Exchange of opinion and confrontation of views are the style and spirit of Marxism-Leninism. They comprise that invaluable method through which every viewpoint, every idea, every position

should display its qualities and viability, show whether it carries a new element, and whether this new element meets the demands of the scientific approach, of the level attained in Marxist-Leninist science. A creative conference, a quest for the truth in a frank comradely atmosphere and by methods and means worthy of communists, a fruitful exchange of theoretical and practical experience — this is our intention and we do not doubt that it will so happen.

In the contemporary conditions of unprecedented growth of the world revolutionary process, of building the new, socialist type of civilization, the role and significance of Marxist-Leninist theory is constantly enhanced. Without the skill of developing and creatively applying our revolutionary theory while taking into account the concrete historical situation, it is impossible to control new phenomena and processes, it is impossible to organize and lead the masses in a successful drive for communism. Time has proved that the Marxist-Leninist teaching is an indispensable scientific guide for action and not a collection of dogmas. Its greatest strength lies in its ability to develop in parallel with life, to assimilate and apply new historical experience, and to map out realistic prospects for our movement as a whole and for each individual party.

When in proportion to the growing successes of Marxism-Leninism not only its confirmed enemies but also its critics and 'critiques' are multiplying; when attempts are made to defame our theory as incapable of creating new ideas and concepts; when efforts are made to break our theory apart by opposing Lenin to Marx, Leninism to Marxism; when departures from the basic propositions of Marxism-Leninism are presented, deliberately or thoughtlessly, as a creative enrichment of that theory, we must remember and staunchly and consistently abide by the approach to the creative enrichment of scientific socialism used by Lenin.

Lenin adopted Marxism's fundamental propositions, enriching and developing them, courageously moving forward both in the theory and practice of the revolutionary struggle in keeping with the new conditions and requirements of the epoch, of the revolutionary struggle. As part and parcel of our revolutionary theory, Lenin's new ideas gave scope in the changed conditions for the development of the class struggle of the proletariat and led to its victory.

In those days some people tried to oppose Lenin to Marx. Today, too, there are people who advise us to repudiate Lenin and Leninism allegedly in the name of Marx and Marxism, allegedly in the interest of the struggle. One might think that between those past years and our day there has been a series of defeats and not a whole chain of historic gains of the working class and oppressed mankind, gains which have

entirely reshaped the map and character of the world, gains which were won under the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism!

No, you cannot divide what is indivisible! You cannot do so because the struggle of the working class which the two titans headed is one for the whole world, and because scientific socialism is one.

To put forward the slogan 'Back to Marx!' is tantamount to understanding our theory as a sum total of frozen postulates given once and for all, to depriving the communists and the revolutionary movement of a reliable theoretical orientation corresponding to present-day problems and requirements.

This slogan is empty of content because Lenin made his great discoveries not by surmounting Marxism, but precisely on the basis of Marxism. Having firmly and uncompromisingly based himself on the scientific and revolutionary principles, which form the nucleus of Marxist theory and methodology, he enriched and deepened these principles in line with their own inner logic.

We, the present-day communist generation, are fully aware that we must treat Marx and Lenin in the same way as Lenin treated Marx. Our task is to develop further the legacy of our first teachers: Marx, Engels and Lenin. They do not fetter us. Instead, they give us creative freedom, because this is the spirit and meaning of Marxism-Leninism. The creative nature of Marxism-Leninism demands that we should not repudiate our theory, partially or entirely — which is one and the same thing — but that we should develop and enrich it in the new situation, in the new conditions.

We the Marxist-Leninists of today, cannot complain that history has been unfair to us and does not set our theory new problems.

Allow me to make a short digression prompted by my recent visit to a number of friendly countries in Africa. Extremely interesting political, economic and social processes are taking place in these countries. The notions 'socialism-oriented countries,' 'non-capitalist path of development' and the like obviously stand for an extraordinarily complex and diversified social practice. In it may be observed tendencies and regularities which we can hardly assert to have been entirely elucidated, explained and mastered by our theory.

Or let us look at the world of capital. We cannot help making claims on our theory in relation to such important processes as, for instance, the new international and supranational economic, political and ideological forms of internationalization of imperialism and to the impact which these processes have and will have on the class struggle on a national and worldwide scale.

We cannot say that we have a thorough and final theoretical answer to some important problems raised by the development of existing socialism.

Yet, there are no new phenomena and processes before which the appraoch and theory of Marxism-Leninism are helpless. It is beyond doubt not only that our theory will provide the answer to these questions, but also that it is the only theory which will give the correct answers.

In speaking of the importance and meaning of the October Revolution, Lenin gave the following definition of the substance of the historical epoch that was ushered in by that revolution: 'The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92). These words have been fully borne out by time. The building of socialism, first in the USSR and then in other fraternal countries, has indeed become a main trend and principal achievement of socio-historic progress on the planet, its leading and major motive force. Existing socialism is the greatest achievement of the world proletariat, the world revolutionary process, and the class struggle of our time; it brilliantly confirms the correctness, strength and viability of Marxist-Leninist theory.

This achievement has been won in some parts of the world. But its scope and importance carry a message to all mankind, because it is the result not only of the efforts of national contingents but also of the fraternal support of the world communist and working-class movement; because, in terms of internal results and international effects, it is consonant with the interests of the working class, of all working people not only in countries where socialism has triumphed but also in all other countries; because it created, and is still creating, ever more favorable conditions for social and national liberation from capitalist domination and class oppression. Much as the formation of the world socialist community cannot be imagined without the existence of the Soviet Union, the revolutionary victories over imperialism won by the peoples of Cuba, Vietnam, Angola, Laos, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Southern Yemen, Afghanistan, and other countries cannot be imagined without the existence and successful development of the socialist community.

The extension of socialism's geographical boundaries is a regular process linked with the steady consolidation and development of the material and intellectual forces of countries where socialism is already an established order. The imperialist bourgeoisie is well aware of this regularity and for that reason engages in inventions about our social system and our life, attributing non-existent troubles and shortcomings to them. For that reason it fabricates the myth that socialist states are aggressive. For that reason it does not shrink from slander in order to neutralize the attractiveness of the example of socialist

society and the socialist life style, and undermine the growing determination of the exploited and oppressed peoples to follow that example.

Existing socialism's greatest strength lies in its tangible achievements and in the absolute, complete and profound truth about these achievements. The nature of the social problems being solved by existing socialism on the national and international scale, and the methods of their solution are a criterion of the socialist system's superiority.

We know full well that in our countries socialism is far from having reached the limits of its development. Serious, difficult problems must be resolved so that the new system's historic possibilities can be fully deployed. Like any other social organism, existing socialism goes through various stages from its birth to its maturity. Each stage is marked by new achievements that are beyond the strength and scope of preceding stages. At the same time, each stage sets us new, difficult tasks. Take, for example, our country's present stage. We are now building a developed socialist society. This process began on the basis of accumulated material, social and cultural prerequisites. It came naturally and is developing according to its own objective regularities. But these regularities do not, of course, operate automatically. The growth rates of mature socialism and the most effective development of this process depend on the choice of optimum forms, of the most suitable concrete ways and means. For their part, the most effective ways require significant changes in organization and management, and in the people's habits and thinking. We are now faced with the pressing need for changing the forms of remuneration for labor. The socialist principle of distribution, which underlies the foundation of the socialist social system, will remain fundamentally unchanged, but the concrete forms of its application must undergo marked changes in the period when improvement of the quality of work will get priority. This is an exceedingly difficult and complex process. It encompasses and affects the people's immediate interests and almost all aspects of the modern economy.

But the difficulties stemming from the objective contradictions of development or from the limits determined by the level of our development at a given stage, are one thing, while the shortcomings and errors due to obsolete notions, inertia and conservatism are something quite different. They do not ensue from the essence of the social system, and we are combating them relentlessly. However, the essence of this social system provides precisely the possibility of using criticism and self-criticism as a necessary and effective means of combating all departures from socialist norms, or reassessing the obsolete or outworn which pulls backwards, of diagnosing pressing

problems early, of giving party and public support to what is new and progressive.

Does such criticism and self-criticism exist in our country? Open any newspaper, switch on the radio or television, leaf through official party documents. They are literally replete with such criticism and self-criticism. There are, of course, people in this country who fear that by the publicity we give to criticism and self-criticism we add grist to the mill of hostile, anti-socialist propaganda. At our latest party congress we gave an answer to such apprehensions. We know that some quarters will try to play up and speculate with the flaws and shortcomings which we ourselves reveal, so as to denigrate our party and our people. This neither scares, nor concerns us.

There is something else that surprises and embitters us. It pains us when even people inspired by socialist ideas and ideals give in to speculations, whose aim is only too simple and familiar: to represent our shortcomings and flaws as the crux, the essence, the real face of existing socialism.

The main thing, the essential truth is that socialism has wrested society from the bondage of economic disorder and social inequality. It has guaranteed a rapid growth of the national economy and a constant rise of the people's welfare. It has emancipated the masses intellectually and politically, and involved them in free and constructive social creativity. It practises a basically new type of democracy — socialist democracy — which not only proclaims but also guarantees in practice the broadest rights to the people, providing conditions for the mass and most active participation of the working people in the various forms and at various levels of social management. It is by its might and by the moral and political unity, the patriotism and internationalism of its peoples that socialism blocks imperialism's way to world supremacy and prevents a global catastrophe.

Existing socialism is not yet the embodiment of human and social perfection. We have shortcomings and errors. Perhaps, we have sins as well. But the road to their extirpation and elimination, the road of social progress is the road of constant development and improvement of the existing, rather than of any other, non-existent socialism.

The bourgeoisie has alway stuck to the principle of 'divide and rule.' Though not its own discovery, this policy has always served it well, enabling it to beat its enemies piecemeal — first the workers, then the peasants, first the communist, then the socialist parties. In the past few years the imperialist strategists have been doing their utmost to create a chasm between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as well as between the socialist community as a whole and the communist movement in the other countries. In diplomacy and propaganda, and in economic and trade relations, a strictly

differentiated approach is applied to the different countries and parties and even to some of their leaders. Moreover, their assessments are not cut-and-dried, once and for all, they vary and are constantly re-assessed — directly or indirectly, crudely or with subtle insinuations. Admittedly, the imperialists are not overly delicate, particularly with us, Bulgarians: the BCP, they say, follows the CPSU blindly, Bulgaria is a satellite of the USSR. These and other labels are meant to offend our self-esteem and make us do something to show that we, too, can move mountains. I can assure you, and I think you know it yourselves, that it would be sufficient for the BCP and Bulgaria to say a few words against the Soviet Union or to oppose the Soviet Union in something for praise to be heaped on us. Provided they believe us, of course.

The attacks against the Soviet Union affect us no less than anti-Bulgarian propaganda. We have given sufficient proof of our patriotism, of our pride in the successes scored by the Bulgarian people under the leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party, and we are not afraid of any accusation of national nihilism. But, we believe, to be a patriot of your socialist country today means to be aware that its destiny is linked with the existence and might of the fraternal community of socialist countries above all, of the Soviet Union.

Even the socialist countries which are not members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization can exist and develop as socialist countries because the Soviet Union and the world socialist system exist. This is how things stand. By linking our destiny with that of the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community, we, Bulgarian communists, the Bulgarian people, assume our share of the historic responsibility for the destiny of world socialism, for the destiny of mankind.

Imperialism is engaged in total ideological warfare against world socialism, in other words, against not only countries with an existing socialist society, but also against socialism-oriented countries and against the communist and workers' parties in other states. The ways, means, and methods of the anti-communist struggle differ, ranging from military intervention and slander to encouragement, praise and arms supplies. But the aim remains unchanged: to prevent socialism's triumph in the world.

Still, the main blow is aimed at the Soviet Union. This is only natural. First, because the Soviet Union, around which the countries of the socialist community are rallied, is the principal economic, political, ideological and military force opposing imperialism's plans. Second, because the Soviet Union embodies existing socialism in the minds of hundreds of millions of working people all over the world, although some people are presumptuously trying to challenge this. Third, because discrediting the socialist system in the Soviet Union

automatically means discrediting existing socialism as a whole and the communist movement in non-socialist countries.

Honest people who think that socialism as an idea can be 'saved' by sacrificing socialism as a reality are deeply and tragically deluding themselves. Political naivété or amateurism of this kind is bound to bring nobody any good. We are occasionally asked the question: what do you want us to do — to defend you and pardon your mistakes and sins? We do not want our mistakes to be plastered over. But we have the right, as communists, to demand that communists refute the slander about our reality, make our achievements and successes known to the working people, and support our policy of peace on the international scene. By telling the truth about existing socialism, the communists in the capitalist and the developing countries defend us, of course, and we are grateful for this. But, we think that by defending us, they also defend themselves, their own parties and peoples. Because to sow mistrust in socialism as a reality, as a policy, inevitably means to sow doubts also about socialism as a theory, as a way out from bourgeois reality, and as a future, for which it is worth fighting and making sacrifices.

The defense of existing socialism and its policy has one more aspect, an exceptionally important once, which concerns not only the communist movement. This is the question of war and peace. We do not consider war inevitable. However, we cannot turn a blind eye to the facts. And the facts are that the imperialist states have not given up the idea of resolving the dispute between the two social systems by war. The latest decisions of the aggressive NATO imperialist bloc to swell the military budgets of the capitalist states and develop and deploy new types and systems of weapons are an eloquent indication of this. No less eloquent is the moral and psychological manipulation of public opinion in the West. What else, if not to prepare public opinion for eventual aggression against socialist countries, is the persistent and brazen falsification of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, the wails about the threat of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe, the noice and uproar about dissidents, the fabrications about camps and psychiatric clinics where the ideological opponents to the system are allegedly incarcerated, etc., etc. — horrors meant to sow confusion and embarrassment, strike terror, and create an atmosphere in which the people's opposition to war can be easily overridden. I think that not only the communists, but every more or less sober-minded person can clearly see that even if this is imperialism's sole aim, a life-and-death struggle should be waged against it, for war would make pointless any ideological discussions, reproaches, and belated self-criticism.

Existing socialism bears the historic responsibility for peace. It has

been doing, and will continue to do everything in its power to prevent and exclude war from international relations, to maintain and consolidate world peace. That is why our party, together with the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, proclaim peace as their supreme goal and the cornerstone of their foreign policy. That is why we fight consistently and relentlessly against the military designs and plans of the reationary imperialist forces. That is why here, too, we must express our emphatic disagreement with the actions of China's leaders, who, far from concealing, are in fact elevating war preparations to the rank of state policy. This is a policy which is entirely at variance with the essence and interests of socialism and also the interests of the Chinese people itself and of all peoples in the world. Socialism and peace are indivisible and any party which does not understand this deviates from one of the loftiest ideas and one of the most essential aspects of the socialist social system.

THE GROWING ROLE OF INTERNATIONALIST SOLIDARITY

Hermann Axen
Political Bureau member and secretary, CC Socialist Unity Party of Germany

The emergence and development of the German Democratic Republic, whose 30th anniversary falls in October 1979, are part and parcel of the world revolutionary process. The experience of effecting socialist transformations in the GDR has confirmed the truth that a communist party guiding the construction of a new society is most successful when it consistently and creatively applies to the concrete conditions of its own country the theory created by Marx, Engels and Lenin and developed by the CPSU and the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries. With us this theory was applied in an industrialized country. And at every stage of our growth, the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws governing the socialist revolution and the building of socialism have reliably helped us to keep our course in solving the complex problems of building the new society.

The experience of the socialist revolution in the GDR has reaffirmed Lenin's brilliant prevision that as more and more nations move on to socialism, the concrete forms of this transition, its pace, the ways of shaping state power, and so on, will become ever more diverse (see *Coll. Works,* Vol. 23, pp. 69-70). We have realized the vital importance for the party of a timely, accurate and creative analysis of the concrete historical situation and national specifics. An

underestimation of the national aspect, it will be recalled, has on more than one occasion done harm to the socialist cause. Accordingly, the SUPG, as its Program stresses, has paid much attention to constantly developing socialist patriotism.

At the same time, our party has always proceeded from the premise that the growing diversity of the forms of transition to socialism is only one aspect of the world revolutionary process. Another aspect is the growing internationalization of the class struggle caused by the internationalization of production and exchange, the sharpening confrontation between socialism and capitalism on a global scale, and the requirements of the struggle for peace, for arms limitation and disarmament, for national liberation and social emancipation, and for the solution of mankind's acute problems, such as elimination of famine and poverty, protection of the environment and the development and conservation of natural resources on land, in the seas, and in outer space.

The objective and rapid internationalization of the class struggle has naturally led to the strengthening of proletarian internationalism and international solidarity.

One of the major conclusions we have drawn from our history, from our experience, is that the solidarity of the fraternal countries, and of all the other anti-imperialist forces, above all the vast political, economic and military support rendered by the Soviet Union, have helped the GDR, a western outpost of socialism in Central Europe, to hold out against all imperialist attacks and rebuff them. Today we have every ground to state that in our Republic proletarian and anti-imperialist solidarity permeates the thinking and activity of the entire party, of the overwhelming majority of our citizens, especially the younger generation. Our motto, 'The GDR has relied on solidarity and so we display active solidarity,' formulated by Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, truly keynotes the thought and action of millions of our people. Everything we are doing to strengthen the socialist society in the GDR is designed to strengthen the socialist community and the entire world revolutionary, liberation movement.

The internationalization of the class struggle suggests still another conclusion: it is imperative jointly and resolutely to defend what has so far been the most important and supreme achievement of social progress — existing socialism.

As regards proletarian internationalism, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany reaffirms its commitment to the unbreakable militant alliance with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with Lenin's country, because in our day a major purpose of the anti-communist and anti-socialist attacks is to sow discord among the communist

parties of socialist and capitalist countries, to erode the socialist states' unity and their natural cohesion round the Soviet Union.

The urge for peace is organic to the very nature of socialism. It is therefore only logical that socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, act as the champions and guarantors of peace. The GDR, in close cooperation with the other members of the socialist community, will continue its purposeful effort to place its steadily growing political, economic and other potentialities at the service of the cause of peace and the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle, and contribute to the positive solution of international problems.

The recent Moscow meeting of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee has drawn the peoples' attention to the fact that international developments have not run entirely in the interests of détente. The aggressive circles of monopoly capital are stepping up the arms race, increasingly coordinating the political and ideological struggle against socialism and against the national-liberation and working-class movements in the non-socialist zone of the globe. The aggravation of the international situation is directly linked with the stepped-up cobbling together of a bloc between the main imperialist powers and Peking, a bloc hostile to peace. The military and military-industrial collaboration with China is now conducted not only by individual imperialist states and concerns, but is officially carried out by NATO. It would be thoughtless for our party and state to overlook this dangerous development. We believe that it is our duty to continue to be politically vigilant, to devote due attention to our country's defense capability, and to deepen the interaction between the fraternal socialist countries in the political, economic and military spheres within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty and CMEA.

We shall achieve new impressive results in the struggle for peace, security and disarmament if we manage to intensify — qualitatively and quantitatively — the pressure of the masses, above all the peace movement, on the imperialist governments. The efforts to solve these key international problems should not be confined to the diplomatic sphere. We communists should work still more actively to mobilize the broad masses and all peace forces, whatever their outlook, race, nationality or creed. It would hardly be possible to turn world developments toward peace and disarmament unless the interaction of all the democratic organizations and movements is more effective.

Nevertheless, this can be done, provided there is the utmost unity of all the communist and workers' parties in the peace effort. There are differences in our movement on various issues, including some big issues, and we are not going to gloss them over or pretend not to see them, and are working persistently to overcome them. But these differences, in the SUPG's opinion, should by no means stand in the

way of our joint solution of problems related to the main task which history has set before us communists, namely, the task of staving off, and ultimately eliminating, the threat of a thermonuclear war and firmly establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations.

Socialism has now struck root on four continents. The three main revolutionary streams have proved stronger than imperialism. There appear ever more ways and forms of socialist revolution, of building the new social system, which will replace, once and for all, relations based on the power of the exploiting classes. The world communist movement is gaining in breadth and depth and is gathering momentum. This increases its responsibility to the peoples, to the whole of mankind. Only Marxism-Leninism can give an answer to the complex problems of our time, an answer which is comprehensive, scientifically grounded, corresponding to the interests of the working class and all working people, and which is, therefore, correct.

It is the answer to the cardinal question of the modern epoch: how to secure lasting peace, deliver mankind from war, repulse all imperialist and reactionary attempts to reverse the process of détente. It is the answer to the question of how to foil the plans of imperialism and reaction for setting up an alliance against the peoples' just struggle for the right to self-determination, national freedom and social progress. It is the answer to the question of concrete forms of the internationalist solidarity of communists and all other revolutionaries in the struggle to abolish exploitation and build socialism and communism — the great future of the whole of mankind.

SPREADING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE NEW SOCIETY

Franz Muhri
Chairman, Communist Party of Austria

In the light of our country's conditions and our experience, we believe that the subject under discussion is meaningful and highly important.

For a number of reasons, anti-communist and anti-socialist preconceptions will still be found among Austrian citizens. Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism had much influence on the minds of the masses during the fascist period. Austria lies along the dividing line between the capitalist and the socialist world system. A sizable part of the mass media in our country operates like an ideological clockwork wound up by the Western imperialist propaganda centers against the socialist countries.

Another reason is that Austrian social democracy, whose leaders give political and ideological support to the right wing of the Socialist International, is still very strong and has a crucial influence on the country's working class.

The right-wing social democrat leaders have been working hard to spread anti-communism and anti-socialism among the workers.

Our experience shows that the diverse inventions concerning relations between the socialist countries and their international role are designed to divert the working class from the struggle for its just demands and against the capitalist system, which is based on a drive for profit, and to induce in the working class a fear of socialism. That is why our party regards the effort to spread the truth about existing socialism as an integral part of the struggle in the interests of the working class and all the other working people of Austria. At our party's 23rd Congress we reached the conclusion that our explanation of the advantages and achievements of existing socialism will be more telling if we speak of the problems facing the socialist countries and show that the building of the new society, to which the future belongs, is an intricate historical process entailing contradictions, difficulties and mistakes. We believe that refutation of the lying, malicious propaganda against the socialist countries and provision of true and objective information about them is an important component part of the effort to realize the Helsinki accords and a contribution to the struggle to strengthen the international détente, for disarmament and lasting peace.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are the main subject of the present discussions between the socialists, communists and the democratic forces among the Catholics. The Communist Party of Austria believes that personal contacts and friendly discussions with our class comrades are a key task in the present situation.

The existence and flourishing of the Soviet Union, the emergence and strengthening of the world socialist system, and the progress and successes of these countries in building the new society, and — equally important — the strengthening of their defense capability are now the most important factor in weakening the positions of world imperialism. Existing socialism provides the most reliable support for all the forces in the world fighting for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

It is not surprising that anti-communist propaganda has directed its main attacks against the Soviet Union, and there is good reason why it keeps plugging the imaginary 'Soviet threat.' In the recent period, we have witnessed a fresh tide of false propaganda over the conference of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee, a propaganda effort which is patently designed to divert attention from

the initiatives and constructive proposals the conference put forward.

The mass media in our country has not said a word about these proposals, which are designed to strengthen peace, détente, achieve disarmament, develop cooperation in Europe, and secure comprehensive realization of the Helsinki accords.

A plenary meeting of our party's Central Committee welcomed the peace initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty countries because they meet our people's aspirations, for, like all the other nations on the globe, it has a vital stake in lasting peace. We believe that our task is to work together with our class comrades from the Socialist Party of Austria and the Christian Democrats, in intensifying, regardless of the differences in ideology and world view, the struggle to increase Austria's contribution to the policy of peace and neutrality and to mobilize public opinion to achieve these noble aims.

It is no exaggeration to say that but for the Soviet Union's peace policy, but for its might, there would have been no State Treaty that re-established independent and democratic Austria, which means that our country would not be neutral and independent. The first socialist country has become the most powerful factor for world peace. The Soviet state's peaceful foreign policy and consistent initiatives aimed to achieve peace and disarmament have profoundly democratic, humanistic functions on a global scale. The development of economic relations with the USSR and other socialist countries has helped Austria to provide additional jobs for its working people, so limiting the possibility of mass unemployment.

That is why our international cohesion, our solidarity and friendship with the USSR, the CPSU, and the other countries of existing socialism and their Communist Parties fully meet Austria's national interests. We resolutely oppose the Chinese leaders' anti-Soviet line, which has increasingly turned them into direct accomplices and allies of the most reactionary forces of world imperialism.

In the light of its political and ideological principles our party believes that there can be no 'model' of socialism, whether Soviet or West European, that is generally valid. The diversity of forms of transition to socialism will probably increase in the future. We are oriented upon a socialist way of development which meets our country's national conditions and traditions, creatively applying the universal principles and international experience of socialist revolution. This is also evidence of our party's independence.

One could list the following specific features of Austria's way to socialism: the possibility of building a new society without civil war; the existence of a highly developed industry and agriculture, a strong state sector and developed cooperative traditions; the winning of anti-monopoly democracy as the start of the advance toward

socialism; establishment of workers' power in the form of a multi-party system, etc.

Far from seeking mechanically to apply the socialist countries' experience in Austria's conditions, we do not want our notions of the national forms and peculiarities of development in our country to be used as a criterion for assessing the development of these countries. Such an approach would not be historical, because they took the socialist road in other conditions which differ from those in which Austria's working class can and will advance to socialism. It is the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that have to be credited with creating these conditions in the first place.

At the same time, the Austrian communists believe that their task is constantly to deepen their knowledge of the processes and experience of the socialist countries. We regard it as a positive fact that the socialist countries' fraternal parties seek to take fuller account of the conditions in our country. We believe that great progress has been achieved in this matter. The mutual study of experience and consideration of each country's specific conditions are an important prerequisite for the development and strengthening of cooperation, for consolidating the unity of the communist parties, for this amplifies our strength in the effort to implement the common goals set at the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe in Berlin in 1976: to work for the broadest joint action by the working class, by an alliance of all the democratic and anti-monopoly forces to create a Europe of peace, security, cooperation and social progress.

Our experience also confirms that peaceful coexistence and international détente do not eliminate the contradictions between the two systems — capitalism and socialism — and that in this atmosphere the ideological struggle will become even more important. We believe, therefore, that mutual support and effective cooperation among communist and workers' parties in this sphere are very important. Thus, the reporting of information, views and assessments by the fraternal parties without delay helps to respond vigorously and in due time to the falsifications and campaigns mounted against the socialist countries. In the past few years, cooperation between our party and the socialist countries' fraternal parties has improved. We believe that it is necessary to continue to make this cooperation still more effective and to intensify our mutual ideological support.

The Communist Party of Austria supports proletarian internationalism, which, in its view, does not contradict the principles of our party's independence, or our people's national interests. These principles are an organic whole. Proletarian internationalism is not confined to the solidarity of the working class of all countries, but also includes solidarity with all the progressive forces of the world. In this

sense, I should like to express and reaffirm, on behalf of all the Austrian communists, our internationalist solidarity and cooperation with all the communist and workers' parties, with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and with all the progressive forces of the world fighting for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

EXISTING SOCIALISM AND ITS INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Boris Ponomaryov
Alternate Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary,
CPSU Central Committee

The correct approach to major international and social problems, let alone to their interconnections, is possible only if existing socialism's objective place in the world is properly and fully taken into account.

The central issue of contemporary world affairs is the issue of war and peace. Lenin warned that world wars, the danger of which comes from imperialism, may destroy the very conditions for the existence of human society. In the nuclear-missile age this danger looms as a stark reality. But by this time a force has appeared and grown strong in the international arena that is called upon, and is able, to save human civilization. Socialism assumed this historic mission. Strength in imperialist hands is a source of the war danger. In socialist hands strength has become an instrument for ensuring peace and lessening the war danger. This was so in the past and is also true today.

The strength of the Soviet state is firmly linked with the strength of the other socialist countries. The joint might of these countries is conjugated with the peace struggle of the communist and working-class movement, and also the national-liberation movement, and that of all progressives. This basic fact implies that it is possible to exclude world war from the life of mankind even before capitalism disappears.

The approach to the Warsaw Treaty and NATO as organizations of similar character and content does not stand up to any criticism from the one and only correct, Marxist standpoint. One only need compare the latest NATO session in Washington and the recent conference in Moscow of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee to see the utter fallacy of this approach.

As regards the 'superpowers' theory invented by the anti-communists, the class criterion is absent in the assessment of their policies. But when echoes of this theory resound in the concepts being spread in the working-class movement, it is proper to ask: What has happened to the class evaluation of the foreign policy of any state

that is obligatory for communists? This, after all, is the ABC of Marxism.

The socialist community and the communist movement, those chief defenders of peace, always bear in mind that imperialism is continuing its material preparations for war at a rapid pace. The arms race has reached a truly unheard-of scale. Following the NATO session in Washington the 'Chinese card' is being played for all it is worth. And this no longer on the plane of mere political demagogy and blackmail against the USSR and other socialist countries. The military-industrial complexes have joined in the game. In this way the imperialist countries are helping to create an exceedingly dangerous seat for starting a world war. And if this is not going to be opposed, the consequences for mankind may be unprecedentedly tragic.

It is obvious that in these circumstances socialist countries cannot be idle. They are forced to take appropriate measures to strengthen their defense capability. But they do nothing in excess of what is absolutely necessary to make their defenses secure, and are prepared on a reciprocal basis to reduce the level of any armaments.

Love of peace is organic to the socialist social system and the political course consonant with its nature. It is essential that this should be known and deeply understood by the millions of people in the non-socialist part of the world. Conversely, obscuring the truth about socialism may weaken one of the most convincing arguments of the communists in support of the need to fight for socialism.

The sharp intensification of the attacks of ideqlogues and advocates of capitalism on socialist democracy in recent years has brought the question of the relationship of democracy and socialism to the forefront of the international ideological struggle.

The ideologues of imperialism attempt to portray bourgeois democracy as the model of democracy for all mankind. Yet, there has never been and cannot be any supra-class democracy. In the modern world there are two democracies — the bourgeois and the socialist.

If the Soviet man did not know what freedom is, did not feel himself really free, how would he have managed to display such self-sacrifice and heroism on a mass scale in the battles for his socialist Motherland? Would there have been such labor enthusiasm and complete dedication in labor for the sake of rehabilitating the war-ruined economy? And is not our own pulsating turbulent, creative life the best possible proof of the profoundly democratic nature of Soviet society? The real democracy in fraternal socialist countries is the power of the people, it is what the people need, it accords with the interests of millions upon millions of working people.

We are far from asserting that what has already been achieved in the field of democracy, rights and freedoms is the limit. The CPSU

and other fraternal parties in the socialist countries regard the continuous improvement of democracy as the main direction in the development of socialist statehood.

An important part of existing socialism's role in the world is its influence on the national-liberation movement.

The national-liberation movement has produced many socialist revolutions. The rest of it has also entered a new historical stage. To strengthen national independence against imperialism, to achieve economic independence, to surmount age-old backwardness, and to ensure that the people benefit from the real fruits of national freedom — such is the main content of the national-liberation movement of our time.

The key to surmounting backwardness is radical social change, the advance along the road of social progress, and the utilization of the extensive experience of the countries of the socialist community. This truth is confirmed by the development of the socialism-oriented states. They are a new, active and growing factor in the world revolutionary process.

Socialism-oriented states are in their way a historic vanguard of the peoples of the former colonies. Imperialism regards them as a serious threat to itself in the world of newly-free countries and makes them the targets of its policy of pressure, blackmail, subversion and even military intervention. Taking this into account we consider it our duty to offer our solidarity and support to these countries. The recently signed Soviet-Ethiopian and Soviet-Afghan treaties of friendship and cooperation are a vivid expression of this policy.

What are the main directions of the influence of existing socialism on the rest of the world?

As was already pointed out, it is attributable above all to its role as the chief factor of peace.

Through its foreign policy existing socialism exercised and is exercising a growing influence on the democratization of international relations. It has called into being interstate relations of a new type by proving that it is possible in principle to put an end to domination and the use of force, enmity, and distrust among nations and countries. The policy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China toward the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, the incitement of Kampuchea against Vietnam, and so forth, are not the products of socialism, but a result of the repudiation of the principles of socialism.

The rapid and stable economic growth of the socialist countries, the steady improvement in the well-being of the people, the attainment of ever new heights in the economic, scientific and technical competition

with the capitalist world multiply the appeal of socialist ideas and strengthen the positions of the left forces in the class struggle.

The socialist countries, having secured vital socio-economic rights and freedoms for their peoples and steadily deepening real democracy, provide a stimulus to and criteria for the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries for similar rights and freedoms, and raise their possibilities, as it were, in the struggle against the domination of capital.

Unfortunately, imperialism's slander campaigns over socialist democracy, over human rights have also misled some of our friends in the West. Not all were able to discern that these subversive acts were directed not only against us but against them, too. But they cannot fail to be interested in seeing a joint principled rebuff being delivered to the imperialist initiators of anti-Soviet, anti-socialist acts.

The existence of the socialist world system seriously limits the possibilities of imperialism to resort to open export of counter-revolution. This enables the working class and its allies to orient themselves also on peaceful ways of winning power, on averting civil war, on using the existing forms of bourgeois democracy, parliament in particular.

The above-said is extremely important for a correct understanding of the great role of internationalist solidarity. It is, and always has been, a major factor of world social progress. Its key element is, as before, cooperation between the revolutionary forces in the non-socialist part of the world and existing socialism.

At the present stage the solidarity of the world revolutionary forces with existing socialism is expressed above all in disseminating the truth about the socialist foreign policy of peace which meets the vital interests of all peoples, about the experience in remaking society on socialist principles, and about how the ideals of socialism are translated into life. Solidarity with the socialist world implies rebuffing the slander campaigns against it. To be neutral in this respect, let alone subscribing to anti-socialist actions, can cause nothing but harm to the working-class and revolutionary movement in every country. An unobjective, fault-finding attitude to existing socialism is, in fact, tantamount, as Lenin put it, to alienation of workers from socialism.

It should be noted that the CPSU has always been and continues to be attentive to objective, friendly views and suggestions of the representatives of the fraternal parties.

In connection with the above I should like to take up another, very topical issue of fundamental importance, namely, what it means to maintain a correct, internationalist attitude to the experience of victorious socialism. In spite of what is sometimes said, it is not a question of copying or imitating 'models,' 'samples,' etc.

Such an approach is alien to the spirit of creative Marxism-Leninism. Back in 1956, the 20th Congress of the CPSU recorded in its resolution: 'Naturally enough, the forms of the transition of countries to socialism will be more diverse in future.' The thesis about the specifics of the transition to socialism in each given country is confirmed by our party today, too. As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: 'Each country that took the socialist road has distinctively, each somewhat in its own way, dealt with the problems of socialist statehood, development of socialist industry, peasant cooperation, and ideological re-education of the masses. Undoubtedly, the transition to socialism of other peoples and countries with different levels of development and national traditions will introduce a still greater diversity of concrete forms of socialist construction. This is quite natural.'

Yet, the search for one's own way does not at all need to be counterposed to existing socialism, and much less to be used as a pretext for defaming it.

We are certain that each fraternal party, each nation taking the socialist road will inevitably come up against some problems in solving which socialism has acquired invaluable experience.

The CPSU does not close its eyes to shortcomings in the practice of socialist construction. At its congresses and in its documents, and daily activity it exposes their causes, and charts concrete ways and means of rectifying them. One of those causes, by the way, is the fact that there was no practical experience which the party could draw upon. Such experience simply did not exist.

Some years in the history of our country were beclouded by violations of socialist democracy and of the norms of party life and government activity. The CPSU formulated its stand on this question in the resolution of the CC CPSU of June 30, 1956. In a report on the draft Constitution of the USSR at a plenary meeting ot the CC CPSU, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out: 'The party has resolutely condemned such practice, and it must never be repeated.' And, indeed, for a quarter of a century there have been no violations of socialist legality in the USSR. Therefore it is strange and harmful when someone claiming to speak in the name of socialism relishes and harps on these violations of the long gone days of the personality cult.

The attempts to cast a shadow on Leninism, counterpose it to Marxism, and reduce it only to a so-called 'Russian' teaching are extremely harmful. Pretending to champion the development of the science of socialism, the advocates of this 'abolishing' of Leninism, whatever their intentions, play into the hands of those who declare Marxism-Leninism 'out-dated' in general and would like to ideologically disarm the working-class movement.

We hold that to approach the experience of socialism correctly means to see, above all, its great, epoch-making achievements. A solicitous attitude to what has been gained, and the ability to analyze, draw upon, use, and develop it is a task without which the struggle for socialism cannot be successful.

Commentary

Peter Boychuck
Alternate member, CC,
CP of Canada, member of
WMR Editorial Council

WORLD PEACE AND THE COMMUNISTS

Many hot words which made one recall the chilliest period of the cold war were spoken at the latest NATO Council session in Brussels in December 1978. Generals and politicians quite earnestly discussed a 'new threat to NATO,' complained about the 'weakness and vulnerability' of its southern flank and in order to bolster the 'deterrent power' of their armies reaffirmed the commitment to increase their countries' military spending by 3 per cent a year. On the eve of the session, people in the Western world experienced several alarming months. From Norway to the shores of the Mediterranean, tanks rumbled across the countryside, windowpanes rattled from the roar of planes and the tramp of soldiers' boots echoed in the neat streets of Holland and the ancient squares of Italy. Heavy transport planes took off from airfields in North America, carrying soldiers and weapons across the Atlantic. NATO was staging a series of large-scale exercises for the official purpose of testing its ability 'to strengthen Europe in a political crisis or enemy attack.'

The whine and din of the hardware developed for slaughter was echoed by loud demands coming from generals, politicians and administrators from NATO, the Pentagon and the White House, who vied with each other in urging the addition of more billions of dollars to the already excessively inflated military budgets and the development of even more efficient death-dealing weapons.

The notorious General Alexander Haig, who will never clear himself of the ignominy of having taken part in the dirty U.S. war aganist Vietnam, NATO Secretary-General Joseph Luns and participants in the 24th annual conference of the North Atlantic Alliance Association urged that NATO should be given weapons with a higher degree of

radiation, i.e., the neutron bomb. In a speech in Chicago in October 1978, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the U.S. President's gray eminence, demanded a powerful national security system based on scientific and technical superiority and capable of defending U.S. interests everywhere, be it the Persian Gulf, South Korea, the Far East or the Atlantic (a very broad view of *national* security, indeed!).

Where was the threat coming from? Naturally, the USSR, the socialist-community countries, the communists. There is good reason why the imperialist propaganda machine has been trying to convince the man in the street that the threat to peace is coming from the USSR, the socialist-community countries.

Nor is the capitalist press of my country any exception in this respect. In an article in *The Toronto Star,* Canada's largest newspaper, entitled 'Arms Race by Soviets Puts Heat on Canada,'[1] a Margaret Macmillan depicts an imaginary attack by Soviet forces on Nothern Norway — an area whose 'defense' has been allotted by NATO to Canada. Her authority is none other than General Haig. Statements of this kind are by no means fortuitous; they form a clearly visible line of imperialist propaganda. Mark Gayn, inveterate anti-Sovieteer, in his column berates the Soviet communists' call for united peace action at the Socialist International's Disarmament Conference.[2] An unsigned editorial in that paper bewails the limited actions taken so far 'to halt the spread of communist influence.'[3]

As was to have been expected, the big propaganda guns like Brzezinski, Haig, Luns and Gayn, were echoed by lesser anti-communist and anti-Soviet pea-shooters, including the very small fry, who wax so earnest that they now and again divulge things which their masters prefer to keep secret. In one such outburst, the Cairo *Akhbar al-Yom* claimed that 'in all things international communism is at the back of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries.'[4]

So that's what you are afraid of, gentlemen! That is not news! the specter of communism has now haunted Europe for almost 150 years, striking fear into the hearts of the moneybags. I have no intention at all to argue with a certain Mr. W. Raafat who has made this statement. What is more, as a dedicated communist, I believe that the victory of socialism in the USSR and the formation of the socialist community is a major achievement of the whole international communist movement, and that the Soviet communists and the communists of other socialist countries are now in its forefront, paving the way for other fighters for social justice. But for the USSR, the socialist community and the Warsaw Treaty, the conditions in which the communists and all the other fighters for social emancipation and national liberation, for democracy and peace have to work in other

countries would have been much more difficult, and our successes — let us be honest — smaller.

But one must also see that the massive drive against the minds of men designed to scare the everyday citizen in the capitalist world with the Soviet or communist 'threat' has borne some fruit.

I have before me one of last year's final issues of a news bulletin issued by the War Resisters League in the United States. Its members have, in all seriousness, issued a call on the United States and the USSR to disarm.[5]

I do not at all doubt the sincerity of the WRL members and their urge for peace. But one has truly to be totally out of touch with the political realities to equate the leading imperialist power and the world's first socialist state, whose founder proclaimed disarmament to be the ideal of socialism, and whose first legislative act was its Decree on Peace. One would think that it is not the United States but the USSR that has from year to year increased the numerical strength of its troops in Europe; that is not NATO but the Warsaw Treaty countries that have agreed on a 15-year joint program for building up their military strength; that it is not Washington but Moscow that has developed the neutron bomb, cruise missiles and other sinister means of mass destruction.

Unfortunately, such attempts to equate the USSR and the United States, imperialism and communism will be found in other contingents of the movement for peace, democracy and social progress. This is especially so since the movement has been growing and gaining in breadth, so involving more and more sections and groups of the population in various countries, including those who frequently have no idea, or only a very vague and distorted idea about the communists, and about the ideals and goals of our movement.

That is why I think it is well worthwhile to take another look at the communists' actual attitude to the problems of war and peace.

The history of the communist movement and the history of the struggle for peace, for a world without war, a world without weapons, are indivisible. When formulating their domestic and foreign-policy line, the communists always see the close connection between the struggle for social emancipation and national liberation and the cause of peace. They have always sought to prevent human progress from being like 'the hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.'[6] The Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association declared that the struggle for peace was a 'part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class.'[7] The communists believe (and historical experience has fully confirmed) that war not only carries death and destruction to mankind. Apart from their aims of aggrandisement, wars started by

imperialists are always designed to bolster the class power of capital; they are always aimed against the interests of the proletariat and the other working people, against the revolutionary and national-liberation movements. Back in 1914, explaining to Alfred Maykosen, a journalist, the Russian Bolsehviks' attitude to the looming war in Europe, Lenin said: 'I am doing and will do everything in my power to prevent mobilization and war. I don't want millions of proletarians to exterminate each other, paying with their blood for the insanity of capitalism. . . . To foresee a war objectively and to try to use it to the utmost if it is begun, is one thing. To want war or work for war, is quite another.'[8]

There is a definite dialectical uniformity in the fact that the conclusion concerning the inevitability of imperialist wars and the need to fight against the bourgeois governments' expansionist plans in an effort to convert imperialist war into civil war, which Lenin drew over 60 years ago, when imperialism still ruled the world undivided, had a tremendous role to play in preparing and securing the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which put an end to the undivided imperialist rule of the world.

Major historical changes have taken place in the world in the more than six decades since the October Revolution. The socio-political consequences of the two world wars started by imperialism have worked a radical change in the balance of class forces in the world arena. Today, imperialism is confronted with the mighty socialist community of nations, the powerful national-liberation movement, and the mounting struggle by the working class and the other broad social and political progressive forces. In view of all these factors, the communists now believe that it is possible to prevent another world war generally, although it will undoubtedly remain a threat so long as imperialism exists. This conclusion is of tremendous importance for the whole revolutionary movement today.

Of course, in each historical epoch, the problems of peace have their specifics and there are different possibilities for their solution, as relations among the various states are differently shaped. International life today abounds in acute conflicts, tense situations and explosive moments. The situation itself demands that politicians and statesmen make a choice: is mankind to advance along the way leading to a growth of mutual fear, suspicion and build-up of arms stockpiles and balancing on the brink of war, or of growing trust and cooperation, détente and disarmament, and lasting peace.

The communists have made their choice. Today, true revolutionaries connect the successes of the revolution and the advances in building socialism and communism with the struggle against war, but this does not entail pacifism, the urge to survive at any price, but a

revolutionary struggle for mankind's better future, a struggle for which peace, détente and peaceful coexistence open up fresh prospects and provide fresh opportunities.

Scientific communism, the supreme expression of humanism, and existing socialism, its practical embodiment, seek to direct the objective course of social development in a way that would most painlessly carry mankind to the triumph of social progress, ruling out the possibility of a thermonuclear clash between the two systems.

In human history, various leaders and movements, political and social organizations have put forward anti-war programs. But this struggle was provided with a real basis only with the emergence in the world arena of victorious socialism, when first the USSR, and then the whole socialist community came to lead the movement for peace and gave it a vigorous and purposeful character.

The communist parties of countries building socialism and communism do not conceal their goals from the peoples. These goals are expressed in simple words which everyone can understand: the peoples of the world can and must live in peace, freedom and happiness. That is the purpose of the efforts of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. The general line of socialism's foreign policy, as elaborated at the 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU, and at the congresses of other fraternal parties of the socialist-community countries, has met with wholehearted approval by the whole of progressive world opinion. It is embodied in a number of proposals made by the USSR and other socialist countries, notably the Declaration issued by the November (1978) meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, which once again forcefully insists that the time has come to secure a resolute break in the negotiations on an immediate end to the further quantitative and qualitative build-up of armaments and armed forces. All those who cherish peace met with deep satisfaction the statement by the Warsaw Treaty countries that there is no type of weapons that they would not be prepared to limit or cut back without harming the security of all countries. There is also much meaning in the proposal for an early start of negotiations between the USSR, the United States, Britain, France and China on withdrawing nuclear weapons from their arsenals and using nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes. The socialist countries reaffirmed their readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty Organization simultaneously with the dissolution of NATO, and to eliminate their military organizations as a first step, starting with a mutual reduction in military activity.

The Warsaw Treaty countries' proposals show once again that existing socialism is prepared to take the most radical steps leading to disarmament, provided, however, and understandably so, that the

principle of equal security of the parties should be observed at every stage. The socialist community does not seek any unilateral advantages for itself, but in face of the growing military strength of imperialism it cannot agree to a unilateral weakening of its defenses, whatever the demagogic arguments used to back up such calls.

Of course, it is no easy thing to agree on a reduction in the level of armaments and armed forces, especially since there are now many dangerous areas in the world, each of which could trigger off another world conflict. That is why the communists expect their partners to go on from general statements about a desire for peace to real and concrete acts, like adherence to the existing treaties and agreements, and the signing of new treaties and agreements helping to raise the level of international security.

How much more tranquil the situation in the world would be if such agreements were signed! What then is the snag? What are the forces blocking disarmament and détente?

For the communists of any country, the struggle for détente and for mankind's peaceful development is, as Palmiro Togliatti once said, a struggle 'for the most just, most socialist cause.' Capitalism takes a different view of the prospects for peace. Although imperialist policy has become subtler over the past few years, it is still aimed against the peoples fighting for liberation from colonial and racist oppression, against neo-colonialism, and for independence and social progress.

The imperialist camp, including the United States, its leading power, was involved in détente not in any sense because of a development of its own political line. It was forced to accept the foreign-policy line worked out by the communists and proposed by the USSR and other socialist-community countries, for there was no other alternative. The new balance of forces in the world has made the stake on nuclear war suicidal. However, this has done nothing to eliminate the aggressive nature of imperialism or its illusions about the possibility of a return to world domination.

These illusions are being fuelled by the military-industrial complex, right-wing counter-revolutionary circles, and a broad alliance of diverse anti-socialist and anti-Soviet forces. At first, the opponents of détente did not take détente seriously, and regarded its initial successes as being no more than an ordinary and temporary easing of international tensions. But when the new political climate turned out to be unfavorable for imperialism, and when the successes of détente in Europe became an external factor helping to topple reactionary regimes in Greece, Portugal and Spain, and strengthening progressive anti-imperialist movements on every continent, when the prospects for disarmament posed a threat to the profits of the monopolies and the leading positions of the military-industrial complex within the

power system in the capitalist countries, these forces mounted a counter-attack in an effort to respond to the undesirable changes in the world by reviving the cold war and starting a hot war, if the opportunity should arise.

These are the forces which have for long years delayed a SALT-II agreement between the USSR and the United States, which have frozen the Vienna talks on troop and arms cuts in Europe, and which seek an increase in military spending and in the numerical strength of the armed forces of the NATO countries.[9] These are the forces that have taken the line, that is a threat to the whole of mankind, moving closer to the bellicose Peking leadership, opening to Peking the door to their arsenals and military research centers, and making no secret of their hopes, which one magazine expressed in this formula: 'China + West = Rattled Russia.'[10]

This imperialist urge to shake up Russia, the Soviet state, the CPSU, and the world communist movement is not a new one at all. As in the past, nothing will come to it. One would think that it is high time for the imperialists to understand that social progress cannot be stopped. Despite all the efforts by its enemies, the USSR has been steadily moving for a seventh decade along its line of peace and human happiness, a policy which springs from the very nature of socialism and communism. The socialist community has been growing stronger. The influence exerted by the communists of the whole world on international developments and the consciousness of the masses has been steadily growing. The communist and workers' parties, together with the other democratic and peace-loving forces, have played, as the Berlin Conference noted, a crucial role in the political initiatives that made it possible to switch to détente and strengthen security and cooperation in Europe.[11] As General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev, an outstanding fighter for peace, détente and universal security, emphasized in one of his interviews, the communists 'eschew the callous quantitative approach to the prospect of nuclear war, an approach according to which a certain percentage of civilian victims is declared to be "acceptable." We are not at all happy about the predictions in the West that "only 10 per cent" of the world's population may be destroyed in a world nuclear war, and that this is allegedly nothing to be afraid of, because it will not be the end of the world. We do not wish anyone, a single man or woman, to happen to be a part of this "10 per cent".'[12] The communists have made and will continue to make a growing contribution to the struggle to maintain world peace, a universal, just and lasting peace.

1. *The Toronto Star,* April 6, 1978.
2. Ibid., May 25, 1978.
3. Ibid., June 2, 1978.
4. *Akhbar al-Yom,* July 9, 1978.
5. *WRL News,* No. 208, September-October, 1978.
6. Marx and Engels, *Selected Works in Three Volumes,* Vol. 1, p. 499.
7. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 18.
8. Quoted in: Max Reimann. 'Peace, War, Revolution,' *WMR*, August 1974.
9. This is instanced by the build-up of the Bundeswehr, NATO's chief strike force in Europe. FRG Defense Minister Apel recently said that the number of units within the highest A-1 combat category is to be increased from 33 to 36 brigades, with each brigade having four instead of three battalions, and each battalion four instead of three companies.
10. *The Economist,* November 18, 1978.
11. *WMR,* August 1976, p. 3.
12. *Vorwärts,* May 4, 1978.

Progress Books announces a new publication

Understanding 'Capital'

A guide for Volume I

by John Fox & William Johnston

Marx's 'Capital' is the cornerstone of Marxist economic theory but it is difficult for most readers. Using the benefit of their teaching experience, the authors have made this theory more easily accessible for both individual and group study by providing detailed chapter summaries which explain the main line of Marx's argument; questions which bring out the main problems and a glossary of important items.

Paper, 111 pages $3.95

Available at your local bookstore

PROGRESS BOOKS 71 Bathurst St. Toronto M5V 2P6

Party experience

Situation in Turkey

I. Bilen
CC General Secretary,
CP Turkey

The vice of the deep-seated economic, social and political crisis which has gripped our country has been tightening. In response to this, the class struggle has sharpened, the influence of the working class on every section of the working people and the country's political life has grown, together with the CPT's role in leading the mass struggle. Meanwhile, the continued activation of fascist elements provides incontrovertible evidence of the ruling class' incapability of maintaining its positions by means of the old methods, and of its fear in face of the inexorable development of the revolutionary process.

When analyzing the situation in Turkey, one should always take into account its dependence on the big imperialist powers and the accompanying speed-up in the monopolization of the Turkish economy. One of the results of this is the close connection between the national monopolies and international capital, and in consequence, the latter's ever tighter control not only in the sphere of credit, finance and technology, but also in the supply of raw materials and fuel.

The dependence of the Turkish big bourgeoisie on foreign corporations limits the potentialities for the development of national monopolies. At the same time, the narrowness of the domestic market and the low competitiveness of the Turkish monopolies on external markets engender contradictions among them. Clashes of interests between Turkish and international monopolies and sharpening contradictions between bourgeois parties caused by the same factors are not all that rare nowadays either.

One should note yet another aspect, namely, the ever faster coalescence of industrial capital and bank capital, and the rise of a financial oligarchy. One could say that a characteristic expression of this process, in particular, is the emergence of holding companies controlled by 43 Turkish banks operating hand-in-glove with foreign capital.

The capitalist mode of production has also moved into agriculture, turning landowners into capitalists, who establish close ties with banks and industrial monopolies.

Since the 20s, Turkey has had a fairly extensive state sector. Initially, when our country just entered upon the capitalist road, this sector facilitated the development of capitalism. Subsequently, the economic power of the monopolies began to merge with the political power of the state, starting the formation of relations characteristic of state-monopoly capitalism. The running of the state was assumed by that section of the monopoly bourgeoisie which collaborated with international imperialism.

Within the framework of this process a militarist clique, which took shape within the Armed Forces leadership, joined with the financial oligarchy. Through a holding company, Organization of Military Men's Mutual Aid, the military infiltrated the governing bodies of a number of monopolies and banks. This tends to militarize the country's economy — witness the demand by the national monopolies for NATO-planned contracts for the manufacture of weapons for the Turkish army.

Together with all this, however, there is the effect of the uneven development of capitalism in town and country, in the various regions of the country and in the various sectors of the economy. In some instances, pre-capitalist relations of production and survivals of feudalism remain. Simple commodity production abounds. In technical terms, the means of production are extremely backward.

Turkey's dependence on international imperialism and the peculiar process of monopolization of national capital deepen the social antagonisms, step up the polarization in town and country and intensify the class contest. Contradictions between labor and capital, and between international imperialism, the Turkish monopoly bourgeoisie collaborating with it, and the landowners, on the one hand, and the masses of the people, on the other, have been sharpening, simultaneously producing the objective conditions for the emergence of crisis situations.

The main reason for Turkey's deep economic crisis will be found in its dependence on international imperialism, on the aggressive military blocs, and in domination by the capitalist system and the monopolies. The collaboration of the Turkish bourgeoisie with the imperialist monopolies has turned the country's economy into a component part of the economic system of world imperialism. The crises rocking the system have had a devastating effect on our country.

The following facts show the sharpness of the current crisis in Turkey. As Prime Minister Ecevit declared in the autumn of 1978, the number of unemployed now comes to 20 per cent of the able-bodied population. Prices have grown at an inflationary rate of 60.2 per cent, the highest figure for OECD countries. From 1972 to 1977, the Turkish lira was devalued 15 times! The latest devaluation came to 30 per

cent. The foreign-exchange reserves fell from $2 billion in 1975 to $450 million in 1977. That year, the country had a foreign-trade deficit of $4.5 billion. Failing to find any internal sources for financing investments, the government has been begging for loans from the imperialists. Military expenditures, according to official data, account for one-third of the government budget.

The imperialist monopolies have not confined themselves to plundering the country. With the help of international financial agencies, they have been seeking to establish direct control over the Turkish economy. In the sharpening economic crisis, imperialism has intensified its pressure on our country. Thus, the International Monetary Fund is prepared to give Turkey credit only if it cuts investments, slows down economic growth, devalues the lira, freezes wages, reduces the government-fixed minimum purchase prices for farm produce, and raises consumer prices. The purpose of such neocolonialist methods is to bind our country still more tightly to the system of imperialism, to raise the profits of the foreign monopolies and the Turkish monopolies collaborating with them, and to get the working people to shoulder the burden of the crisis.

The successive governments have tried to overcome the crisis, relying completely on the recipes of U.S. imperialism. But this has merely intensified Turkey's dependence on the imperialist monopolies, not only on the U.S. monopolies, but also on those of the Common Market (primarily the FRG's), thereby further deepening the crisis. Turkey's external debt has risen to $20 billion. Even Turkey's government budget is controlled by foreign consortia.

Political life in Turkey is marked by large-scale strikes and militant demonstrations by the working people. The Turkish people are mounting an active struggle for their vital interests. Here are some of the most important mass actions of the past several years: the May Day demonstrations and rallies in 1976, 1977 and 1978, the 1976 general strike with the demand to eliminate the State Security Courts, the eight-month long strike by metal workers against local and foreign monopolies n 1977 and 1978, and the general strike against the fascist terror in March last year.

Efficient organization and massiveness have been the distinctive features of the May Day demonstrations of the past few years. Their political character was especially pronounced during the 1978 manifestations. Alongside the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist slogans, the working people put forward this demand: 'Freedom for the CPT!' All of this is the result of the Turkish communists' well-considered and painstaking preparatory work with the use of legal and illegal methods.

The conclusion is quite clear: the struggle of the working class and

the rest of the people for economic and social demands is becoming increasingly political. It is growing into a struggle against imperialism, against the country's participation in NATO and greater spending on armaments, against the monopolies and the landed estates, against the fascist danger and national oppression, and for independence, peace, democracy and freedom.

The class struggle is being carried on in various forms. Now and again, it becomes savage. The level of organization is rising. Nationwide democratic action is becoming ever more massive. The role of the working class, the working people's vanguard in the struggle, is growing. The CPT's vigorous efforts have been consolidating joint action by the communists, socialists and social democrats.

The course of the revolutionary struggle shows that the working class is developing an internationalist consciousness. The socialist countries' successes, the gains of the international communist and working-class and national-liberation movements help to advance the revolutionary process in our country. The CPT's growing strength and its ever greater capability of leading the masses have had a mounting impact on developments.

Accordingly, the political crisis, which first broke out in the mid-60s, is becoming sharper and protracted. Stable governments are a thing of the past. There have been government cabinets that stayed in office for no more than a few months.

On March 12, 1971, a fascist-type regime was set up in our country in accordance with the plans of U.S. imperialism and under pressure from the militarist clique. However, it could neither cope with the crisis nor put down the class struggle. It broker up within two and a half years.

Following the aggression mounted against the Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish government, another government crisis broke out in Turkey. The monopoly bourgeoisie, collaborating with imperialism, tried to find a way out through a government coalition of reactionary and fascist parties. However, this government, too, fell because of the sharpening contradictions and deepening crisis, under pressure from broad masses of people, the working class in the first place.

This was followed by an attempt to unite the main reactionary and reformist parties on a common political platform. This tactic also failed as a result of resistance from the working class and the other democratic forces, and because of the internal contradictions rending the bourgeois parties asunder. Thereupon, the ruling classes took another tack: a coalition was cobbled together from representatives of the bourgeois-reformist Republican People's Party (RPP), on the one hand, and a group which split away from the Justice Party and two other reactionary parties, on the other. In the government headed by

RPP leader Ecevit, the tune is called by the party's right wing, which is connected with Turkish holding companies and foreign monopolies. But it is not stable either. Its stay in office merely tends to deepen the crisis.

In face of the growing imperialist pressure on Turkey and the mounting fascist danger, the present government has done nothing to improve the working people's condition. On the contrary, it has sought to shift the burden of the crisis onto their shoulders. Nor has the government done anything about the worsening condition of the middle sections. It has not defended the interests of the small rural producers either. It has even postponed the land reform. Repression in the Kurd-inhabited eastern areas of the country has become daily practice.

The government has done nothing to counter the fascist threat. In particular, nothing is still being done to purge the state machine of fascists. Fascist organizations have not been banned. The government has shown no readiness to join the democratic forces in fighting the fascist danger, and this makes it incapable of overcoming the crisis, so enabling imperialism and the Turkish monopoly bourgeoisie collaborating with it to keep open the way to fascism.

In contrast to its predecessors, the Ecevit government has tried to dampen the growing class conflicts by social-democratic methods. (Let us recall that the RPP is now a member of the Socialist International.) The purpose of the present government is to check the working-class struggle, to suppress the class, trade union movement, and to get the working people to accept the ideology of class conciliation.

The ruling class has started an anti-communist campaign in an effort to break the strength of the Confederation of Progressive Workers Trade Unions (DISK). In its policy of freezing wages and restricting the rights of workers and trade unions the government relies on the pro-American trade union Turk-Is association. Reprisals against the working class are on the increase. One need merely recall the punitive measures taken against those who during the May Day demonstration demanded the lifting of the ban on the CPT or the court case initiated against those who published the CPT program.*

In assessing the incumbent government, the CPT bears in mind that the former defends the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie collaborating with imperialism. The Communist Party is aware that the government has not only displayed indecision but has steadily slid to the right and increasingly resorted to repressive measures. That is why we have warned the masses, the middle sections and the non-

*See *WMR*, October 1978, p. 71.

monopoly bourgeoisie against pinning their hopes on the Ecevit government for solving the grave problems produced by the current acute crisis.

Nevertheless, the CPT does not equate the Ecevit Cabinet to the earlier reactionary-fascist governments. Our party supports the realistic trends in its foreign policy, and its timid attempts to stop the slide to fascism. In other words, the communists encourage any — even the slightest — steps taken by the government in the right direction. At the same time, the communists resolutely criticize its vacillations in resolving the socio-economic problems and its concessions to reaction.

The fascist threat in Turkey did not arise overnight. Thirty-six of the 56 years since the establishment of the republic were marked by a state of 'emergency.' Parliament has never exercised the functions of a bourgeois legislature. The CPT has been under ban for 55 years. Not only communists, but all the other democrats have been deprived of democratic rights under Laws Nos. 141 and 142 and other fascist acts.

The specific feature of the present stage in the step-up of fascist activity is that it is now organizationally formalized, with the National Action Party (NAP) acting as its shock force. This party emerged when the reactionary-fascist coalition was in power, and has repeatedly taken part in the government, which enabled it to infiltrate key echelons of the state machine. Lumpen proletarians, members of the middle classes, and petty bourgeois, ruined and desperate, constitute its social basis.

With the support of a section of the monopoly bourgeoisie collaborating with the imperialist circles, the NAP has managed to win over those who had voted for the ultra-reactionary parties, so increasing the number of its deputies in parliament from three to 16 and obtaining the right to form a parliamentary group. The fact that at the last election the NAP won one million votes is alarming evidence of the reality of the fascist danger.

The sharp increase in the number of terrorist acts staged by the NAP and its armed units — not only against the working class but also against that part of the bourgeoisie which has refused to be led by reaction — is the most threatening expression of the slide to fascism.

The further increase in the number of terrorist acts since the formation of the new government is another important point. From January to mid-December 1978, about 1,000 persons were killed by fascists in attacks mainly against the communists, socialists, representatives of other progressive organizations and members of the RPP. In this way, a civil war is being fomented under the slogan 'Destroy the Communists!'

The Turkish fascists have adopted all the methods and organizational forms of their Hitlerite predecessors, as will be evident from the bandit sorties by the fascist commando units. All these acts are guided by the American CIA and the Turkish National Intelligence Administration, which in our country has the role of the Gestapo, by the secret 'counter-insurgency' outfit set up in the armed forces, and by the NAP. The massacre of the massive demonstration on May Day 1977,* for instance, was effected by the reactionary-fascist government with their help and with the use of provocation by Maoist groups.

The NAP leaders preach a vile anti-Sovietism and wild anti-communism. The Turkish fascists' ideology is based on a cult of war, racism and chauvinism. But they have not shunned social demagogy in an effort to present themselves as opponents of capitalism and Washington's imperialist policy, in order to attract the masses who are disappointed with the present government's lack of will.

The Maoists are among the most important allies of fascism in our country. The fascists and the Maoists maintain ties with each other, and often act together in armed attacks. Their common ground is above all anti-Sovietism and hatred for the CPT.

The U.S. imperialists and the NATO countries' ruling circles seek to sabotage the international détente and provoke and whip up the arms race. By means of the NATO bloc they seek to involve Turkey in their adventurist policy. Fanning the strife between the two communities in Cyprus, Washington has been stepping up tensions in the area. The purpose of the policy pursued by Washington and its allies is to provoke the ruling circles of Turkey and Greece into taking reckless action aimed at partitioning Cyprus, and turning it into a NATO base. This policy includes Turkey's occupation of a part of Cyprus after the colonels' putsch, in Athens.

In an effort to prevent the break-up of NATO's southeastern flank, U.S. imperialism has intensified its pressure on Turkey and has resorted to diverse machinations with deliveries of U.S. weapons to the country. Thus, in return for the lifting of the embargo on these deliveries, Washington demanded that Ankara should re-open the U.S. military bases in our country, and also increase its arms spending. The United States seeks to prevent Turkey's rapproachment with the socialist countries.

It is important to note, however, that it is not only the working class

*At the close of December 1978, when this issue was already being printed, the escalation of fascist terror led to another bloodbath, this time in Kahramanmaras. More than 100 persons were killed and over a thousand injured. Profiting by the disturbances, the monopoly bourgeoisie, and the imperialist and militarist circles imposed a martial law upon the country. Civil liberties were further curtailed. —*Ed.*

and broad sections of the working people but also the other social strata and Turkey's military circles that are beginning to realize that one of the chief causes of the economic crisis lies in the heavy burden of military commitments imposed on our country by the NATO bloc. Realistic-minded bourgeois leaders are aware of the importance of mutually advantageous ties with the socialist countries for overcoming the economic difficulties. This explains, among other things, the fact that at the last NATO Council meeting, Prime Minister Ecevit complained about some aspects of the policy of U.S. imperialism and declared that Turkey saw no threat from the Soviet Union.

The emergence of such trends is a direct consequence of the development of détente and the successes of the peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Public opinion in Turkey has repeatedly had evidence that the Soviet Union has always pursued a policy of peace toward Turkey and that it has helped our people in its hours of trial, as will be seen, in particular, from the large-scale industrial complexes which the Soviet Union has built in our country.

The CPT believes that the Turkish government's development of relations with the socialist countries would fully meet the national interest. That is why the communists demand that the government should abide by the Turkish-Soviet political document under which Turkey and the USSR must not allow their territory to be used for aggression against each other. Relying on the letter and spirit of this document, the CPT has worked for the dismantling of U.S. and NATO military bases on Turkish soil. It has resolutely opposed the government's policy of succumbing to the imperialist diktat.

The CPT attaches much importance to the struggle for easing tensions and for disarmament. Among the key goals of the CPT in the struggle for peace and national independence are: the country's withdrawal from NATO and CENTO, the elimination of all the military bases of the United States and NATO, an end to the arms race (including measures taken on the plea of setting up a 'national defense industry'), establishment of peaceful and friendly relations with our neighbors, notably the socialist countries, and pursuit of a policy of non-alignment, and an active anti-imperialist foreign policy of peace.

The CPT stands for the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Cyprus and insists on the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from the island, including Turkish troops, and on the closure of foreign military bases on its territory. The CPT wants a peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem in the interests of both communities under UN control and within the framework of an international agreement. It demands a solution of the problem of the continental shelf in the Aegean Sea through the efforts of Turkey and

Greece, without interference from the United States and NATO and in the light of the interests of all the peoples in the region.

For us Turkish communists, the struggle for national independence, democracy and socialism is inseparable from the struggle for peace, and that is the paramount principle which determines the CPT's stand on foreign-policy issues. The CPT believes that joint action by all the contingents of the international communist and working-class movement is the most important and necessary premise for success in this struggle.

In the first half of 1978, a Plenary Meeting of the CPT Central Committee defined the top-priority tasks facing the party today. Most important among these are efforts to eliminate the fascist danger, rebuff the imperialist policy of oppressing Turkey and stop all attempts to shift the burden of the economic crisis onto the working people's shoulders. The platform of our party is in essence a program of action to democratize society and the state machinery and to defend the national interest and the interests of the working people.

Turkey's crisis cannot, of course, be overcome by merely meeting day-to-day demands. The original source of the crisis is its dependence on imperialism and monopoly rule. Therefore the primary task of our working class and the entire people at present is to get rid of dependence on imperialism, overthrow the power of monopolies and liquidate the large landed estates. All this is in the interest of our five million workers, tens of millions of peasants, of the middle urban strata, of the Kurdish people and all other ethnic minorities; it is in the interests of a part of the bourgeoisie which is not bound up with imperialist monopolies.

This task, the CPT believes, will remain central to the revolutionary process in the forthcoming period as well. By uniting the popular forces led by the working class and relying on the worker-peasant alliance, it will be possible to overthrow the rule of the Turkish monopoly bourgeoisie and accomplish an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic revolution. The old state machinery will be replaced with a progressive democratic state.

However, the main contradiction of society, that between labor and capital, will not be resolved at this phase of the revolution, which is viewed as an integral process. Its second phase will be a socialist revolution which is our party's long-range goal. Only socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat can lead the country out of the deep crisis and remedy its economic dislocation. And only under socialism is it possible to solve the social problems burdening Turkish society. A fundamental, Leninist solution of the nationalities question will be ensured at this phase.

For this reason, the CPT closely combines its struggle for the

immediate demands of the working people with the long-range struggle for a democratic revolution, for socialism.

Since its inception and at every stage of the revolutionary process, the CPT has striven to unite all the anti-monopoly forces into one national front against the common enemy — imperialism. Today, conscious of its historic mission, the CPT unequivocally declares that it is prepared to act together and form a united front with all national democratic forces, including the left wing of the RPP.

Dependence on imperialism, the monopolization process and the economic, social and political crises have impaired the position of the working class, and not only the working class. The ruin of small producers and peasants, and the social stratification in the countryside are going on at a fast pace; the differentiation among the bourgeoisie has been growing; and the non-monopoly bourgeoisie has suffered. This has provided the basis for broad alliances of the working class with other classes and social groups, alliances opposed to the Turkish monopoly bourgeoisie collaborating with imperialism.

In the course of the class battles ever broader masses of people come to realize what U.S. imperialism really is. Anti-imperialist actions gather momentum. As fascist groups become more active, the political circles which until recently did not see the need for a united front now support the idea. Anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, which used to be the main ideological barriers to setting up a united front, increasingly reveal their futility.

Due to these circumstances, the idea of a national democratic front, of the unity of all the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-fascist forces began to spread by 1977 on a national scale, throughout the working-class movement and the trade unions, and also in a number of democratic mass organizations. In some cities newly-formed joint action committees, representing members of various political parties and groups, have staged anti-fascist and anti-imperialist meetings. Never before have the problems of a united national front been the object of such a broad discussion in all the parties and periodicals. A decisive factor in all these processes is the CPT's growing political influence and its consistent implementation of the policy of alliances.

It should be admitted, however, that the problem of setting up a national democratic front still has to be solved. Accordingly, in the June 9, 1978 appeal to all the national democratic forces, parties, organizations and individuals, to patriotic-minded scientists, men of art and letters, deputies and army officers, the CPT Central Committee said: 'The Communist Party of Turkey proposes to convene a forum to work out a platform for uniting the national democratic forces and discussing organizational matters related to the formation of a united front.'

This task demands consistent solution of a number of interconnected problems. A major target in this process is working-class unity. In our country, the working class is divided on the trade union and political levels. Although it has lately been ridding itself of the influence of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, the influence of bourgeois reformism is still strong among the working people. Opportunist and revisionist trends, both right and 'left,' are still pronounced in the working-class movement. There are several legal socialist parties, while the social-democratic trend is represented by a wing of the bourgeois reformist RPP.

Left unity is a major factor in building up the political unity of the working class. The CPT seeks to use every opportunity for a dialogue and joint action with socialists and social democrats. However, we have only succeeded in concerting action with these parties' rank-and-file members, for their leaders, burdened with prejudices, continue to reject our proposals on joint efforts in the struggle against imperialism and the threat of fascism.

The worker-peasant alliance is the cornerstone of the national democratic front. Taking into account the differentiation of the peasantry, the CPT defends the interests of the poor and middle peasants (and at this stage, also a part of the rural bourgeoisie) in their clashes with landlords, big capitalist farmers and agrarian monopolies. The CPT's policy is to free the broad masses of peasants from the influence of the bourgeoisie and win them over to the side of the working class.

The party is making great efforts to draw into the national democratic front the Kurdish people fighting against national oppression and forced assimilation, against any kind of chauvinistic oppression. The Kurdish people can win equality only if it joins hands with the Turkish working class led by the CPT, which has included in its Program the Leninist principle of equality of nations and their self-determination. On the other hand, concerted action by millions of Kurdish working people together with their Turkish counterparts is indispensable if the struggle against imperialism, fascism and the monopolies is to be won.

It is vitally important that the middle strata, which are also oppressed and exploited by the monopolies, should join the front. Defending their interests, the CPT has been trying to neutralize the influence of the reactionary political forces, including the fascists, upon small traders and handicraftsmen. Democratic, progressive trends are winning the minds of teachers, architects, engineers, technicians, physicians; they have spread among the intelligentsia as a whole and in its unions. These social groups are increasingly attracted to the national

democratic front. Besides, the struggle of youth and women, and the peace movement are ever more important.

The CPT also seeks to draw into the front the national bourgeoisie, i.e., a part of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie which is not linked with imperialism.

However, great political and ideological obstacles must be removed before these forces, population groups and their political organizations join in the front. In this connection, mention should be made of the campaign launched by the monopoly bourgeoisie, in which it has used every available means to discredit the CPT and the united-front policy. To prevent the emergence of a united front, the bourgeoisie has flatly refused to legalize the CPT. In these conditions, the struggle to lift the ban on the CPT parallels the struggle for a national democratic front.

As the CPT works to set up a united front, it has no intention to impose its policy on others. The party has repeatedly stressed that it has always stood up for organizational equality, for independence and a fraternal militant union of all parties and forces that will join the front. But this does not mean that the CPT has renounced the principle of working-class hegemony. On the contrary, without such hegemony no democratic front can exist.

The success of the CPT's united front policy depends in large measure on the further strengthening of its own ranks. In recent years, the party has taken a number of important steps in that direction. The heavy wounds inflicted by bourgeois terrorism have been healed and the effects of opportunist influence have been removed. The CPT has broken out of its isolation inside the country: its militant activity is becoming ever more widely known to the world public and its ties with the world communist movement are growing stronger. It is now doing its internationalist duty more effectively.

The CPT's experience has obviously proved that a party can cope with any difficulties if it remains loyal to Marxism-Leninism, adheres unswervingly to the positions of proletarian internationalism, consistently fights anti-Sovietism and opportunism, and has ties with the fighting masses. Guided by these principles, the CPT has achieved a still higher level of organizational, ideological and political unity. Its militant Leninist policy is attracting increasingly broader masses of people.

The CPT is the oldest party in Turkey. It emerged under the direct impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution and was tempered by fire in the national-liberation war. But, at the same time, the CPT may be called the youngest party in the country: the average age of its members is under 30. The young communists learn from the experience of the veteran party members. Their enthusiasm, readiness for

sacrifice, their initiative add strength to the party. Of great importance is the CPT's social composition: 60 per cent of its members come from the working class. Its slogan is: 'The factories must become the bastions of the party.' Another major task is to educate new party members in the class struggles and equip them with the science of Marxism-Leninism.

The 1977 conference of the CPT, in which its branch organizations were broadly represented, proved to be a very important event. It adopted the new Program and Rules and elected the leading party bodies, thus consolidating the basis for the Leninist unity of the party. The Politbureau then held several meetings with the functionaries sent by the branch organizations from every part of the country. This was a preparatory measure for convening a regular plenary meeting of the Central Committee in the first half of 1978, which formulated the party's political, ideological and organizational tasks in various spheres. It has also consolidated the party's collective leadership.

Every new step toward the party's numerical and qualitative growth enhances the leading role of the communists in the class struggle, strengthens the CPT's ties with the masses and increases its influence on the country's political life. The Central Committee organ, *Atilim,* and other CPT publications facilitating the legal dissemination of Marxism-Leninism have a major role to play in building of the party.

It will be no exaggeration to say that the CPT is on the way to becoming a mass Marxist-Leninist party of the working class in our country. Consolidating its ties with the masses, and guiding the masses, our party is gaining fresh strength in its struggle for the noble ideals of communism.

December 15, 1978

The goals are set

Hermann Gauthier
Deputy Chairman, German CP

The German Communist Party held its latest congress in Mannheim, the traditional working-class center of Baden-Württemberg, from October 20 to 22, 1978. The Congress was attended by nearly 900 delegates with vote and voice, and also by numerous guests from the FRG and abroad. It adopted the GCP Program, which makes it a historic event in the life of the party and the working-class movement of our country.

The draft GCP Program, which was unanimously adopted by the Mannheim Congress, was discussed at more than 5,000 party meetings in the course of a year. We held numerous discussions with social democrats, trade-unionists and non-party people. The Congress considered 1,290 proposals aimed at specifying various provisions of the Program.

Our Program declares that the GCP is a revolutionary party of the working class of the Federal Republic of Germany which sees its highest duty in defending the interests of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and other working people in face of the drive of big capital with its unrelenting urge to make profit and consolidate its power. The teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin are the party's political guide, the scientific foundation of its policy. The GCP creatively applies the scientific world view of the working class in our country's conditions.

The Program we have adopted shows how the communists intend to tackle the urgent and vital problems facing the working people. It also shows the goals and means of the working-class struggle for radical social changes, for a socialist Federal Republic of Germany.

Our attitude to the Federal Republic is determined by our firm class stand, the working people's interests, and our sense of national responsibility and proletarian internationalism. We have no bond with the capitalist system. However, we support our country and our people, in which our party has its roots and of which it is a part. The most important thing for us is the well-being of our land and our people. The report of the GCP Board to the Congress says that 'we want the Federal Republic to be a country that the working people can rightly call their homeland, a country truly serving peace.'

The participation in the Congress of 55 delegations of communist and workers' parties and national-liberation movements showed that our party's activity and policy guidelines had aroused much interest abroad. This is an indication of the great importance of the processes going on in the FRG, the importance of the road which the German Communist Party has been following. Realization of this gives our party fresh strength in defending the working people's social and democratic rights.

Our adversaries and the working people's enemies did not see the Congress as a welcome event. Among the typical assessments of the Congress by the bourgeois and, indeed, the social-democratic press were: 'The GCP has failed to use the opportunity to put on a new ideological and political face by means of the new Program;' 'The present GCP has not found the strength to renew itself.' It is 'dogmatic, incorrigible and incapable of learning anything.'

To this we reply that the nature of our party has always been and will always be determined by progressive, creative, innovative ideas, the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which have been changing the face of the world. If we tried to put on the kind of 'different ideological and political face' suggested by the bourgeoisie, it would mean a complete loss of our own face.

As for the charge that we have 'not found the strength to renew' our party, we say: The GCP learns from its own experience, from the experience of the class struggle in our country, and also makes use in the light of its tasks of the lessons of the international communist and working-class movement. Our party has introduced many new elements into the political, social and ideological contest going on in the FRG, proving that it is capable of making a constructive contribution to the solution of the country's problems.

The Program defines the main task of the party as bringing about a change in favor of democratic and social progress in the Federal Republic. The struggle for this covers a whole stage of class battles and is oriented upon the future. Our strategic goal is to establish anti-monopoly democracy and create the conditons for going over to socialism.

The party's aim to switch the country to democratic and social progress, and above all to solve the problem of defending peace and the working people's social and democratic gains, is predicated on the political reality which we face now and will deal with in the foreseeable future. They are, first, the need to work together with the working class and other democratic forces in maintaining democratic and social gains and in furthering international détente; second, the need to carry on the class struggle so as to extend the working people's rights, curb monopoly power and achieve a decisive change

in the balance of political forces; and lastly, the need to help the working people to frustrate the attempts of big business to pull out of the crisis at their expense.

Our working people are now faced with an intensifying multi-pronged drive by monopoly capital and the bourgeois state against their living standards. First, mass unemployment and the disastrous defects of the education system jeopardize not only the living standards but the very social existence of millions of men and women. Second, inadequate wage rises, the decline in the purchasing power of the mark, the increase in taxes and in social security contributions tend to freeze wages and occasionally even to reduce real incomes. Third, the deliberate government policy of curtailing social security has a disastrous effect on the condition of pensioners, the health services and virtually every other sphere of social security. As a result, the condition of the working people in the Federal Republic is worsening as compared with the early years of the present decade.

Our party has drawn proper conclusions from the consequences of the capitalist crisis for the working class, and also from the increasing militancy of the workers, the struggle of dockers, shipbuilders, metal and steelworkers, typesetters and printers. We have sought to apply these conclusions consistently and without delay in the everyday work of party groups in the enterprises and residential neighborhoods and in the party's regional and district organizations.

The important thing is to realize the need to fight for the right to work, for job security, against mass dismissals, for adequate vocational training opportunities, and for higher real wages. It has also transpired that now, more than ever before, the right to work is connected with a reduction of working hours without pay cuts. Another important lesson of the class struggle is that job protection largely depends on real democratic participation in management and control by the workers and their trade unions. Lastly, we have noted that for the first time in the history of the class struggle in our country, large groups of workers have taken a stand against the use of scientific and technical progress for the benefit of capitalism.

Under capitalism, job security cannot be fully guaranteed. The right to work can be assured only under socialism, but it does not follow that there is no point in fighting for job security, against massive sackings. On the contrary, the possibility of preventing massive dismissals and the transfer of enterprises abroad, of neutralizing the disastrous effects of rationalization and securing shorter working hours, hinges on the intensity and scope of the class struggle and on a change in the balance of political forces in favor of the working people. In other words, everything depends on the working class itself, on its class consciousness, and its readiness to fight; above all

else, it depends on joint effort and united action by the social democrats and communists.

Since big business cannot cope with the deepening crisis, it has been putting ever stronger pressure on those who are against making the working people bear the burden of the crisis, who seek a way out of this disastrous situation and question to one extent or another the very lawfulness of the capitalist system. The monopoly bourgeoisie wants to restrict democratic rights so as to narrow down the opportunities of the communists, socialists, social democrats, trade unionists, peasants and all the other democrats, for action.

The Berufsverbot (ban on professions) may be cited as the most crying expression of this policy. It is aimed above all at barring us communists from holding jobs in government agencies. Members of our party cannot work as university lecturers, teachers in schools or in institutions of the social security system, as train drivers or postmen — to name only some of the jobs that are off limits for them.

However, the Berufsverbot is applied not only against the communists, but also, on a growing scale, against the social democrats and even liberals. Thousands of FRG citizens are under surveillance. More than two million men and women have been screened for their way of thinking. As a result, over 4,000 democrats are now barred from working in their chosen field on account of their world view and political convictions.

The Berufsverbot is a threat to all democratic forces. It is designed to spread a sense of fear and produce servility so as to bolster the power of monopoly capital over the working people. But even this unconstitutional law, and the curbs on democratic rights as a whole, do not at all prove that big business has a 'position of strength.' The ruling circles' policy is determined above all by their fear of their own people.

Almost every day now, the bourgeois mass media report on the application of the Berufsverbot or discuss the problems it has created. The steadily spreading movement of protest against the Berufsverbot has put its architects in a difficult position. Everywhere those members of the federal government and right-wing social-democratic leaders who are responsible for this policy are asked about their attitude to the unconstitutional Berufsverbot.

At the Mannheim Congress, representatives of 55 fraternal parties and national-liberation movements expressed the aversion of the peoples of the world, of the progressive forces to the discriminatory and anti-democratic Berufsverbot. I take this opportunity to thank them once again for their solidarity and support for the democratic forces of the Federal Republic.

But while spokesmen for the SDPG/FDP federal government are

now forced to reckon with the reaction to the Berufsverbot and the consequences of its application, this does not at all mean that the ruling circles have changed their spots. Characteristically, the Berufsverbot is now applied more strictly on the railways and in the postal service, sectors for which a social-democratic minister is responsible.

The alarm should also be sounded over the curbs on democratic rights in yet another area. I mean the attempt by agents of big business to get the Constitutional Court to invalidate the Law on Participation in Management, which was passed by the Bundestag in 1976 and gave workers, office employees and their trade unions a minimum say in the operation of enterprises within concerns. At the same time, bug business resorts increasingly and ever more resolutely to outrageous lockouts, in which the FRG leads the other countries of capitalist Europe.

We communists regard this broad drive against democratic rights as an integral whole, as a phenomenon produced by monopoly capital. That is why we seek to expose the interconnection between the anti-democratic steps of the ruling circles. This will help to defend democratic rights more effectively. Our slogan is: 'For the right of each to work in his chosen field, for democracy in industry.'

In an effort to find a way out of the crisis, big business uses its reactionary ideology, going as far as to revive the fascist ideology. We draw public attention to the growing activity of neo-nazism, which now assumes various forms. It is our conviction that this trend is only one of the aspects of the general shift to the right now taking place in the political life of the Federal Republic.

We communists emphasize that the struggle against neo-nazism and the shift to the right is in complete accord with the basic political provisions of the Constitution, whose democratic principles we are resolved to defend. At the same time, we have issued a serious warning about the grave responsibility of those who minimize the danger of neo-nazism or tolerate it (as in the Bundeswehr), those who promote the 'Hitler wave' which has swept through publishing houses, the film industry and the mass media, all those who fail to expose the sources of fascism (such as the authors of school textbooks or those who work in the bourgeois mass media).

We communists will never allow the nazis to use the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism and the shift to the right for misleading our citizens, young people in particular, by manipulating the reactionary fascist ideology. Our party will remain in the forefront of the fight for democratic rights, and against neo-nazism. The Mannheim Congress issued this call to all the democratic forces of the FRG: 'Let us learn the lessons of history. Let us fight together to uproot the shoots of

neo-nazism. Let us set up a broad front of defense against neo-nazism. Let us work together and mobilize the broadest democratic forces to frustrate all attempts to revive fascism.'

Our party gives much attention to the problems of scientific and technical progress, for life itself poses ever more emphatically the question whether it is a boon or a bane. Our stand is quite clear: science and technology must serve man and make life easier. We are sure that scientific and technical progress has been and remains an absolutely necessary condition for mankind's development. However, one should never lose sight of the great importance of *who* controls the instruments which ensure scientific and technical progress, *who* benefits from its results.

The trouble is that the political and economic power of monopoly capital in bourgeois society turns science and technology into a curse for the working people. That is why we believe scientific and technical progress must develop simultaneously with social progress. Our ultimate assumption is that only under socialism is it possible to make widespread use of scientific and technical progress for the benefit of the working people, that is, those who create all values.

The peaceful uses of atomic energy are a particular but fundamental problem posed by scientific and technical progress. It was emphasized at the Mannheim Congress that the reason why the GCP opposes the building of atomic power stations in the Federal Republic is not that we think nuclear fission is a 'satanical invention.' It is our conviction that nuclear energy can in principle be controlled by man, and that the development of science and technology increases the possibilities for controlling atomic power stations and nuclear waste. Even so, we never minimize the complexity of the scientific and technical problems involved.

We are sure that the problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy is socio-political. It has arisen because the FRG's atomic industry is dominated by big business. This means that on the pretext of using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, reactionaries and militarists opposing détente could gain access to atomic weapons. The communists have never lost sight of this danger, being mindful of the historical experience of the nations of the world, which fell victim to aggressive German imperialism. That is why we resolutely reject the atomic program formulated by the federal government and the power concerns.

The crucial importance of the problem of war and peace in our epoch was re-emphasized at the Mannheim Congress. It affects the future of all mankind including the Federal Republic of Germany.

Successes in the struggle for international détente have made it possible to reduce the danger of war in Europe. Cooperation between

states with different social systems has been growing and gaining in depth. We attach much importance to the successes scored in this area. They are an inspiration to all true champions of peace.

But one must not forget that the reactionaries, who are hostile to détente, have been stepping up their pressure in the political, military and ideological spheres, and have been aggravating tensions. Their purpose is to cast doubt on the successes achieved in improving the international climate. They justify the whipping up of the arms race by the imperialist powers and the approval by the NATO powers of their long-term armaments program, and fuel fierce anti-Sovietism so as to frighten citizens with inventions about the 'Soviet peril' and the 'threat from the East.'

Very frequently, there is discussion in the FRG of the causes of the growing aggressiveness of imperialism and NATO's dangerous course. The GCP Congress saw the sources of this process in the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism, which in the early 70s cost imperialism a number of important positions. The hopes the leaders of the imperialist powers had of fortifying their positions, or even of winning back those they had lost, by adapting themselves to the changing situation have been blasted. It is, after all, in the atmosphere of international détente that the socialist-community countries have scored new successes, that the national-liberation movement has made further headway, and that new favorable opportunities have arisen for the struggle of the working class and its organizations, and all the other democratic forces in the capitalist world.

There is every reason to say that the imperialists dread the prospect of further advances by the forces of social progress. They also dread the prospect of new proposals and alternatives, like those contained in the Moscow Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee. Besides, powerful arms concerns, which are part of the military-industrial complex, fear that their super-profits may be jeopardized by any concrete advances in limiting armaments or in disarmament. That is why the circles hostile to détente oppose its continuation.

The Chinese leaders have become allies of the ultra-right-wing forces of the CDU/CSU and also of the monopolies fattening on arms manufacture. They support the annexationist aspirations of the reactionary circles of the FRG designed to step up the arms race. By their frank approval of NATO's arms-drive policy, by their military preparations against the Soviet Union and acts of aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Chinese leaders have cast their lot with the most reactionary forces of imperialism.

But this policy is totally at odds with the country's national interests and our people's peaceful aspirations. That is why the party

Congress urged all the peace forces to intensify their action for peace and disarmament. This is the key task of our day. We reaffirmed our readiness to do our utmost for the realization of these truly humanistic aspirations. We will spare no effort to help defend peace, consolidate détente and put an end to the arms race.

We resolutely oppose the manufacture of the neutron bomb and its deployment on the territory of the FRG. It is time the federal government proposed effective measures for limiting the arms race and effecting disarmament. It should stop resisting the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and proceed to play a positive role in the United Nations. We shall insist that the FRG keep to the letter and spirit of the treaties it has signed with the socialist countries.

We are sure that there are real possibilities for preventing the reactionary and revanchist circles from plunging our country into the cold-war trenches. We know that in campaigning for the materialization of these possibilities, we can expect trade unionists, social democrats, liberals and members of the peace-loving democratic public to support our demands.

The German Communist Party believes that the growing struggle in defense of social and democratic rights, for détente and disarmament, must become a prerequisite of concentrating and deploying forces which will carry on the battle to extend the working people's social and democratic rights and to curb the power of the monopolies. The task is to change the balance of forces in favor of the working class and the other democratic circles, and to secure a switch to democratic and social progress. This is the GCP's main aim at the present stage, an aim meeting the objective requirements and the actual situation in our country.

The struggle to switch to democratic and social progress should lead to the establishment of anti-monopoly democracy. This, however, will not be a new social system, let alone a socialist system. It will merely be one of the possible forms of carrying forward the revolutionary process, a form of transition to the new social system.

By anti-monopoly democracy we mean a period of revolutionary struggle in which, on the one hand, all the elements of capitalism will remain but, on the other hand, the shoots of socialism will emerge. Although the elements of the old will still predominate at this stage, the balance of forces should gradually tilt in favor of the new society as the class struggle goes on. That is the only way to prevent the counter-revolution from suppressing the revolutionary process. The GCP regards the anti-monopoly and socialist stages in the revolutionary struggle as interconnected stages of a coherent process of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The need to build socialism in the FRG is determined by the fact that only by converting the main means of production to social property is it possible to overcome the deep contradiction between the social character of production and the private appropriation of its results. Our country needs socialism, because only social property in the means of production makes it possible to ensure social administration and planning, because only under socialism is it possible to make scientific and technical progress serve the people's interests, and because only this social system can guarantee the working people social security. Finally, socialism alone will make it possible to eradicate the conditions for an imperialist expansionist policy and the urge to make money on the arms race and war.

We are frequently asked how we envisage the transition to socialism and its construction. Just now we would not risk predicting future development in detail. The concrete way will depend above all on the strength of the working class, on the stability of its alliance with other democratic forces, on the strength of the revolutionary party of the working class, and also on the forms of resistance by reaction. But in any case socialist society in the FRG will have the following main features: political power of the working class and its allies, social property in the basic means of production, and their planned use for the benefit of the people.

The socialist-community countries' experience shows that socialism can be established only if the above-mentioned conditions are there. This fully applies to the future, socialist Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time, socialism in our country will have specific, national features corresponding to the level of development of the productive forces and the changing historical conditions. That is how we formulate our stand on this fundamental question of the GCP Program.

At the same time, our party's Program unequivocally declares our readiness to discuss these fundamental propositions with all socialist and democratic forces. We shall constantly search together with them for a way to socialism that best meets the conditions of the Federal Republic and the working people's interests and views.

The GCP Board's Report to the Congress and the GCP Program emphasizes that our party has worked and will continue to work in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. GCP policy combines consistent defense of the working people's interests in our own country with support in the spirit of solidarity for the struggle of the progressive forces throughout the world. Mindful of the internationalist character of the historic mission of the working class, the GCP has resolutely rejected all attempts to contrast the national and the international aspects of the class struggle.

This important proposition is formulated in our Program as follows: 'Each Communist Party works out its own policy independently. It bears the responsibility for this to its working class, to its nation, and at the same time to the working people of all countries. Along with a growing internationalization of the class struggle there is a continuing unification of the reactionary forces of various countries. The strengthening of socialism and the aggravation of the capitalist crisis create new opportunities for further successes in the world revolutionary process.'

The Congress reaffirmed that the GCP advocates closer solidarity and greater coordination of action among the communists on the time-tested principles of internationalist cooperation of the working class and its parties, based on a common world view, on joint struggle against the same enemy — imperialism — and on a common goal — socialism. We communists of the Federal Republic will always be loyal to our internationalist duty.

We have invariably emphasized that existing socialism is the greatest achievement of the working class. Its very existence and example make existing socialism a bulwark for all who are fighting for social emancipation and national liberation. Its growing might increasingly limits the imperialists' room for maneuver.

The Soviet Union is the chief factor in strengthening peace and furthering social progress. For that reason, solid alliance with the USSR and the CPSU serves the interests of all progressive forces. This conclusion is confirmed by our people's entire history. The GCP intends, for the benefit of the people of the Federal Republic, to develop its fraternal ties with the CPSU, the strongest and most experienced contingent of the world communist movement.

Loyal to Ernst Thälmann's legacy, we regard the attitude to the Soviet Union as the touchstone of every communist, the touchstone of his loyalty to the cause of the revolutionary working-class movement. We seek to spread the truth in the FRG about the Soviet people's historic contribution to the elimination of fascist barbarity and about its role as the standard-bearer in the struggle for peace, humanism and social progress.

The GCP attaches much importance to strengthening its ties with the fraternal parties of other socialist countries. We constantly work to develop contacts with the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, with which we have a common history and tradition. The GCP has close, fraternal ties with the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries. First of all, we urge concrete joint action against the nultinationals, against attempts to shift the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the working people, and for more durable peace and disarmament.

We have been working to promote and consolidate fraternal ties with the communist and workers' parties, and also with revolutionary-democratic parties and anti-imperialist movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. All the peoples fighting against imperialism, and for national liberation and social emancipation have enjoyed our unqualified solidarity and may count on it in the future.

The GCP has constantly worked to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the international communist movement on the basis of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, for joint action by the chief revolutionary forces of our day is of the utmost importance for the struggle against imperialism and for social progress in all countries. Realizing that the strengthening of the international revolutionary movement is conditional on strengthening the revolutionary movement in the individual countries, the party sees its main internationalist duty in doing everything to support the forces of peace, democracy and socialism in the Federal Republic.

We have the right to regard the Mannheim Congress as a success for the communists of the Federal Republic. It is bound to play an important role in the further development of our party and in the nation's life. Big business in the FRG admits as much, and so do the political spokesmen for the monopolies in the parties which are integrated into the state structure and in the bourgeois mass media. They are aware that they have failed to force the GCP out of public life.

Reporting on our Congress, the bourgeois mass media had to admit that we have succeeded in increasing our influence in industry, above all at the big enterprises, among the working and student youth, and also among women. They also had to note that the communists have made advances in the struggle against the unconstitutional Berufsverbot, and that our positions have been consolidated.

It was emphasized at the Congress that working young people and students play a growing role in the struggle for social and democratic rights. Associations of young people with various orientations, trade unions and youth groups of enterprises display ever greater initiatives in acting together for the interests of the younger generation. We communists play an important role in this big democratic and social movement, and are ready to go on giving full support to every action promoting the struggle for the rights of young workers and students.

In the concrete conditions of the FRG, solution of this problem is of decisive importance for strengthening the party and extending its influence on the masses. The GCP will help and act together with the Socialist German League of Young Workers and the Spartakus Marxist Student Union, with which it has friendly ties, and also with the socialist Young Pioneers organization. The organizations of young workers, students and children have been working successfully, and

their influence has been increasing. They play a growing role among young people.

That the GCP has become an important factor in the country's political life is confirmed in particular, by the fact that in spite of the extremely difficult conditions of the class struggle, our party has been gaining in numerical strength. It now has 46,480 members. Our party's newspaper. *Unsere Zeit*, has succeeded in markedly consolidating its positions. The hundreds of newpapers published by the GCP in enterprises, cities and residential areas are gaining in influence. The more than 60 deputies representing our party, including those in such big cities as Nuremberg, Fürth, Oldenburg, Marburg, Göttingen, Mannheim and Bottrop combine extra-parliamentary and parliamentary struggles ever more successfully.

In summing up, one could say that by approving the GCP Program, the Mannheim Congress clearly defined the goals and the lines of struggle, while the meaningful political conclusions formulated at the Congress and the GCP Board's Report to the Congress contain clear-cut proposals which we have put forward in the course of the ongoing political contest. The German Communist Party has established itself as a political force and an active and necessary participant in the class struggle. The communists of the FRG have set themselves great goals. They have been and remain staunch fighters for peace, freedom and socialism.

Socio-economic development strategy

Wieslaw Klimczak
Alternate member, CC PUWP

The 70s will go down in Polish history as a period of particularly rapid — indeed very rapid — progress. Our country today differs in many respects from what it was in, say, 1970, before the Sixth PUWP Congress. Its economic potential has grown substantially, the living standard has gone up, favorable changes have come about in the social composition of society and in the thinking of its members, and socialist democracy has made further headway. Appreciable, if not always favorable, changes have occurred on the international scene, and many of them have had or are having a direct impact on the situation in our republic.

In view of the rapid pace of development at home and abroad, the

PUWP has found it advisable to hold national party conferences in-between its congresses to discuss the more important problems in carrying out congress decisions. The first such conference took place in 1973 and the second, last year. The latter confirmed the correctness of the party's strategy worked out by its Sixth and Seventh congresses (1971 and 1975), and concentrated on steps to improve the ways and means of implementing this strategy now that the country has attained a higher economic and socio-political level.

The conference made an in-depth analysis of world processes and decided on ways and means of fulfilling, in the new situation, the fundamental economic, socio-political and ideological tasks on the basis of the documents of the Seventh Party Congress.

The party's action program drawn up by its Sixth and Seventh congresses and carried forward by the Second National Conference opened a new chapter in the nation's history. It is known as the strategy of socio-economic development, for the central task it sets is to improve the living standard by raising the social productivity of labor, modernizing and advancing the economy, and enhancing the quality of work and the efficiency of economic management. It was concretized in the new situation by the decisions of the Fifth and Ninth plenums of the PUWP CC and by socio-economic development plans for the current period.

Consistent implementation of the strategy of socio-economic development has appreciably improved the working people's life. This is expressed, first of all, in a tangible rise in every family's living standard in town and countryside. Real incomes have grown as a result of increases in wages as well as in social consumption funds, various social allowances, government food subsidies, and so on. The standard of urban and rural housing has improved. And while we are still lagging behind the leading countries on some social and economic-growth indicators, we have every reason to say that in the seven years since the Sixth Party Congress we have reduced the lag to a greater extent than ever before in the past three decades. The share of the national income allocated for consumption in 1977 was roughly 75 per cent greater than in 1970, and was 3 and 6 times greater than the 1960 and 1950 figures. The workers' average pay has grown by 52 per cent. The plan to provide every family with a separate modern flat is being carried out.

However, society's perception of these gains has been somewhat dampened by tensions and difficulties in some areas. The Second Conference pointed out that the party was aware of these difficulties, that it had analyzed their causes and formulated a specific program to overcome them. The program includes measures to improve the supply of the home market, increase food production, build more

homes, improve the operation of the service and handicraft industries, and promote agriculture.

The party attaches primary importance to agriculture. The key objectives of its agrarian policy are to make production more efficient and gradually to transform it on socialist lines. Through continuous effort to fulfill the overall program for advancing agriculture and the countryside, we are strengthening the worker-peasant alliance, the solid class foundation of our system.

The party's socio-economic strategy is not confined to increasing the consumption of goods. It is also aimed to create conditions for more and more working people to share in cultural and artistic values and raise their political consciousness. As the Second Conference stressed, it is also designed to shape and develop the socialist way of life.

Our way of life has in principle nothing to do with money-grubbing, with the desire to enrich oneself at any price, to make profit without working. Ostentatious consumption, which turns things into a symbol of social standing, a means of underlining one's 'superiority,' and other similar trends run counter to the socialist principle of distribution according to work. They are contrary to the ideals of social equality and social justice. The principle of distribution according to work implies that the volume of income and consumption depends directly on the results of work, on one's contribution in the form of labor. Under socialism, labor is the chief criterion of social justice, and hence of its real and not fictitious recognition by society. Neither the moral qualities of the socialist individual, nor socialist laws allow him to appropriate the fruits of someone else's labor, to live at the expense of other people. We regard growing satisfaction of people's material requirements as a requisite of extending the possibilities of meeting the individual's need for spiritual enrichment and all-round development.

In socialist society this is achieved, first of all, through the systematic establishment of high cultural and moral values in the spiritual life of the individual and of society as a whole.

We also consider it very important that in forming a consumption model in harmony with the socialist way of life and our national conditions, account should be taken, not only of existing economic and social possibilities, but also of the need to mould tastes according to socialist ideals and introduce scientifically sound standards. The solution of the problems involved has an ever greater role to play in our cultural and social policy.

One of the goals of the party's socio-economic program — a goal whose importance was re-emphasized by the conference — is to achieve a higher standard of workmanship and raise the economic

efficiency of enterprises and staff. Our party has always acted in theory and practice on Lenin's idea that the touchstone of the superiority of socialism over capitalism is socialist society's ability to bring about 'a new and much higher productivity of labor ... Communism is the higher productivity of labor — compared with that existing under capitalism — of voluntary, class-conscious and united workers employing advanced techniques' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 427). This is a very difficult matter requiring much time, Lenin pointed out. But it is a condition that must be met if the people's living and cultural standards are to improve. In the past decade, the PUWP has concentrated on raising quality and efficiency to turn them gradually into decisive factors for developing both material production and the social sphere.

We are working to establish a social and moral climate to make every member of society aware that the country's future and his own are directly linked with his personal contribution to its development, to fulfillment of the party's socio-economic program. Indeed, this program and its every provision can be put into effect only through quantitative and qualitative changes in the development of production, through better use of labor reserves, plant and materials, faster scientific and technological progress and better organization of labor and production.

It is perfectly logical, therefore, that the Second PUWP Conference put forward the slogan 'We are materializing the future today,' which reflects the social and humanist aspects of the party's policy on production and investment. Constantly growing production, and so a rising standard of life, cannot be achieved without allocating part of the national income for future economic growth, without investing in raw material and power resources and the economic infrastructure.

The significance of high-quality workmanship and efficient economic management goes byeond the economic sphere. In encouraging a mass movement to achieve these goals, our party strives to use it for heightening the working people's political consciousness, perfecting their moral qualities, educating them in the spirit of socialist patriotism and showing them the humanist and creative aspects of labor under socialism. Our experience, like that of other fraternal countries, suggests that to raise efficiency and quality, it is necessary to educate in every member of society a sense of responsibility for his job, to help him realize the necessity for discipline in labor, in carrying out plans, in fulfilling production assignments, to foster thrift, and encourage initiative, while leaving no room for tolerance of wasteful use of raw materials and electric power, haphazard organization of labor, and so on. People's attitude to work, to their enterprise or office, to their work team is an important

element of our party's ideological-education work, and we consider it an important aspect of the socialist education of our people. We make a special effort to show that patriotism cannot be abstract, that it manifests itself in every citizen's desire to make his country more prosperous, as it firmly advances along its socialist path, and that it is closely connected with proletarian, socialist internationalism.

Poland's social and economic progress in the years of socialist construction is a decisive factor in strengthening its positions in the world. This we began in rather difficult conditions and have been carrying on in an international climate that is not always favorable. Be that as it may, our gains are there. We owe them to our system, to the socialist character of our state, to the fact that the development of our society is being guided by a Leninist-type party, a party whose program is accepted and is being carried out by the whole nation. This is also the reason for the Poles' unprecedented moral and political unity, which has been demonstrated on many occasions and is confirmed again and again.

Under capitalism, a nation cannot be morally and politically united because of the sharp class antagonism dividing labor and capital, the existence of mutually hostile alignments in society, rivalries between warring economic and political forces, particularism and the selfish interests of private proprietors. This is why our unity, a logical product of the socialist system, is a thorn in the flesh of the enemies of socialism.

Unlike capitalism, which creates an atmosphere of spiritual degradation and amorality, socialism elevates sound morals to the stature of the greatest social values, so that when we speak of strengthening the people's moral and political unity, we make a point of stressing the role which a constructive program of moral education of the masses plays as a key component of the activity of our party and our people's state as a whole.

The resolve of the state and other institutions of our society to consolidate the moral order and further society's moral progress is expressed in the efforts to guarantee every citizen proper living conditions, help in strengthening the family, guide the formation of the spiritual qualities of youth and their training for independent activity and ensure the well-being of elderly people whose active life is drawing to a close. The promotion of high moral principles holds a leading place in the mass media, creative endeavor and cultural education. It is only natural that they were also prominent at the Second National Conference of the PUWP.

The report which Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the CC PUWP, made at the conference on behalf of the Political Bureau, re-emphasized the fundamental importance of the Polish people's

patriotic unity born of the construction of socialism on Polish soil and won through tremendous effort and enthusiasm, a unity that has been and remains the basis and an earnest of all our victories. 'We will go on strengthening in every way this unity of the people on the basic issues of the future development of the country, the socialist principles of power, relations of socialist alliance and socialist goals in foreign policy,'* Edward Gierek said.

Our people's moral and political unity is a dynamic and promising unity developing under the direct impact of processes going on in society and reflecting their dialectics. It cannot, of course, be indifferent to the confrontation of ideological and moral values and world views, for it is the unity of people fighting vigorously for the triumph of socialist ideals.

At this higher stage of development, the moral and political unity of Polish society is gaining in depth and value, and acquiring fresh facets. This will be seen very well in our party's policy toward religion, a sphere in which it closely combines the main principles and standards of socialism with both the Polish tradition of religious tolerance and anti-clerical ideas. At the same time, our party takes account of the deep-going changes which have occurred or are occurring in public life, including the religious sphere. We now have every reason to say that there is no conflict in our country between state and church, between the people's power and believers, between the government and virtually the entire clergy.

Of course, our party, being Marxist-Leninist, has been doing much to promote materialist views, the values of the Marxist world view and socialist ethics. We are stepping up our ideological activity as we strive to ensure that the people as a whole assimilate Marxism-Leninism and the dialectical conception of the evolution of nature, society and man.

We consider that this approach is entirely in line with our chosen ideological orientation. Far from being contrary to the further unification of the Polish people, it makes the greatest contribution to their unity.

In carrying on its anti-socialist subversion against Poland, imperialism goes out of its way to attack socialist democracy. In the past year or two, these attacks have developed into a fierce campaign ostensibly to defend 'human rights.' Like other actions of the same kind launched by the enemies of Marxism-Leninism and existing socialism, this campaign ignores or grossly misrepresents the political system and its functioning in Poland and other fraternal countries.

Our party is committed to a policy of extending the people's power,

**Il Krajowa Konferencja PZPR (9-10 stycznia 1978). Podstawowe dokumenty i materialy*. Warsaw, 1978, p. 39.

of devising new forms and perfecting the substance of democracy by increasing the role of the people's councils, the branches of the People's Unity Front and workers' self-management, and territorial self-government in town and country. One of the more important problems in extending democracy, the Second Conference noted, is to intensify public control, which is exercised by the party and mass organizations, and to improve the system ensuring broad public participation in the discussion of projects of national magnitude.

The framework of socialist democracy is determined by the fundamental principles of our ideology and system, the principles of justice and social equality. Social justice is based on a socio-economic policy of providing everyone with equal opportunities in life. The party has evolved this policy and constantly carries it deepter, as it did, for instance, in the program guidelines approved by the Second Conference. However, justice is not limited to social and economic measures. One necessary component is ordinary, everyday justice, which manifests itself in the totality of human relations, in every contact between citizen and state, in the functioning of every work team. In this respect, the decisions of the conference calling for efforts to extend self-government are an important step toward increasing the exercise of justice in the social, political and moral spheres.

The principles and goals of socialism formulated by the classics of Marxism-Leninism have been confirmed and carried forward in the course of socialist construction. They form the theoretical basis of socialist practice in every country building socialism, regardless of the distinctions in the alignment of social forces, historical and cultural traditions or economic level. In fulfilling its program for building a developed socialist society in our country's distinctive conditions, the PUWP draws on the vast experience of the CPSU, the first party to start building the new system and to have built a developed socialist society, and on the experience of other ruling fraternal countries.

An important theoretical task facing us is to specify the thesis that the formation of a developed socialist society is a new and higher stage of socialist construction both in the sphere of social relations and in building an appropriate material and technical basis. This raises problems like establishing socialist standards of human relations, combining the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist system, consistently applying the principles of social justice, accelerating the evening out of living standards and gradually effacing the distinctions between town and country, and between manual and mental work. There is also the need to further socialist democracy, to perfect the functioning of the state, of its institutions and agencies, which should help ever

more effectively to meet the requirements of the population and to promote the advance of socialism.

The Second Conference reaffirmed the party's invariable policy of safeguarding and consolidating peace, striving for peaceful coexistence and détente and contributing to the strength of all the revolutionary, progressive and democratic forces. The socialist countries' foreign policy, which is based on Lenin's ideas of peace and international cooperation, proceeds from a scientific analysis of the class struggle and its prospects in the world. This analysis leads us to the conclusion that the countries of existing socialism are the most reliable guarantee of lasting peace. At the same time, peace and the restructuring of international relations on democratic principles offer greater opportunities for the development of the revolutionary process on all continents.

It is by no means contrary to the principles of peaceful coexistence that we, being deeply convinced of the universal value of our ideals, publicize the immense potentialities and historic achievements of socialism, acquainting the public at large with the advantages of the socialist system of management and social organization and upholding socialist ideals and the socialist way of life. The PUWP considers it highly important that truthful information about progress in the far from easy matter of realizing socialist ideals in Poland and other countries of the socialist community, about achievements on which we look with legitimate pride and satisfaction, should reach the greatest possible number of our contemporaries without hindrance or distortion.

Our unshakable allegiance to proletarian, socialist internationalism has been and remains a characteristic of socialist construction in Poland. The Second Conference pointed out that the policy of the PUWP and the Polish state is aimed in the spirit of Lenin's great precepts at strengthening our country as a loyal member of the socialist community, and that the Polish People's Republic contributes its share to the defense capability of the Warsaw Treaty countries and takes an active part in the work of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

Our fraternal alliance with the peoples of the Soviet Union is the keynote of our foreign policy. Polish-Soviet cooperation covers virtually every shpere of life in both countries. A symbol of this cooperation is the Katowice industrial giant, a modern steel plant being built with Soviet aid. Close and steadily growing ideological, political and economic relations with the Soviet Union greatly benefit both our countries. They help consolidate the entire socialist community and make for lasting peace.

'We are sure,' Edward Gierek said at the Sejm meeting on the 60th

anniversary of the restoration of Poland's state independence, 'that by strengthening our friendship, alliance and cooperation with the fraternal Soviet Union we are meeting the highest interests of our state and nation. With the Soviet Union's help, Poland has maintained its existence, achieved historic victories and provided dependable guarantees of its security, the inviolability of its frontiers and peaceful progress.'*

The Second Conference put forward a program for the internationalist education of our people. The program sets out a wide range of measures intended to educate the masses and the rising generation in the spirit of brotherhood with the Soviet people and the peoples of the other socialist-community countries, in the spirit of solidarity and unity with the international working class, the communist and working-class movement, the national-liberation movement, the peoples of the developing countries and the forces of progress and democracy throughout the world. Loyalty to internationalist principles prompts us to strengthen the common anti-imperialist front and its vanguard, the communist and workers' parties, and to join in solidarity action in the interests of their unity and new gains.

The struggle for influence over social consciousness is a special form of class struggle. As its role grows, we consider it most important to make proper use of so valuable an instrument for shaping socialist thinking as the people's historical consciousness. We know from experience that we must not underestimate dynamic and weighty components of the people's spiritual life like their desire to have a better knowledge and understanding of their history, especially their modern history, and to make an impartial and detailed assessment of their recent past. To advance with confidence as a nation, we must know where we have started and where we are going.

Sixty years have passed since Poland's state independence was re-established. It was an event of fundamental significance for the Polish people's history, as Edward Gierek put it at the Second National Conference of the PUWP. The restoration of independent statehood created new historical conditions and afforded the Polish nation new opportunities. How far these opportunities have been used is a different, but equally important, matter.

Between the two world wars, Poland lacked neither people striving for national renaissance, nor accomplishments serving the same goal. Even in those years, many constructive steps were taken and there were useful patriotic, progressive initiatives which made the inter-war period an important one in the history of our nation and our state-

**Trybuna Ludu,* November 7, 1978.

hood, in what may be called the prehistory of People's Poland. However, at the time the forces that should really have regenerated the country were still to weak. Our national development was impeded by the class egoism and narrow-mindedness of the ruling bourgeoisie. Poland was a state based on class oppression, a state encouraging rightist, reactionary trends, brutally curbing the activity of left-wing, democratic forces, of champions of progress and social emancipation. The result was that many hopes were dashed and considerable opportunities missed.

Bourgeois Poland proved unable to solve such problems of decisive importance to national and social progress as the redistribution of land in favor of the peasants, industrialization and the democratization of science, culture and education. The fate of the agrarian reform law is an instructive case in point. While taking account primarily of the interests of the big landed proprietors, the law also held out some promises to the peasants. But it was never fully enforced.

From their history the Polish people drew the conclusion that to solve the fundamental problems of Poland's existence and development, they needed a viable and strong power serving the interests of the working majority of the nation. This is the people's socialist power.

Our people chose the socialist alternative of development, doing so firmly and definitively. They are convinced that this is the only way to materialize their age-long aspirations and ideals. Experience has shown that the people's state we have chosen is the best political system in our country's specific historical conditions. There is no support in Polish society for the concept of political pluralism because the functioning of our political system, with the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class as its core, guarantees the stability and all-round progress of People's Poland and makes the people's power a reality.

Our achievements confirm the correctness of the historic choice made by the Polish people under the leadership of their Marxist-Leninist party. This choice has borne ample fruit to date and enables us to build a radiant future for Poland on the solid foundations of socialism.

The leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party in our society, which is building developed socialism, is a necessary condition for our nation's progress, for perfecting our statehood and for the triumph of the humanist ideals of socialism in Poland.

Working out a national development program and mobilizing the people to carry out this program under the party's political guidance and organizational direction are not the only ways in which the party fulfills its mission as leader of society. The party's leading role implies

and includes methodical exertion of educational influence in various forms on all social strata to mould socialist social consciousness.

The Second Conference emphasized that the party's leadership in socialist construction is a natural result of the fact that the party represents and heads Polish society's most progressive force, the working class, which it rouses to the struggle for its national and class aspirations coinciding with the fundamental interests of all other social categories and working people, of the democratic and patriotic-minded masses of our country. The party exercises its role in cooperation with the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party.

The leading position of the working class in Poland today and its party's leading role stem from the historic requirements of our people, from our traditions and experience. This is a convincing instance of the continuity of the working-class movement and Marxist thought in Poland. Ideals for which our working-class movement began to fight a hundred years ago and which inspired our working people to fight for socialism are now being translated into reality by our party and people and have become the content of the program for full-scale socialist construction. This is why the 1978 anniversaries — the 60th anniversary of the restoration of our state independence, the 60th anniversary of the founding of the party of Poland's communists, and 30th anniversary of the unification of the Polish working-class movement and the founding of the PUWP — were such a powerful stimulus for our further advance.

Our country's living experience provides incontrovertible proof that no one and nothing can replace the working-class party as a political leader uniting the nation on the principles of socialist humanism and progress, mustering the people's forces and organizing them for the conscious making of history. In accordance with the actual conditions of national and social development and the objective exigencies and tasks at this stage of Polish history, the responsibility for realizing the nation's fundamental interests, building a developed socialist society, guiding and organizing this truly nationwide effort rests entirely with the party of the working class, the Polish United Workers' Party.

The Polish people have been following their socialist path for over three decades. They have shown that the policy of the party of scientific communism is the only policy to have stood the test of life. The communists' program, which comprises all that is best and most progressive in Poland's past and present history, fully accords — unlike any other socio-political concept — with both the current tasks and the strategic aspirations of the Polish people and state.

Report at first hand

Jose Lava
Member *WMR* Editorial Council,
Representative of the CP
Philippines on the journal

Vsevolod Rybakov
WMR staff member

VIETNAM: FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE ARE THE SUPREME VALUES

As our plane circled to land in Hanoi, one of the passengers, an elderly Vietnamese, a veteran of two wars of Resistance, drew our attention to some brown spots which stood out on the green of the rice paddies around the airport. 'Those are U.S. bomb craters,' he said. We looked down at the still open wounds of the Vietnamese land, whose people just over three years ago victoriously ended their 30-year war for the country's liberation — against the French colonialists, the U.S. aggressors and their puppets in the South. The victory of the Vietnamese people came as a triumph of its indomitable will so emphatically expressed in the words of its leader, President Ho Chi Minh, with which we have entitled this report, the words which today, too, are a slogan rallying the free citizens of socialist Vietnam.

Following the liberation of Saigon, now Ho Chi Minh City, on April 30, 1975, peace descended on the country. The people's efforts were concentrated on peaceful construction, rehabilitation and the development of the economy, national culture, the environment — of everything that had been so heavily damaged by the U.S. aggression. The country's unification in 1976 paved the way for fully realizing the vision of President Ho Chi Minh for a peaceful, united, independent, democratic and flourishing Vietnam. However, some forces set out to frustrate this at any price. They are those, Vietnamese comrades told us bitterly, who are in power in the neighboring People's Republic of China and Democratic Kampuchea, people who style themselves communists.

In a conversation, Comrade Dao Duy Tung, editor-in-chief of *Cong San* (Communist Journal), a theoretical and political organ of the CP Vietnam Central Committee, said: 'The present situation could be

expressed in the formula: "Semi-peace, semi-war." This means that we have simultaneously to step up the construction of socialism and build up our national defense, and be prepared to defeat the enemy.'

We decided to start by describing the second part of the formula — this 'semi-war' state — because that is not only one of the aspects which now determines the Vietnamese people's life, but also the overall background which helps to understand many of the difficulties in socialist construction.

'Friendship Gate' padlocked

Highway No. 1, along which we are travelling to the North of Vietnam, starts at Pnom Penh, in Kampuchea, and runs through Ho Chi Minh City on to Hanoi and reaches the Chinese border in the province of Cao Lang. Not far away, the Hanoi — China — USSR international railway runs across the border, the way along which Vietnam received the bulk of its assistance from China (and from the Soviet Union, until the Peking authorities began to hamper it). That is why this border check-point, beyond which the Chinese erected a great archway, was called 'Friendship Gate.' That was the scene on August 25, 1978, just over a month before our arrival, of one of the major incidents provoked by the Chinese over the mass exodus, the so-called flight of ethnic Chinese from Vietnam.

When we reached the Vietnamese frontier post at 'Friendship Gate,' everything was quiet. In the roadway, a large group of children were splitting bamboo stems for spikes which are dug into the ground sharp end up, an effective defense against an invader and one repeatedly used with success in Vietnamese history: in the Middle Ages, in the fight against the Chinese feudals, who sought to conquer Vietnam, and during the war of liberation against the U.S. aggression. The commissar of the frontier post, Vi The Sinh, explained that the frontier areas needed security because the harvesting started in late autumn. 'Things are quiet here just now, but in summer, when thousands of Chinese were crowded along the road, the tension was exceptionally high and we had to display great restraint and steadfastness.

'We first discovered that the ethnic Chinese were going off to China along mountain paths in late 1977 and early 1978. There were no entanglements along the border, and those who went were mostly young people without any belongings. Then, in January 1978, we learned that a "Committee for the Reception of Persecuted Chinese" had been set up on the Chinese side at a place called Binh Tuong, 18 kilometres from the border. We then found out that some of the young men who had been given training by the Committee then returned to Vietnam, to Ho Chi Minh City and other cities and began to engage in

propaganda among Chinese, urging them to flee the country. They were promised all sorts of privileges, trips to the United States, Canada, Hong Kong, and so on.

'In March and April, the number leaving sharply increased, and they now travelled in whole families. In May, we contacted the Chinese frontier post and suggested that the flood of fleeing Chinese should be channeled along the road. For our part, we confined ourselves to simple border formalities, requesting that they leave behind their Vietnamese papers, and allowing them to carry away all their belongings. In this way, more than 20,000 ethnic Chinese, who were Vietnamese citizens, crossed the border here by July 11, 1978. They were given a boisterous reception on the Chinese side.

'Suddenly, on July 11, a spokesman for the Chinese frontier post came over and declared that from the following day anyone who wanted to go to China would have to produce a "home-returning certificate" issued by the Chinese Embassy in Hanoi, with a Vietnamese visa. At midnight, the Chinese deployed a guard along the border and closed it.

'This produced confusion on the border, as nearly 4,000 men and women pitched tents along the road. A few days later, the Chinese allowed entry to those who had come from the South, mainly from Ho Chi Minh City. These were chiefly officials and policemen of the old puppet regime and a few capitalists, who had gold and other valuables with them.

'Thereupon the Chinese organized gangs of hooligans who attacked our frontier guards, and carried on propaganda among the Chinese who were held up at the border. They claimed that it was unsafe to remain on the road, and induced them to move their tents to the slope of the hill along whose summit the borderline runs. The Chinese families were in a sad plight and some were turning back. So on August 25, when we sent a delegation of social organizations to the hill to urge the refugees to return home, the Chinese used loud hailers to signal the hooligans, who attacked our delegation with stones, sticks and knives. Many of our people were wounded. Our frontier guards ran to the rescue, but at that time they were unarmed, and one of them was killed and another died later. We were forced to fall back, and a large number of Chinese soldiers and policemen in civilian clothes emerged from behind the trees marking the borderline and came over to our side of the hill. They also occupied a neighboring hill. After this, the Chinese allowed the refugees to cross the border.

'Our frontier troops had to attack the hills and force the Chinese soldiers and hooligans to clear our territory. We then set up frontier entanglements and a fortified frontier psot. Meanwhile, the Chinese government began to issue statements which the imperialist press

eagerly played up, alleging that we were occupying Chinese territory and that we had driven the Chinese crowded along the border into China, harassing and killing them along the way.'

'Things are quiet here just now,' Comrade Vi The Sinh repeated, 'but the tension remains. We are aware, in particular, that the Chinese have concentrated 2,500 refugees at a railway crossing and want to sent them back into Vietnam to carry on subversive activity.'

All the while, the Chinese government continues to talk about persecution and repression of Chinese inhabitants in Vietnam.

'Such statements are inventions, pure and simple. We have always lived in peace,' Comrade Hoang Lam, a member of the CP Vietnam's Cao Lang Regional Committee Bureau, emphasized. 'The Chinese have always enjoyed equal rights with the Vietnamese in our Republic. One need merely point to the fact that an ethnic Chinese is Chairman of the Patriotic Front Committee in the province, and that two Chinese are deputies of the National Assembly. Of the 14,000 Chinese who lived in our province, only about 4,000 have fled. But, of course, the tension along the border is doing the economy of the province much harm. After all, we have a 510-kilometre borderline with China, which is one-half of Vietnam's whole border with China. Along the border, there are 11 districts inhabited by various nationalities (in our province we have 10 nationalities). Whereas in the past we had relations of friendship with the nationalities living along the border on the Chinese side, the Chinese authorities have now been replacing them with hostile-minded people from the interior.'

Peking propaganda claims that the Chinese refugees from Vietnam are 'victims' who have been 'subjected to persecution and ostracism.' The use of these terms was intensified after the anti-capitalist changes in trade were made in South Vietnam in the spring of 1978. Why is that so?

At the moment of reunification, multinational Vietnam had about 1.2 million ethnic Chinese, known in our country as 'hoa.' Over 800,000 of them lived in the South, mainly in former Saigon, and the rest in northern provinces bordering on China, and in cities like Haiphong, Hanoi and so on. Over a period of 2,000 years there have been several tides of Chinese emigration into Vietnam, the largest of these, from 1925 to 1933, bringing in something like 600,000. Their status in North Vietnam was settled after the victory over the French colonialists. In 1955, the Central Committee of the Vietnam Workers' Party (VWP) and the Central Committee of the CP China concluded an official agreement under which Vietnam's hoa were placed under the leadership of the VWP and were in time to become Vietnamese citizens, something that most of them had done by 1957. Since then

they have enjoyed the same rights as the native Vietnamese. In South Vietnam, as a result of coercive measures by the Ngo Dinh Diem regime and handouts from the Nguyen Van Thieu regime, virtually all the hoa had become Vietnamese citizens by 1956. Most of the hoa were working people — peasants, workers and government officials, and a sizable section, petty traders. Many of them fought actively against the French colonialists and then against the U.S. aggressors and their South Vietnamese puppets. But in South Vietnam a section of the big Chinese capitalists, partly industrialists, but mainly merchants, took shape under the wing of the U.S. invaders and the comprador regime. They profited on speculation, chiefly in food, and ruthless exploitation of the peasants. Among them were the 'rice king' Ma Hy, the 'petrol king' Ly Hoa and others. When liberation came, they controlled roughly 80 per cent of South Vietnam's national wealth. They owned 80 per cent of the fixed assets in manufacturing, 100 per cent of the wholesale trade, 50 per cent of the retail trade, and 90 per cent of the export and import trade; they controlled 100 per cent of the grain trade, and received 80 per cent of the credits from South Vietnamese banks, owning 42 of the 60 companies with a turnover of more than 1 billion piastres, including major banks. They had bought up the whole state machine, from bottom to top, including 'President' Thieu, while one of them, Ly Long Than, was called the 'actual president' of South Vietnam. Their economic domination was backed up with stark violence, for the big Chinese compradors controlled bands of gangsters which flourished in South Vietnam, Saigon in particular. The Chinese comprador bourgeoisie in South Vietnam constituted 'a state within a state,' which was much stronger than the official one.

After the liberation of the South, the revolutionary authorities nationalized the big industrial enterprises, but trade, above all the marketing of food and other prime necessities, largely remained in the hands of the speculators. We were told in a conversation with Comrade To Huu, alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CPV Central Committee, that it was a question of who won: 'socialism or the Chinese bourgeoisie?'

Then, at the end of March 1978, three years after liberation, the People's Committee, the organ of local power in Ho Chi Minh City, relying on the newly formed and consolidated state apparatus, decided to 'eliminate capitalist trade and transfer the capitalist businessmen into the sphere of production.' A few days later, a corresponding decree was issued by the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, under which the means of production and the goods were taken over by the state at cost, with a 10 per cent addition for profit.

Anticipating events, let us say that this act was a complete success. Comrade To Huu told us that the inhabitants of former Saigon did not believe that they could ever get the comprador bourgeoisie, the speculators and their gangsters off their backs. Only the people's power could do this. This is an event for the whole of Southeast Asia, where in every country, including the Philippines, from which one of us comes, there are numerous ethnic Chinese who also control the economic — and frequently also the political — levers.

The operation to eliminate capitalist trade — capitalist, we emphasize, and not small-scale trade — had a class, not a national character, for it also affected all the capitalist merchants of Vietnamese nationality without exception. The ethnic Chinese, the hoa, suffered most because of objective reasons — their domination of South Vietnam's economic life and their possession of much larger capital.

These rich men were relatively few, only about 13,000 of the 700,000-800,000 Chinese residents of Ho Chi Minh City, with a few individuals in other cities. That was the pretext — and what has been said shows that it was no more than a pretext — that the Peking authorities used to worsen relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, an act which posed a real threat to the Republic's northern borders.

We were told by Vietnamese comrades that a minority of the Chinese capitalists — as of Vietnamese merchants — accepted the government's decision, reported on their property holdings, and invested their capital in mixed state enterprises. Some who leave the country do not go to China, but to capitalist countries. These however, are few. We went to the district in Ho Chi Minh City which has a predominantly Chinese population and which was once Cholon, Saigon's twin city. If one were to believe what the bourgeois press, especially the French press, now says, Cholon should look like a dead city. Indeed, we did see shops with rolled down iron shutters, but these are few in that big city, which continues to brim with life and which here and there still has signboards with flowery Chinese characters.

Still, the massive flight of ethnic Chinese from Vietnam to China is a fact. Roughly, 150,000 had emigrated by the time we arrived. It is a fact that the exodus began back in 1977, long before the March 1978 measures. What then is the matter? To understand the problem, one has first to consider another conflict now complicating life in Vietnam, the conflict with Kampuchea.

Below the slopes of Mount Ba Den

We are back on Highway No. 1, but this time headed from Ho Chi

Minh City to the point at which the highway intersects with the Vietnamese-Kampuchean border. Over a long distance in Tay Ninh Province, the highway runs parallel to the border, some 20 kilometers away from it. That is the location of the famous Parrot Beak, Kampuchean territory which wedges deep into Vietnam's territory. As we neared the border crossing, there were mounting signs of tension and an atmosphere of war. There were more regular troops and soldiers of local armed units by the roadside. Some three kilometers from the border stands the village of Moc Bai. Not a single building remains intact, and soldiers live in the ruined houses. Finally, we reached the remains of what used to be the customs house and frontier post alongside which are the fortified dugouts of the border guards. We are not allowed to go any further: the sound of firing is heard from behind a row of palms some 500 meters away.

We then went to Ben Cau District, where a year earlier, on September 24, 1977, four villages were fully destroyed and 1,000 Vietnamese were killed or wounded when a large Kampuchean armed force invaded the area. Three Kampuchean divisions continued to maraud in various districts of Tay Ninh Province right till November of the same year, penetrating to a depth of up to 10 kilometres, until they were driven out by the Vietnamese troops.

Today, October 2, 1978, there is relative calm in the area, the peasants are working in the rice paddies, the children are tending buffaloes, but they come here only in the day time, and spend the night in a village deeper in the interior, where they were resettled after the Kampuchean troops burned down their old village. But even the present calm is deceptive. Only last night, a frontier guard told us, Kampuchean scouts tried to penetrate into Vietnamese territory. They were discovered and driven back with fire. A week ago, on September 25, there was an incursion of Kampuchean troops not far from here, in the new economic zone of Phuoc Vinh, 20 kilometres from the provincial capital.

On our way to the city of Tay Ninh, Comrade Phan Van, a member of the Bureau of the party's Regional Committee, who travelled with us, pointed out the damage by long-range artillery fire, which the Kampuchean troops have been systematically carrying on along the entire border with this province. One of their main targets is the Go Dau Bridge across the Vam Co Dong River, as its destruction would cut Highway No. 1. However, they have so far failed to hit the bridge. But they did hit the football field in a village community (Cam Giang), during a football game. Thirty-four persons were killed. More than 30, including children, were killed or wounded just recently when shells hit some buses in the Long Hoa district of the city of Tay Ninh, and we saw their ruins as we drove past.

Before leaving for Tay Ninh and Ho Chi Minh, we were able to get a clearer picture of the causes and course of the conflict on the strength of what we were told by Comrade Phan Van, and by Comrade Hoang Tuan, Director of the Cener for the Collection of Facts and Material on the Kampuchea Problem. We also saw the expositions and the documents.

Kampuchea's armed provocations against Vietnam began just after the South of the country was finally liberated on April 30, 1975. On May 4, it already attacked Vietnam's island of Phu Quoc, and on May 8, invaded the province of Tay Ninh. Initially they pretended that it was all a mistake: Pol Poth, Secretary of the CP Kampuchea Central Committee, told Comrade Nguyen Van Linh, who represented the Vietnam Worker's Party, that the incidents had resulted from a 'poor knowledge of topography by the Kampuchean troops.' However, the incursions continued. On August 10, 1975, there was a meeting between Comrade Nguyen Van Linh and Deputy Secretary of the CPC Central Committee Nuon Chea. In the course of the meeting, the Kampucheans agreed to respect the existing borderline and to settle all differences by peaceful means. At a meeting on August 28, 1975, between Nuon Chea and Comrade Guyen Hai, Secretary of the party's Tay Ninh Regional Committee, the Kampucheans once again admitted that they had been in the wrong.

In 1975 and 1976, the Tay Ninh Provincial leadership held some 20 meetings with the Kampucheans in an effort to implement the August 10, 1975 agreement. The problem appeared to be simple: the parties agreed that a pre-1954 map published by the French Geographical Service of Indochina was to be the basis for defining the borderline. This is an established border and the only problem is actually to define it in the localities. If any correctives are required, these could be made by mutual agreement of the parties. However, the Kampucheans refused to answer questions, suspended the negotiations and in January 1977 began a sharp escalation of armed operations against Vietnam along the entire border, which is adjacent to five Vietnamese provinces. Then, at a press conference in Peking (sic) on December 31, 1977, the Kampuchean goverment issued a statement accusing Vietnam of aggression against Kampuchea, allegedly 'for plundering the rice crop,' seeking to take over its territory, overthrowing the regime in power, and including Kampuchea in an 'Indochinese Federation' under Vietnam's sponsorship. That same day, and again on February 5, 1978, the Vietnam government issued statements setting out the facts to refute these charges and proposing fundamental and concrete measures for a peaceful settlement of the differences, including a mutual pullback of troops to a line of five kilometres from the

border, as a first step. No response has come to these proposals to this very day.

We were told by Vietnamese comrades in Tay Ninh Province that at first they were simply at a loss; what were they to think of the Kampuchean authorities' acts? After all, they had very fresh reminiscences of the comradeship-in-arms with the Kampuchean people during the war of liberation against the U.S. aggressors and their puppets in Vietnam and Cambodia. Comrade Phan Van recalled that it was there, in Tay Ninh Province — and he himself had fought in these parts throughout the whole of the war — that the people's armed forces for the liberation of South Vietnam had provided protection for the headquarters of the Communist Party of Kampuchea and had helped to shape its cadres and to provide them with military training.

However, the picture was gradually clarified as in the course of the clashes the Vietnamese army captured Kampuchean soldiers, scouts and provocateurs, and as the tide of Kampuchean refugees to Vietnam swelled.

The Kampuchean prisoners of war and refugees said that the propaganda of national and racial hatred for the Vietnamese had been carried on in the army and among the civilian population for several years. The Kampucheans were told that the whole of the territory of South Vietnam, called Cochinchina under the French colonialists, belonged to Kampuchea and that it had to win the territory back. They were made to believe that this would be easily done, because Kampuchea was stronger. Why? Because, though the Vietnamese people had carried on a heroic struggle they had liberated their country later than Kampuchea had (respectively, on April 17 and 30), which testified, they are told, to the superiority of the Kampuchean army. But the main thing was that Vietnam was weak because it followed the CPSU's 'revisionist line' (an echo of Peking propaganda) while Vietnam's socialist society was of a 'lower' type and Kampuchea's, of a 'higher' type. Finally, Kampuchea had the all-round support of China (indeed, Vietnamese comrades told us that after liberation, Kampuchea's army had consisted of 6-7 divisions, but now the Chinese had armed 21 divisions, of which 17 were concentrated along the border with Vietnam).

This clarified the picture. The different approaches to the borderline were not the main issue. The point, Vietnamese comrades told us, is that the regime set up by the Kampuchean clique of Pol Poth and Ieng Sary is an extremist nationalistic regime engaged in genocide against its own people. It needs an external enemy, so as to divert the people's wrath. Comrade Phan Van stressed: 'The main thing is that the Pnom Penh rulers are pliant tools in Peking's hands, puppets

whom China's reactionary leadership has been using to prevent Vietnam from becoming stronger and building a socialist society.' Each of these statements is borne out by facts, documents and eye-witness accounts.

We inspected two camps of Kampuchean refugees, of whom there are now almost 150,000 in South Vietnam, including 22,000 in Tay Ninh Province. Eighty per cent of those in the camps are children, and their mothers are almost all widows, for their husbands have been killed. When asked why they had fled, most simply said, without any political subtleties, that the authorities were killing everyone, right and left; they had been terrified and ran away. It turns out that Pnom Penh's policy of setting up a 'higher type of socialist society' consists of killing off all those who had lived on the territory controlled by the Lon Nol government and who had reached the age of 18 years on April 17, 1975, liberation day, and above all those who had at least a secondary education. According to the world press, 2.5 million people have already been killed. Those who are still alive have to work in the fields from 3.00 a.m. to 6 p.m., receiving two bowls of rice a day (smaller bowls for children), attend a session of 'criticism and self-criticism,' after the working day, with a reduction in the pitiful food ration for poor work. Death is meted out for the slightest insubordination. From the age of 13 years, children are separated from their parents and sent to special camps, where they are trained to be living robots. But then there is no money, no markets, no cities, no intelligentsia (only primary education is allowed), no entertainment, none of the 'sores' of capitalism.

The Vietnamese comrades are convinced — and with good reason, we think — that the idea of this kind of 'socialist society' was borrowed by Pol Poth in Peking during the 'cultural revolution.'

In 1977, in order to prevent any attempts at resistance, the Pol Poth-Ieng Sary regime wiped out all the veterans of the CP Indochina (one paper suggests a figure of about 5,000),[1] and all those who were trained in Vietnam during the war of liberation. But all this to no avail. Resistance to the blood-thirsty regime has been growing and developing into a general uprising directed by Kampuchea's true communists, who had managed to escape with their lives.[2] Units of the Kampuchean army, press reports say, are beginning to join the insurgents.

'The Kampuchean regime's aggressive acts have done much harm,' Comrade Phan Van told us. 'In the frontier areas, thousands of hectares of rice fields are not being cultivated, and this with our difficult food situation. The normal, peaceful life of 18 communities in the province, with a population of 70,000, has been disrupted. In some places, the Kampucheans still occupy Vietnam territory, as in the urea of the Than Lap community. We have to feed 22,000 Kam-

puchean refugees, plus 60,000 Vietnamese refugees expelled from Kampuchea, where they had lived. Among them are 7,000 ethnic Chinese. Our wish just now is only to build, and not to shoot and shed blood. Our province suffered heavily during the war against the U.S. aggression, and it was especially fierce over here, as the U.S. command tried to wipe out one of the Liberation Army's main bases. The population had been herded into strategic hamlets, the forests were sprayed with defoliants, of 75 communities 6 were destroyed and 15 heavily damaged. Still, we stood our ground. Look around you (Comrade Phan Van pointed to a lonely mountain rising above the plains). It is called Ba Den (we felt that we had heard the name before from Western war correspondents' reports from South Vietnam). U.S. troops were entrenched during the liberation war on its summit, which overlooks the city of Tay Ninh. We, fighters of the Liberation Army, were down below in the forest and in the underground caves and tunnels. We were fiercely bombed by the U.S. Air Force; but we did not let the invaders descend from the mountain top to establish contact with their other forces, and they had to be supplied by helicopters. This battle was a long one. Finally, the Americans were forced to pull out (by helicopter), thereby paving the way for the complete liberation of Tay Ninh.'

In conclusion, Comrade Phan Van said: 'Today, we are also sure of victory. The Pol Poth-Ieng Sary anti-popular, reactionary clique will not defeat us despite the all-round support from their Peking patrons.'

The reactionaries will not pass

Initially, the Peking leadership preferred to say nothing about this support, for it was much too obvious who the aggressor in the Vietnamese-Kampuchean conflict was. But in the summer of 1978, even the semblance of neutrality was discarded, the Chinese press and then the Chinese leaders came out openly in support of the Pnom Penh authorities against Vietnam, and linked up the conflict with the 'expulsion' of ethnic Chinese from Vietnam.

However, this 'linkage' has been tacitly exercised by the Peking leadership since at least 1977 in its propaganda and provocations among the ethnic Chinese in Vietnam. This became clear from the testimony of the Peking trouble-makers arrested by the Vietnamese authorities, and also from the stories of the hoa who tried to flee or did flee to China, but who, when they realized that they had been deceived, returned home.

The 'logic' of the propaganda by Peking agents carried on among the hoa in Vietnam is highly primitive, and is designed to intimidate simple people. Here is how it was summed by Vi The Sinh, the comrade from the frontier post by 'Friendship Gate,' who had special

talks on the subject with fugitive ethnic Chinese. 'Vietnam,' the Peking trouble-makers say, 'is carrying on a new war against Kampuchea. China supports Kampuchea. Because Vietnam will never submit there will be a big war, and China will be on Kampuchea's side. Then the Vietnamese will kill all the Chinese, those who are of Chinese stock and keep to Chinese traditions. That is why they must flee to return to the land of their ancestors and help to build China. Everyone who stays betrays China and helps Vietnam. That is why, even if they are not killed by the Vietnamese, the Chinese army will come in and shoot them as traitors. But even if the Vietnamese turn out to be humane, and the Chinese soldiers forgive them and do not kill them, the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries will come to Vietnam's aid, and they will not forgive them and will kill them all, because the Soviet Union hates all Chinese.'

Those who believed this simplistic, and therefore highly insidious, propaganda and were frightened by the atmosphere of tension created by Peking's agents in the northern provinces of Vietnam neighboring on Chine, fled. The elimination of capitalist trade from March to May 1978 was used by the Chinese government to step up this campaign in the South, chiefly to attract rich Chinese, whom the Peking agents made to pay large bribes in gold and valuables for ferrying them over to China. But the number of the rich who rose to this bait turned out to be small, and they preferred to go to capitalist countries. Most of those who succumbed to the panic are peasants, fishermen, workers and artisans in the northern provinces, who now find themselves in an unenviable situation in Chinese camps.

Quite naturally, their departure has done considerable harm to economic life in Vietnam's northern provinces. It was simultaneously used by the Peking authorities to inflict an even heavier blow on the Vietnamese economy. From May to July 1978, the Peking leadership announced it was stopping all assistance to Vietnam, on the pretext that it needed the money to settle Chinese refugees from Vietnam, and also in view of 'the Vietnamese aide's unfriendly position.' China stopped the construction of all installations in Vietnam and recalled all Chinese specialists, who took along with them all the technical specifications. Finally, at the end of September, while we were in Vietnam, the Chinese unilaterally broke off the talks in Hanoi on a settlement of the problem of the ethnic Chinese leaving Vietnam. The Chinese had been concentrating their troops on the Vietnamese border.

The Vietnamese comrades are unanimous in their analysis. All these acts — the provoked flight of the hoa, the aggression on the part of Kampuchea, the end of assistance to Vietnam and the creation of tensions on the Chinese-Vietnamese border — are links in the same

chain, in one comprehensive policy meant to undermine socialist construction in Vietnam and its independence.

Why has the Chinese leadership now taken such a position, which is patently hostile to Vietnam. Replying to this question, the comrades frequently began by pointing out some past facts.

Comrade Dao Duy Tung said: 'The fact is that while giving us assistance, effective assistance, for which we are highly grateful, the Chinese leadership has long since pursued its own political goals, which have nothing to do with our struggle. The Peking leaders tried to make Vietnam, the Vietnam Workers' Party enter into their orbit, pursue their line in the world arena and within the international communist movement. But our party and the country's leadership have invariably maintained an independent stand.

'Back in 1963, when China's Maoist leadership came out with its 25-point program designed to split the international communist movement and destroy the world socialist system, Peking tried to set up a united front of 11 Communist Parties of Asia against the CPSU. But our party opposed this and without it the scheme wouldn't work. When in 1966, the Maoists started the "cultural revolution," they tried to carry it over to our country, inviting the ethnic Chinese residents in Vietnam, to act. We resisted this, our press ignored the "cultural revolution," and it was clear that we disapproved of it.

'Throughout the whole period of the liberation war against the French colonialists and then against the U.S. aggressors, the Peking leaders strove to destroy the solidarity of the three peoples of Indochina, and we have many facts testifying to this. The same purposes are being pursued by the current propaganda accusing Vietnam of striving to establish an "Indochina Federation" and to impress Kampuchea (and also Laos) in it, so as to use it to extend its influence in Southeast Asia. This is a patent lie. Indeed, the possibility of a voluntary establishment of an Indochina Federation was envisaged by the CP of Indochina, set up in 1930, in its 1935 resolution on the nationalities policy for example. But already at its Second Congress in 1951, the CP of Indochina was dissolved on the initiative of the Vietnamese communists and three independent parties were set up: the Vietnam Workers' Party and People's Revolutionary Parties in Laos and in Cambodia. Since then, the question of an Indochina Federation has not been raised. In 1954, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam fully accepted the decisions of the Geneva Conference, which established the independence and sovereignty of each of the three countries of former French Indochina.'

During the war against the U.S. aggression, Comrade Dao Duy Tung continued, 'the Chinese leaders wanted Vietnam to receive only Chinese aid, and to reject Soviet aid, but we refused to do this. They

sought to make Vietnam a card in their game with the United States, and wanted to maintain the puppet regime in South Vietnam. They lost this card when the South was liberated. They wanted Vietnam to become a base for their great-power hegemonistic expansion in Southeast Asia. Instead, united socialist Vietnam has become the main obstacle in their way. Hence, their hatred for the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

'But we are highly optimistic,' Comrade Dao Duy Tung emphasized. The Peking leaders' ambitions are big but their strength is limited, justice is not on their side.

Comrade Hong Chuong, Deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Cong San* recalled: 'Indeed, throughout the whole period of our liberation war against the U.S. aggression, the Peking leadership tried to involve us in its fight against the Soviet Union. Thus, the Chinese supplied us with pipes for an oil pipeline. We built it. Then they said: "We shall give you the oil, if you come out against the CPSU and the Soviet Union." We flatly refused.

'As soon as we liberated the whole country, the Chinese leadership began to cut back its assistance to Vietnam, slow down the projects, and in the summer of this year, as you are aware, stopped its aid altogether. They wanted to inflict an irreparable blow at our economy. But they failed to reckon with the power of socialist internationalism: the recent meeting of the CMEA Executive Committee in Ulan Bator adopted a decision to help Vietnam in completing the projects abandoned by the Chinese.

'While encouraging the ruling Pnom Penh clique in its efforts to take over South Vietnam, Peking strove to mount an uprising in the South with the help of the ethnic Chinese of Cholon, and the former officials of the puppet regime and reactionary Catholics. But these attempts were foiled due to the vigilance of our security organs.

'Some observers in the imperialist press assumed that the Peking rulers had been doing all this to divert attention from the difficulties and contradictions at home. There may be some truth in that, but their main purpose is to establish their hegemony in Southeast Asia with the help of the ethnic Chinese living in the countries of the region, and the pro-Chinese Communist Parties and groups operating some of these,'[3] Comrade Hong Chuong declared.

'The Chinese leaders took a hostile attitude to Vietnam, but it was never provoked by the Vietnamese side,' we were told by Comrade To Huu. 'Why have they done this? They want Vietnam to depend on Peking, they want us to abandon our independence, our solidarity with the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. They want us to come out against Lenin's country, the country of the first victorious socialist revolution, but only traitors who have abandoned

Marxism-Leninism and who have become allies of world imperialism could want this.

'They want us to live according to Mao Tse-tung thought, while we want to live according to Marxism-Leninism.

'The Peking rulers have come out in defense of the Chinese comprador bourgeoisie, and they claim to be communists. Who will now believe them?

'The Chinese leaders are swayed by the ideas of hegemonism, hopes of re-establishing the empire which had existed 2,000 years ago. They are following Mao's thought, and he wanted to lead 500 million poor Chinese peasants to take over Southeast Asia with the help of the 20 million ethnic Chinese residents in the area. They have come up against a barrier: united, socialist and independent Vietnam. That is why they have accused our country of having expansionist plans in Southeast Asia. The countries of Southeast Asia are beginning to understand the true meaning of Chinese policy, and this has been largely promoted by the visits to these countries by our Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, who has dispelled the suspicions with respect to Vietnam's policy in the region spread about by imperialist and Peking propaganda. A peaceful, independent, neutral and prosperous Southeast Asia is a blow at Peking's expansionist plans. In our determination to attain this goal, we are united with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community.'

'In accordance with their false "Three Worlds" theory,' Comrade To Huu continued, 'the Chinese leaders have concluded alliances with the reactionaries of the whole world, with the most reactionary regimes of the Pinochet type and leaders like Strauss. China is now rightly called NATO's Asian member. We Vietnamese have a saying: "You are dark near ink and white in light." Peking is now quite dark. Its policy fully encompasses the Chinese leadership's support for the Pol Poth — Ieng Sary clique, which has betrayed the Kampuchean people and is trying to destroy them. But we well know the friendly people of Kampuchea and are sure that they are strong enough to put an end to the bloody regime, which is digging its own grave.[4] Of course, Peking's alliance with world reaction is a grave threat and it should not be underestimated. However, the future does not belong to the reactionaries. They will not pass.

'The Peking leaders have accused us of being the Soviet Union's puppet. But we are no one's puppet. We are simply defending the cause of world revolution and the socialist community. And we are happy that we are in the frontline of this noble struggle.' Comrade To Huu concluded.

As we completed our work on this report, we heard an inspiring piece of news: on November 3, 1978, Vietnam and the USSR signed a

Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. We want to quote what Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said that day at a dinner in honor of the Vietnamese delegation: 'I am sure that everyone who wants lasting peace will learn with satisfaction of the conclusion of the Soviet-Vietnamese Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation.

'But one could also anticipate that it will not please those who do not like the friendship between the USSR and Vietnam, and who seek to build up tensions and divide the socialist countries.

'But the Treaty is already a political reality. And whether they want to or not, they will have to reckon with the reality.'

In reply, General Secretary of the CPV CC Le Duan said: 'The signed Treaty is a vivid reflection of the principles of proletarian internationalism, and a guarantee of unbreakable ties between our peoples within the socialist community, in the common struggle for full victory of the ideals and goals of our epoch.'

1. See *International Herald Tribune*, October 31, 1978.

2. At the end of 1978, a Kampuchean United Front of National Salvation was set up on liberated territory; it elected its leading organs and adopted a program.

3. One of us, a Filipino communist, knows from his own country's experience the harm they have been doing to the communist movement.

4. Vietnamese friends told us that because of the worldwide publicity of the bloody crimes of the Pnom Penh regime against its own people, Peking, engaged in an active foreign-policy drive to draw closer to the imperialist powers, is beginning to feel uncomfortable over its alliance with the Pol Poth — Ieng Sary clique. The Chinese leaders would perhaps not be sorry to see the Pnom Penh regime fall, as this would rid them of such an ally, while enabling them to level fresh charges of aggressive schemes against Vietnam. A little while later, we read an item which bore out this view. China's Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping told a group of Thai journalists: 'It would not be bad if Vietnam took Pnom Penh, for then the whole world would discover its intentions' (*Le Monde*, October 25, 1978).

The Cuban revolution — a qualitative advance in the struggle of the Latin American peoples

For the Latin American continent the first day of the year 1959 signified much more than the commencement of a new period of the earth's rotation round the sun. The triumph of the Cuban revolution ushered in a new stage in the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean. An epoch-making event that punctured the geographical fatalism in the views held about our region by wavering and defeatist elements in the liberation movement took place in a relatively small country situated in close proximity to one of the world's strongest imperialist powers. The Cuban revolution demonstrated the hollowness of the Maoist theory that in our day a revolution can only triumph in the flames of a world conflagration and, moreover, it showed that the proletariat and its allies can assume power in one country in our continent without waiting for a revolutionary explosion in a majority of the Latin American states.

Further confirmation of Marxist-Leninist theory

The Cuban revolution has in fact borne out the conclusions, formulated by communist and workers' parties at international meetings, about the deepening of capitalism's general crisis, the new alignment of forces on the world scene favoring the revolutionary process, and the distinctive features, character, and content of our epoch. Revolutionary practice has confirmed the theory of Marxism-Leninism, swept away many obstacles and pseudo-scientific theories, and enriched the forces fighting imperialism, for democracy and socialism.

A beacon illumining the road of the Latin American revolutionary movement stands in the sight of all peoples only 90 miles from the citadel of world imperialism. No sooner had that beacon been lit than imperialism went to all lengths to extinguish it. It was joined by a cohort of so-called friends, who made every effort to dim the beacon's light. They shouted that the Cuban revolution was a 'revolution without ideology,' a 'special socialism,' and so on, that it had been accomplished in spite of the laws of social development formulated by Marxism-Leninism. But these were time-worn, specious theories proferred in a new packing. Carlos Balino, a comrade-in-arms of Jose Marti during the struggle for independence and later

one of the founders of the first Communist Party of Cuba, showed the entire hollowness of the arguments about a 'special socialism' for Cuba. 'This "special socialism" they speak of,' he said, 'contains much that is special, but there is nothing of socialism in it.'[1] Julio Antonio Mella, also a founding member of the Communist Party of Cuba, refuted analogous theories of the APRA, a Peruvian bourgeois party, relative not only to Cuba but to the whole of Latin America. He said: 'In order to declare that Marxism and, consequently, the Communist Party, i.e., the organization that undertakes to translate this teaching into life, are an exotic plant in America it must be proved that there is no proletariat here; that there is no imperialism with all the features brought to light by the Marxists; that the productive forces in America differ from the productive forces of Asia and Europe, and so on.'[2]

Comrade Fidel Castro, leader of the revolution and socialist construction in Cuba, declared on July 26, 1965, refuting these theories: 'What they did not know before was how well Marxist-Leninist ideas take root in our climate.'[3] At the celebrations of the 25th anniversary of the storming of the Moncada barracks, he characterized the general and specific features of the Cuban revolutionary process as follows: 'The revolutionaries of our day owe the vast fund of ideas at their disposal to the creators of scientific socialism: Marx, Engels, and Lenin. It is indisputable that without them our people would not have made such dramatic social and political progress. However, even with them we would not have achieved this progress if the grains of prolific ideas and unbounded heroism had not been sown in the minds of our people by Marti, Maceo, Gomez, Agramonte, Cespedes, and other giants of our national history.

'The specific conditions of development in Cuba and the militant traditions of the Cuban people combined with the consistent application of universal principles, which cannot be ignored, ensured the accomplishment of a genuine revolution in Cuba.'[4]

A new historical situation

The leftist elements of all stripes who are trying to prove that the Cuban revolution was almost like a bolt from the blue, that it owed its accomplishment solely to the courage of a few people, have likewise been effectively rebuffed by the leaders of socialist Cuba. The Cuban communists have proved that the revolution triumphed because the objective and subjective conditions for it had taken shape on both the national and the international scenes. In a recent interview Castro said: 'I believe that if we had deposed Batista in 1953 imperialism would have been able to crush us. The point is that the alignment of forces in the world changed significantly in the period from 1953 to

1959 ... The Soviet Union was still relatively weak at the time. Besides, it should be borne in mind that it was namely the Soviet Union that extended decisive assistance, which it was in no position to render in 1953. This is my opinion.'[5]

In the early half of the 1950s U.S. imperialism suffered ignoble defeat in Korea. Later, a successful war of liberation unfolded in Algeria against French imperialism, while in Vietnam the patriotic forces won a decisive victory at Dien Bien Phu. All these facts were evidence of a general upswing of the liberation struggle. However, in that period imperialism, chiefly U.S. imperialism, was still in a position to inflict, albeit temporary, defeat on various contingents of the world revolutionary movement, on champions of progress, a case in point being Guatemala, where the democratic government of Jacobo Arbenz was overthrown as a result of U.S. intervention supported by the puppet Organization of American States (OAS).

However, the revolutionary torrent, in which the three basic streams — the socialist world system, the international working-class movement, and the national-liberation movement — merge, was steadily rising and inexorably paving the way for itself. In 1956 the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary was put down and, thanks to the resistance of the people and the solidarity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialist aggression against Egypt was repulsed. In those years a significant upsurge of the mass struggle against reactionary governments and imperialism was observed in Latin America. Some dictatorships were overthrown and other major victories were won as a result of the offensive of militant revolutionary forces headed by the communist parties.

As the Program Platform of the Communist Party of Cuba notes, the Cuban revolution, which ushered in a new stage in the struggles of the peoples of Latin America, was accomplished at precisely that historical moment. In other words, on the Island of Freedom the revolution took place as a result of the heroic and resolute actions of the Cuban freedom fighters under favorable external and internal conditions. Moreover, its birth and development are leading to further changes in the alignment of forces on the international scene, particularly in the developing world.

Force of example

The Cuban revolution and its accomplishments inspire the peoples of Latin America in their struggle for life, land and a better future. It eloquently shows the working masses that not only can the enemy be defeated but that a nation can resolve its most complex problems in the course of socialist construction.

The revolution has put into effect a far-reaching agrarian reform,

transferring land gratuitously to the working peasants and helping the agricultural cooperatives. It nationalized the latifundia of the U.S. monopolies and the landowning oligarchy, creating large state agricultural enterprises on expropriated land.

The new state did away with unemployment, ensured the right to work, reduced rents, and rapidly built a large number of dwellings and many modern townships in different parts of the country. Soon after its triumph it put an end to gambling, drug-addiction, prostitution, and destitution, and instituted social insurance for aged and disabled people, free medical care for all citizens, and social equality for women.

The revolution nationalized the education system, wiped out illiteracy, enlarged the network of educational establishments, improved the methods of teaching, and tied it in more closely with labor. It stripped culture of its élitist character, placed it in the service of the people, and gave its citizens every possibility for taking up physical culture and sports.

On the economic level the revolution strengthened and continues to strengthen the national economy, promoting its planned development and making every effort to satisfy the material and intellectual requirements of the people. By placing the principal means of production in the hands of the working people it guaranteed the people's social and economic rights. This is seen in the people's growing participation in economic management and in the solution of social and economic problems. Socialist Cuba pursues an independent foreign policy, consistently fosters fraternal friendship and close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in keeping with the principles of proletarian internationalism, unremittingly shows its militant solidarity with the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa, and cooperates with all countries that respect its sovereignty.

In the long run the revolution and socialist construction have brought the Cuban people confidence in the present and the morrow. It is, therefore, not fortuitous that while other peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean are exploited ruthlessly, while Latin American society is afflicted with ills such as unemployment, the high cost of living, hunger, dispossession of land, illiteracy, and the lack of a future for young people, socialism's imposing achievements in Cuba are helping to bolster the militant spirit of the working class, the peasants, and all other working people, and to reinforce the revolutionary firmness of their vanguard, the communist parties.

The Cuban revolution has demonstrated that the revolutionary vanguard is able to unite all democratic, anti-imperialist, and socialist forces in the struggle for, and consequently, the building of social-

ism. It has shown that the national bourgeoisie, which can play an active part in the anti-monopoly alliance, is no longer able to head the deep-going, genuinely revolutionary movement. It has been proved once again that in order to build socialism the proletariat, led by its party and in alliance with the peasants and all the other strata interested in the revolution, should win supremacy in the revolutionary process. The need for a state of a new type with a new social content has been lucidly borne out. The modern Cuban state is a socialist state of workers and peasants, a state of all workers by hand and by brain, a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a state that is profoundly democratic.

Within a short span of time the Cuban revolution brought genuine national independence, accomplishing an uninterrupted transition from the national-liberation and people's democratic stage to the socialist, establishing socialist property in the basic means of production and, in the process of its development, abolishing exploitation of man by man.

The huge contribution made by the Communist Party of Cuba, and of its leaders to the building of the new society is worthy of admiration. Fidel Castro spoke very vividly and highly of the work that has been done by the Marxist-Leninist party, 'The party,' he declared, 'is the personification of everything. In it are embodied the hopes of all revolutionaries throughout our history. It mirrors the ideas, principles, and strength of the revolution.'[6]

In the new world situation, the example of Cuba, which defied the U.S., has unquestionably had a powerful influence on different bourgeois and petty-bourgeois governments, Under pressure from their peoples these governments have begun showing some independence relative to the northern 'colossus.' More and more countries are promoting relations with Cuba, refusing to take part in blockading and isolating it. New form of inter-state relations, for instance, the Andes Pact, the Latin American Economic System, and the Caribbean Multinational Fleet, are emerging in the region. In parallel, trade and diplomatic relations with socialist countries have expanded. As a consequence of the new trends, the old voting system, under which the Latin American states automatically supported the USA, is no longer working in the United Nations and other international organizations.

Wounded imperialism demonstrates its fury

Shortly after the triumph of the Cuban revolution and the failure of the attempts to destroy it, U.S. imperialism found that the example and revolutionizing influence of Cuba were imperilling its supremacy in the continent. The first move stemming from recognition of this

'peril' was the creation of the Alliance for Progress, which was a sort of reformist alternative to the Cuban revolution. It was conceived by U.S. President John F. Kennedy in May 1961, and in August of the same year his brainchild was endorsed at the OAS conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay, by representatives of Latin American countries, with the exception of Cuba's delegate Ernesto Che Guevara. The founders and spokesmen of the Alliance for Progress counted on support from the masses and demagogically pressed for structural reforms, endeavoring to give its program out for concord between governments, entrepreneurs, and workers, as a powerful means of reconciling classes in the drive for the 'common' ideals of progress and development of Latin America. However, this scenario quickly collapsed and was consigned to the dust heap. Later U.S. imperialism began supporting governments that came forward with programs for economic growth, thereby attempting to block the realization of a genuine revolution.

This was not the only tactic employed by imperialism in its efforts to prevent the influence of the Cuban revolution from spreading in Latin America and the Caribbean. It has recourse to blockades, to military intervention, to sabotage and provocations, at the same time mounting an offensive against other progressive governments in the region. Imperialism organized coups and extended immense assistance to fascist and reactionary forces. The fascist coups against the governments of Goulart in Brazil, Torres in Bolivia, and Allende in Chile are, among other things, eloquent examples of the policy of the U.S. State Department and the CIA in protecting the interests of U.S. imperialism and in 'respecting human rights' advocated so strongly by the incumbent President of the USA, James Carter.

However, imperialism's aggressions and intrigues have fallen and will always fall short of their aims. They will never bring the Western Hemisphere's first socialist country to its knees. This will not take place thanks to the heroism of its people, the firm and skillful leadership of the Communist Party, and the internationalist solidarity of the working people of Latin America and the whole world, chiefly of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This massive support is bringing into ever bolder relief the disgraceful, treacherous role played by the present leaders of China, who justify the economic blockade of Cuba and the maintenance of a U.S. naval base on its territory.

Proletarian internationalism lives in the heart of the Cuban revolution

Socialist Cuba has received tremendous internationalist assistance, for which its leaders and people have repeatedly expressed their heartfelt

gratitude. However, Cuba does not confine itself to this but is itself always prepared to extend disinterested aid to all peoples fighting for liberation and defending their gains against imperialist aggression. The leader of the Cuban revolution said: 'Internationalism is the most eloquent manifestation of Marxism-Leninism and of its ideas of solidarity and brotherhood among peoples. The Cuban revolution would simply have been unable to exist without internationalist solidarity. To be an internationalist means to discharge one's duty to mankind.'[7]

In 1963 Cuban internationalists fought as volunteers shoulder to shoulder with Algerians to repulse aggression against Algeria. Soon after the outbreak of the last war of the Arab states with Israel in 1973, they acted on the side of Syria. Many of them laid down their lives with Che Guevara or fought shoulder to shoulder with the patriots of Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Ethiopia.

This firm, internationalist stand by Cuba has won the respect of the peoples of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, of the working people of the whole world. The conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean in Havana in June 1975 re-emphasized Cuba's immense contribution to the revolutionary movement in the region. 'The Cuban revolution meant a historic change in the life of Latin America. . . . Today the Cuban people are a remarkable symbol of revolutionary unity, national and internationalist awareness, ascendant culture and ethics. They have advanced their revolution, defended it on all fronts, reorganized and confidently expanded the crisis-free economy, and asserted fraternal ties with other socialist countries and all states opposed to imperialism. The Cuban revolution marks a sharp turn in the struggle against imperialist domination on the continent, making it much broader and deeper in character. It exercises a considerable influence on international affairs.'[8]

The important international meetings held in Cuba, for instance, the above-mentioned meeting of Communist Parties, the 11th World Youth and Student Festival, and the conference of non-aligned nations scheduled for 1979, are likewise eloquent evidence of the prestige enjoyed by the Island of Freedom on the international scene.

For the proletariat and peoples of Latin America the victory of the Cuban revolution meant a victory of their own, which inspired them with new strength and courage in their unrelenting struggle against imperialism, for their liberation. From this victory the communist parties drew the only valid conclusion, that it has borne out the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolutionary reshaping of the world, that this is a universal theory and is applicable in all countries in keeping with the general regularities of world development and the specific conditions obtaining in each country.

The Cuban revolution marked the beginning of the victorious socialist revolution on the American continent.

WMR Commission on Problems of Latin America and the Caribbean

1. *La luz de las ideas de la Revolucion de Octubre*. Moscu, 1978, p. 105.
2. Ibid., pp. 105-106.
3. Ibid., p. 106.
4. *Granma*, July 27, 1978.
5. Casa de las Americas, No. 109, 1978, p.13.
6. Primer Congreso del Partido Communista de Cuba, Informe Central. Havana, 1976, p. 203.
7. *Granma*, July 27, 1978.
8. 'Latin America in the Struggle Against Imperialism, for National Independence, Democracy, People's Welfare, Peace and Socialism.' *Information Bulletin*, 1975, No. 12.

Norway: communists against monopoly

Hans I. Kleven
Deputy Chairman, CP of Norway

For a number of reasons, Norway is among the last countries to have felt the impact of the worst postwar crisis of the capitalist economy, which began in 1974 and then became a protracted depression. Besides, crisis phenomena do not at the moment make themselves felt in our country as strongly as in other industrial capitalist countries.

All this is largely due to the vast popular movement against monopoly, which has kept Norway out of the EEC. It thus retains its independence on major economic-policy issues, in particular oil production on its North Sea shelf. And because it does not belong to the Common Market, Norway is in a position to control labor and capital transfers more effectively than EEC members. Our legislation on concessions is intended to safeguard the national economy against excessive foreign penetration. (True, it has not prevented foreign capital from capturing strong positions in electro-metallurgy, electro-chemistry and mining.)

North Sea oil has enabled industry, especially the shipyards, which build oil rigs, to use hitherto idle capacities and achieve full employ-

We continue the discussion of the crisis of capitalism (see *WMR*, January, March, June, November and December 1978).

ment. The prospect of huge oil profits offers Norway almost unlimited opportunities to obtain foreign credits. However, this has also had its adverse effects: the government and the monopolies seized on these opportunities and greatly increased the foreign debt.

Even so, the decisive thing is that the Storting and the government, and not the Common Market, make the political decisions. This may prove important in planning measures against the crisis. By contrast, the dependence of neighboring Denmark on guidelines from Brussels restricts its freedom in pursuing a dynamic economic policy and aggravates the impact of the crisis.

Of late, however, Norway has been increasingly affected by the crisis and depression. This was predictable since Norway is a component of the capitalist system. Workers are dismissed, pensioned ahead of time or put on a shorter work-week with lower pay.

Registered unemployment is still no more than one per cent, but hidden unemployment is much higher, especially in some areas. In addition to the reasons I have mentioned, unemployment is relatively low because the Norwegian trade union movement has greater possibilities of influencing economic policy than, say, its West German counterparts. This means that the Norwegian government is constantly under strong union pressure to pay special attention to the problem of employment.

Nevertheless, the threat of mass unemployment is growing. Owing to the country's geography (the fact that Norway stretches in a narrow strip from north to south and is cut up by lakes), the reduction of jobs spells disaster for the population of isolated areas where there is little or no industry. Many an area is dependent on a single industrial enterprise. Communities are far apart and communication poor or expensive, so that changing a job entails big social, economic and family problems.

Industrial activity is still fairly high. In spite of recurrent price increases, high taxes and declining real wages, no sharp drop in income or living standard has occurred so far. What gives cause for concern, however, is that the monopolies have already mounted an offensive against the working people's personal consumption and such vital areas of social consumption as the health and education services.

Norway is dependent on foreign trade more than any other country. It exports about one-fourth of its gross national product (in value). Its foreign trade situation has markedly deteriorated. The government's long-term program envisaged a nearly six per cent increase in traditional exports in 1977. Instead, exports decreased by approximately 5.8 per cent, nearly 12 per cent below the target figure. In 1977 imports exceeded exports by 20,000 mln. kroner, or 25 per cent. Plans

for 1978 envisaged a balance of payments deficit of 8,000 mln. kroner (anticipating, among other things, an increase in earnings from oil sales). The actual deficit will reach 20,000 mln. kroner. In 1978 Norway's foreign debt will top 100,000 mln. kroner.

The fall-off in foreign trade is due, among other things, to the fact that Norway, like other industrial capital countries, finds itself in the vicious circle of insoluble economic contradictions. One of these is the desire of every capitalist country to refrain from stimulating domestic demand so as to restrict imports and achieve economic growth through exports. But when this device is used by all countries simultaneously the result is an impasse.

At this stage of the crisis, industrial growth is very low in all capitalist countries, and is almost nil in some of them. It is lowest of all in Sweden, Britain, West Germany and Denmark — Norway's main trade partners. Norway's export pattern is unfavorable; it includes fish products, products of the wood-working and metal-working industries, metals and chemicals, mostly fertilizers.

There is also a sharp drop in revenues from oil exports and taxes. Oil exports have brought in less than expected (115,000 mln. kroner instead of the expected 140,000 mln. in four years). Tax revenues will drop in the next four years from 70,000 mln. to 50,000 mln. kroner. Moreover, the working of new deposits will require greater investments than envisaged. Today's capacities cannot raise oil and gas output to the planned 90 million tons per year.

Shipping, a sphere in which capitalist economic anarchy is more marked than in any other,* poses acute problems. The shipyards are running out of orders. Once the demand for oil rigs has been met, many yards will have to close down. Shipping is declining noticeably. Many shipping companies have failed and a number of others are kept going only through government subsidies. It looks like the end of Norway's golden age in shipping.

The upheavals experienced in so important an economic field necessarily give rise to structural changes throughout Norwegian industry, primarily in shipbuilding, which employs a large work force. With the disastrous decline in the demand for tankers, what is to keep the bigger shipyards in business?

How do the ruling quarters try to cope with the economic and social problems compounded by the crisis?

The rightists, who were unable to break through to power in spite of substantial gains in the general election in the autumn of 1977, want the people to bear all the hardships. Using high production costs, the

*At the close of 1977, about one-fifth of Norway's merchant tonnage, which adds up to 26,300,000 gross tons, or seven per cent of the world tonnage, was laid up. By July 1, 1978, it had dropped to 25 million gross tons.

difficulty of selling output and increased competition on the foreign market as an excuse, spokesmen of monopoly capital firmly resist the workers' demand for higher wages, job security, shorter working time and a lower pension age.

Throughout the postwar years the state has been playing a growing role in the economic and social spheres in general and in the development of monopoly capital and the concentration of capital in particular. Monopoly capital fuses increasingly with the state and now exerts a stronger influence on the latter over a widening range of important problems.

In view of the crisis, the state led by the social democrats aids industrial and major shipping companies by granting them loans, subsidies and guarantees. In the first half of 1978, the state wrote off private industry debts exceeding 200 mln. kroner. It also paid off some of the loans granted by it and allocated substantial sums for the purchase of shares and the granting of new loans. In the same half-year, the share of the state in new financing exceeded 1,000 mln. kroner. Shipbuilding firms were allowed to defer payment of loans.

The support which the working people gave the social-democratic Labor Party in the elections, enabling it to stay in power, was conditional on meeting certain demands. They wanted the government to protect jobs and real wages or, in other words, to solve major economic and social problems in favor of the working class and not at its expense.

Months before the general election, the Central Executive of the Communist Party issues a policy statement calling for a government that would put the country on to a democratic and anti-monopoly road.

'Such a government should seek support chiefly among the left-wing forces of the working-class movement,' the statement pointed out, 'Neither the present government led by right-wing social democrats, nor the governments of the bourgeois parties to the right of the Labor Party have demonstrated the will or ability to solve the country's fundamental problems in favor of the working people. Not one of these governments has shaken the power of big capital. On the contrary, big capital has been strengthening both its power and its positions in the postwar period. In foreign policy the emphasis has been invariably on Norway's membership of NATO, which ties it to the United States and West European powers. . . .

'On the eve of the coming general election, the Communist Party considers it important to state its view on the nature of the future government. We are explicitly and emphatically against a government headed or backed by the Hoyre party and other conservative forces. The social composition of the Norwegian people and the strength of

the trade union movement can only be represented by a government that has emerged from the working-class movement. Power must not go to a government representing reaction, a government that would be still more committed to exploitation of the working people and the continued enrichment of the big companies, a government opposed to détente and disarmament and, moreover, declaring for an arms build-up rather than for disarmament.'

In other words, we gave preference in the election campaign to a Labor government as against a Hoyre-led bourgeois cabinet. But we did so not because we considered it 'good.' In our view, such a government was the only realistic alternative at the given stage to a bourgeois coalition government. The CPN insisted that the social democrats should follow an economic and social policy in keeping with the interests of the working class, that is, aimed primarily at providing full employment and raising real wages. This did not happen, however.

The social democrats' traditional reformist policy is obviously in crisis. This also applies to the reformist neo-Keynesian economic thinking underlying it.

Ever since 1936, when the social democrats came to power, they have used available possibilities to pursue a policy of social reform intended to bring about full employment. However, this policy did not affect the foundations of the capitalist system, which has become stronger still.

The pre-war arms race, postwar rehabilitation and the militarization resulting from the cold war and Norway's membership of NATO, plus diverse economic regulation measures, have combined to keep down unemployment. Since the war we have had almost continuous economic growth and what is to all intents full employment.

This provided fertile soil for myths about the 'affluent society,' 'crisis-free' development, a 'mixed economy' and 'continuous and steady economic growth.' Leading social democrats have even come to call Marx a 'retired prophet' and his theory of crises, an 'obsolete dogma.' They have suggested replacing the class struggle by class collaboration and instead of regulating capital and reducing profits, they proposed 'stabilizing' the capitalist system.

For a long time advocacy of such reformist ideas did not tell on the vital interests of the working class. Real wages went up somewhat and the standard of life showed a certain improvement thanks to a steep rise in labor productivity and to social reforms wrested by the workers. Nor did the situation change much when the crisis hit the capitalist system.

Social-democratic leaders and economists expected the world

economic crisis to start on a downward trend before it could affect Norway to any considerable extent. But when their expectations failed to materialize and the 'economic prerequisites changed noticeably,' as the government admitted, they had to revise the key aspects of their economic policy. How was this policy carried on? At whose expense and what cost? Who were the losers and who the winners?

Thinking and proceeding on typically social-democratic lines, the government gave in to the pressure of the big industrialists, bankers, insurance companies and ship-owners and their organizations. Instead of curbing monopoly profits and taking steps against tax-evading big capital, it used the need to 'put the national economy on its feet' as a pretext to urge the wage and salary earners, fishermen, small peasants and other small producers to accept a lower standard of living and cut consumption. The government increased indirect taxes, curtailed consumer credits and put up rents.

At that crucial juncture, which for the first time in years laid bare the inherent evils and insoluble contradictions of Norwegian capitalism, the government did not venture beyond a timid revision of its long-term program and the national budget. Indeed, it is going to jettison its traditional policy by announcing a 'pause in reform.'

The government wants to reduce demand substantially through its tax policy (granting easier terms to companies and raising consumer tax) and its credit policy (housing loans at higher interest, cuts in consumer credits and in appropriations for public health and education). The planned devaluation of the krone will enable export enterprises, or, in other words, the major monopolies, to derive bigger profits. At the same time, it will limit import opportunities and so hit the consumer. The government intends to resist demands for higher wages. In this way it expects to make industry more competitive, on the one hand, and curtail the working people's purchasing power, on the other, so as to reduce the foreign debt.

Measures of this nature add to the discontent in the trade union movement and are bound to give rise to new sharp contradictions among the social democrats, especially over relations between the trade union movement and the government, inside the various unions and between the unions and the social-democratic leadership.

The impasses of social-democratic reformism highlight the need for a new, democratic and anti-monopoly economic policy. And in the manifesto 'Unity of the Workers in the Struggle to End the Capitalist Crisis,' adopted by the 16th CPN Congress (April 1978), we communists urge 'expanding public consumption by increasing construction and investment in public health, social needs, transport, education, scientific research and culture.' The manifesto also demands better living conditions for the working people in accordance with

technological progress and rising productivity, as well as a shorter working week, longer holidays, larger holiday bonuses and a lower pension age. Other priority measures listed in the manifesto are regulation of interest on loans and effective price and profit control.

The central provision of the manifesto is an alternative, anti-monopoly, anti-crisis policy. 'The economic life of the country, especially industrial investment,' the manifesto says, 'should follow a national plan, with the parliamentary agencies and the trade union movement playing the chief role. At the same time, it is indispensable to promote real production democracy under which the wage and salary earners will have an effective say in managing the enterprises. Planned people's control over economic life implies the early nationalization of banking, in which the greater part of private financial capital is concentrated, the nationalization of major metal-working enterprises (including the shipbuilding companies), the paper industry and the foreign-owned enterprises of the chemical, aluminum, electrical engineering and metallurgical industries.'

To prevent unemployment in shipbuilding, the CPN proposes placing orders for oil-drilling equipment with shipyards. We realize, however, that this is no more than a palliative. What is needed is to nationalize shipbuilding and put it under democratic control both 'from above,' on the part of parliamentary agencies, and 'from below,' on the part of shipbuilding workers and other employees.

In view of the special role of foreign trade in the national economy, our party has called for control over it. 'Free trade,' it says in its manifesto, 'must give way to a system of long-term trade agreements. Imports of machinery and plant must be put under control and so must trade in important raw materials, including oil.'

The communists emphasize that this democratic alternative of ending the crisis is closely linked with the struggle for peace, détente and disarmament. The manifesto demands a reduction of the military budget and foreign arms purchases, which should release large public funds to meet pressing civilian requirements, in particular by creating new jobs and preserving old ones. 'Thereby Norway would take a concrete step toward détente and disarmament.'

Rapid progress in science and technology and the country's production potential provide the objective requisites of pursuing a dynamic and democratic economic policy. 'The working people of Norway must not reconcile themselves to the economic decline of the country, to unemployment and a lower standard of living. This trend of development is at variance with the country's production, technological and professional resources and possibilities. The social gains and standard of living won by the working people must be furthered by using the achievements of science and technology to

meet the people's material and cultural requirements. Restrictive measures must not be directed against ordinary consumers. They must strike at big capital and speculators.'

'None but the people themselves can cope with the threatening economic situation,' said the 16th Party Congress in its message to the working people's organizations and the progressive forces of the nation. 'It is necessary to create a broad popular movement based above all on organized labor, a movement that would defeat every attempt to "resolve" the crisis at the working people's expense, at the expense of social measures by the state and measures to raise the living standard. The only way to gear the national economy to meeting the people's needs and guaranteeing their future is to limit freedom of action of big capital, interfere effectively in its economic power and release Norway from the shackles of the international capitalist system.'

The manifesto and the party's other economic-policy documents should be seen as components of our party's anti-monopoly strategy, whose long-range goal is socialism. This strategy maintains that at every stage of the struggle the working class plays the leading revolutionary role, that it operates as the leading force in the most important fields. This strategy provides for the formation of a broad anti-monopoly alliance whose mainstay and leading force will be a united working class.

'Whatever concrete anti-crisis measures are proposed by the communist parties, they do not forget the perspective,' wrote William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, in his article 'The capitalist crisis and the communists,' which opened a discussion of the problems of the current stage of the general crisis of capitalism. 'The communists strive to find a way out of the crisis that would make it possible to advance to the ultimate goal — to genuine democracy, to genuine social progress, to socialism.'*

This approach fully accords with our own point of view. We Norwegian communists consider that our principal task is to use the present crisis of capitalism for shaking this antiquated social-economic formation and hastening its final downfall. The best way to achieve this in a developed bourgeois democratic country like Norway is to carry on a day-by-day class struggle against capital in the enterprises themselves and use the trade union movement and its opportunities for struggle to change and influence state policy. In so doing, account must be taken of the actual economic and socio-political situation and the needs and social consciousness level of the working class.

*WMR, January 1978, p. 78.

The trade unions as a mass organization of the working class have far from exhausted their potentialities. They still confine themselves to economic struggles, that is, to struggles over wages and other everyday social issues. This is largely due to their reformist leadership and semi-syndicalist and narrow-union principles. Renouncing these traditions, this one-sidedness and narrow approach, is decisive for success in the anti-imperialist struggle.

One of the communists' priority task is to help make the trade union movement more militant and unfold the class struggle in the enterprises. It is essential to influence the evolution of the movement and at the same time to increase our leverage in it, particularly in the enterprises. We consider that the trade union movement must play a big role in the reorganization of Norwegian society on democratic and socialist lines.

The further fusion of the state with monopoly capital poses new and bigger tasks. State 'interference' in the economy, much advertised by social-reformists, does not change the substance of the matter, for the right of ownership, management, control and profit is still exercised by big private shareholders and big financial capital. The focal place now held by the state in the economy prompts us to ask more emphatically than ever: Whose interests is the economic policy of the state to serve? Is it to meet the interests of monopoly capital as it does today or to be put in the service of the working class and other working people?

The new draft Action Program of the CPN answers these questions in no uncertain terms: *'With the role of the state in the economy growing, the economic policy of the state is becoming more important and essential to the struggle of the working class.* This trend itself makes it necessary to increase the scale and raise the level of the workers' struggle and demands. They can no longer be met by action at enterprise level. The struggle must turn increasingly against monopoly and such important aspects of official activity as budget policy, value-added tax, distribution of the national income or "incomes policy."

'The workers' economic demands are merging with their political demands. Guaranteed jobs, continued social progress, growing security, protection of the environment in and outside the country, and struggle for the rights of women and youth all depend on struggle for further democratization and workers' control, for national independence, peace and détente, for the international cooperation of the working class in the trade union and political spheres. These demands will be gradually linked with the struggle for the *democratic alternative to monopoly domination.*'

The scope of the tasks and demands of the trade union movement is

expanding as a state-monopoly capitalism develops. Along with the traditional demands for stable or higher real wages, better working conditions, shorter working time, and so on, the trade union movement comes up against economic and political problems at state and national level. Due to objective conditions, the struggle for the solution of these problems makes relations between the trade union movement and the state one of the main problems of the revolutionary strategy of the working class.

Thus the very dialectic of the revolutionary process brings the trade union movement into a direct clash, not only with individual capitalists and their organizations, but with the bourgeois state as a whole. The trade union movement must take a stand on every aspect of socio-economic policy and considerably extend the range of its demands. In other words, the task is not only to grapple with the problem of numerical growth of the movement but to give its activity a new qualitative turn.

This is not to say, of course, that progress in the trade union movement will in itself make the political parties of the working class redundant or diminish their role. On the contrary, the expanding activity and tasks of the movement confront these parties, first of all the CPN, with new, still bigger and more difficult problems. The importance of an ideologically, politically and organizationally strong Communist Party is growing in step with the development of state-monopoly capitalism.

Every manifestation of syndicalism or anarcho-syndicalism, every attempt to present the trade union movement as a self-sufficing force, must be resisted. The illusion that the trade union movement can 'settle everything' is particularly widespread where the movement is controlled by large social-democratic parties and right-wing opportunist leaders. And this is the case in Norway.

These tendencies can only be defeated through active effort by the Communist Party, through ideological struggle on its part with strong support from the masses, particularly in the enterprises and the trade union movement. The working class can never fulfill its historic mission — winning political power and building a socialist society — without a communist party leading the workers' struggle and basing its entire activity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Political lessons of the latest local elections in Israel

Tawfiq Toubi
Deputy General Secretary,
CC CP of Israel

The municipal elections in Israel, which were held on the 7th and 21st of November, 1978, are considered of special political importance for two reasons: (1) they were the first 'general' elections to be held since the ultra-nationalist Likud government came to power (June 1978), and (2) they were the first 'general' elections to be held since the Camp David agreements in the atmosphere of a pressure campaign aimed at misleading public opinion and forcing the Palestinian Arab people to their knees.

The election results proved that in spite of the Begin government's 'historic achievement' — 'forcing the biggest Arab country, Egypt, to its knees' — the Israeli voters had in effect curbed the Likud. The Communist Party of Israel and the Democratic Front led by it, campaigning under the slogan '*No* to the Camp David conspiracy, *yes* to a just and lasting peace,' achieved a convincing victory in the elections among the Arabs, who constitute 15 per cent of the country's population.

The recent elections emphasized the disappointment with and lack of confidence in the parties and blocs of the ruling class — the Likud, Maarach[1] and Mafdal.[2] The reactionary parties of the Likud bloc, which had hoped that a change in their favor would take place at local level since a government led by them had taken over, were sorely disappointed.

The elections were distinguished by a large number of abstentions. Although they were held on a rest day the turnout did not exceed 55 per cent nationally and was as low as 50 per cent in the big cities.

The large proportion of abstentions was undoubtedly due to political as well as social causes. It was an expression of disillusionment with the performance of the leading parties in both central and local government.

Neither the Nobel Prize awarded to Prime Minister Begin, nor the Camp David 'peace' accords helped the Likud. The fact that the Likud defeated the Maarach bloc in ten small localities is certainly no

comfort for its shattered hopes. However, many voters, mostly in the big cities and particularly in the Jewish sector, do not yet see any alternative to the existing reactionary parties.

By contrast, the turnout in the Arab communities ranged between 75 and 80 per cent and in some places was as high as 90 per cent. This was due to the mobilizing and inspiring alternative of the candidates of the communist-led Democratic Front. It was also a result of the activity of many groups representing local interests.

One of the reasons why the electorate distrusts the leading parties and blocs — the Likud, Maarach and Mafdal — is that it holds them responsible for the increasing public debt, which is 14,000 m. now and is actually bigger than the annual budgets of all local councils in the current fiscal year. The voters also hold these parties responsible for the decline in government support for local councils.

It should be pointed out that Shelly[3] did not win a single seat on any municipal council although it campaigned in three cities: Tel-Aviv-Jaffa, Jerusalem and Beersheba. Its refusal to cooperate with the CPI and DF in the municipal elections, and the sectarian line adopted by its leadership caused it harm. Had it accepted the proposal made during negotiations with the CPI to join in the elections in Tel-Aviv on a common program and with a common list, there would have been a good chance of bringing in at least one mandate on the municipal council, as the election results showed.

The outcome of the elections was a great success for the CPI, which cooperated in the DF with other democratic forces on the basis of a common program.

The DF was successful in the elections of mayors and heads of council in 20 cases compared with nine in the previous elections. It won 112 seats on 37 local councils compared with 54 seats on 23 councils previously. In all communities (with the exception of two) in which we were represented, we either retained our positions or extended them.

This was a notable victory for the CPI and DF, for which credit is due to the party, its members, youth organization, sympathizers and allies in the local democratic fronts with whom we fight in common for democracy, equal rights and a just peace.

The DF's success in Nazareth is worthy of special note. Tawfiq Zayad was re-elected mayor (62.7 per cent of the vote); besides, 11 DF candidates were elected to the municipal council as in the previous elections (out of 17). These are all noteworthy gains for the people of Nazareth, the whole Arab population, the DF, and the country's forces of democracy, progress and peace.

We are also glad to point out the success of the CPI and DF in Haifa, where the candidate of the Jewish and Arab democratic forces

was elected to the municipal council for the first time after a break of almost 20 years.

The CPI and DF victory in Nazareth and among the Arab population of the country as a whole stands out in the light of the following political realities:

(1) attempts by government agencies to frustrate the activity of the democratic administration of the Nazareth municipality which had never ceased since it was elected in 1975;

(2) continuous subversion by government and reactionary anti-communist elements aimed at splitting the DF in Nazareth and inducing it to distrust the CPI;

(3) the unity of all Zionist blocs and parties — the Likud, Maarach and Mafdal, their coordinated action and mobilization of all their agents in a single camp against the CPI and DF;

(4) the political conditions prevailing in the region after the Camp David agreements, the heavy pressure exerted on the Palestinian Arab people and the Arab population of Israel by the most diverse forces, including the government and its allies, pro-imperialist Arab reaction, reactionaries among the Arab population itself, and pressure designed to sow despair and impose capitulation to the government's policy;

(5) the existence in a number of places of various extreme nationalist elements, including highly dubious ones, who openly took a stand against the candidates of the democratic fronts and caused damage in some communities.

The outcome of the elections showed again that the CPI plays a leading and unifying role among the Arab population of Israel. Moreover, this role has objective origins and is a fruit of historical development and of the party's correct policy.

The Arab population's massive support for the DF candidate was an expression of opposition to the policy of national discrimination and of a resolve to fight for equal rights. It was also an expression of confidence in the peace policy of the CPI and DF.

The success of the DF list proved the correctness of the line of the 18th CPI Congress, which stressed the importance of establishing and developing a broad democratic front at national level with due regard to local conditions. The election results also proved the correctness of the resolutions of the June 1978 national conference, which pointed again to the importance of creating local frameworks for the participation of the widest possible range of political forces in democratic fronts under a common joint program aimed at meeting local interests, extending democracy and improving the population's life.

The dogmatic and sectarian approach taken in some communities caused considerable harm to the idea of the front, occasioned hesi-

tance and a wrong appraisal of events, and finally led to losses. We must draw conclusions from the elections in each particular area. Speaking generally, the elections confirmed the importance of expanding and strengthening the existing fronts and of setting up broader ones.

The authorities and their agents, having been defeated, tried to provoke riots among the Arab population so as to split it and injure the DF. This was attempted in Nazareth and elsewhere. In defending their shaken positions, the authorities would like to push the Arab population to the brink of civil war.

We condemn the behavior of the Likud bloc government and hold it responsible for the events we have mentioned. We call for energetic public action against the demolition of houses in Arab villages. We call for vigilance and unity in the party ranks to consolidate the great victory achieved in the election campaign.

1. Bloc composed of the Labor and Mapam parties.
2. National Religious Party, an ultra-reactionary party of the government coalition.
3. Small left-Zionist group made up in part of Mikunis's backers.

African panorama

Joshua Nkomo
President, Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), co-Leader, Zimbabwe Patriotic Front

THE PROSPECTS OF OUR STRUGGLE

News from Rhodesia (called Zimbabwe in Africa) continually commands the attention of the press. The situation worsened at the end of last year. The 'general elections' scheduled for December 1978 were postponed by the racist regime to April 1979. Even after the 'elections,' it announced, power would not go into the hands of the African majority.

In this interview for the *WMR* Joshua Nkomo reviews the international aspects of the present situation.[1]

Q. Imperialism is striving to launch a counter-offensive in Africa today. Its sabotage of the Zimbabwe liberation movement is becoming particularly treacherous. Could you comment on the policy of the imperialist states in relation to your country?

A. Zimbabwe is one of those countries in Africa which Britain and other imperialist powers wanted to dominate permanently. Just a few decades ago Rhodesia and South Africa were regarded as being 'suitable for white occupation' serving to perpetuate imperialist positions.

Now, as a result of the struggle of the peoples in the southern part of the continent, the situation has changed. As long as the outposts of Portuguese colonialism existed, the British were certain they could maintain their positions in Rhodesia. But when Portuguese colonialism fell, they had to change their strategy. They now claimed that they supposedly favored the independence of countries like Namibia and Zimbabwe. They even started using our slogans: 'one man — one vote,' 'universal suffrage,' etc. Hence, the creation of the so-called 'group of five' in Namibia and a strategy against Namibia and our country to establish a regime of imperialist lackeys and puppets.

At first glance, President Carter's statement that after the Vietnamese experience his country didn't want to interfere in the affairs of other countries and that the United States wanted to see these countries free without outside interference seemed to be promising.

But these are words and we can believe them only when we see them put into practice. During the negotiations we had with the British in the presence of the Americans, we did not see the Americans go half way to meet the Patriotic Front.

We do not think that the words one reads and hears in the imperialist press, radio and television represent the real policy. After all, imperialism supplies Smith with anything he needs.

Q. Progressive circles in Africa often stress that in reality imperialist plans for the future of Zimbabwe are but moves to impose neo-colonialism. What is the state of these intentions today?

A. Well, first of all, I want to stress that while talking with the Patriotic Front, Britain and the United States not only continued conniving with the Smith regime, they encouraged it and its puppets in order to impose neo-colonialist rule in Zimbabwe. The March 3, 1978, Salisbury agreement signed by Ian Smith and his three avowed Black puppets — Bishop Abel Muzorewa, the Rev. Sithole and tribal chief Chirau — is a glaring demonstration of the shamelessness of imperialist machinations.[2] It is an agreement to work together to perpetuate fascism and racism in our country. We witnessed three quislings selling the country to imperialism and reaction.

But this bargain between the racists and their puppets is doomed, it is already folding up like a house of cards. The Zimbabwe patriots have intensified their armed resistance to such an extent that the partners in this collusion were unable to hold their planned white

referendum to approve the March agreement, neither will the so-called elections help them. Attempts by Smith and his quislings to avoid their downfall are doomed.

Q. In recent months the Salisbury regime, with the connivance of the imperialist powers, has been carrying out acts of outright aggression against neighboring countries. How do the collaborationists behave in such cases?

A. Here, as elsewhere, they are nothing but agents of imperialism. Sithole said that he and his colleagues in the 'Executive Council'[3] agreed to such invasions and that this would be aimed against us, the Patriotic Front. However he should know that we are fighting not in Zambia or Mozambique but in Zimbabwe. That is the real picture.

Q. But the imperialist press has continually distorted this picture. Rhodesian commando attacks on peaceful towns and villages in neighboring countries and their brutal treatment of refugees from Zimbabwe are considered 'permissible' in conditions of war. Would you comment on this?

A. First, in these aggressions against neighboring independent and peaceful countries, the rebel regime has always had the support of the Western imperialists, namely Britain, the United States, West Germany, Canada, France and, of course, the Republic of South Africa. This is evidence by their total silence when thousands of our people are massacred in cold blood; at least 30 people are killed every day. But there is a massive outcry when a few whites are killed by our forces. We are told that the life of a Black person cannot be compared to the life of a white person.

We did not resort to armed struggle because we are war-mongers. We resorted to war because all peaceful moves by us had been rejected by the rebel Smith regime, which quite openly is supported by its Western paymasters. We reject outright the malicious lies by this regime which, intentionally twisting the facts, claims that ZAPU fighters 'murdered' the survivors of a Rhodesian plane that had developed engine trouble and crash-landed. The 'murder' and the crash-landing itself, given such broad coverage in the Western press, were invented in order to compromise our liberation movement. The truth is that the patriots shot down one of the planes used by the enemy for military purposes, regularly transporting military personnel from Salisbury. This was an act of war.

Q. What is your appraisal of the present stage of your country's liberation struggle?

A. The struggle has reached a very important stage. The patriotic forces are now in control of over 95 per cent of the rural areas. The regime calls this the 'area of operations.' But Smith's forces cannot operate there as they wish. *The Times* of London wrote on July 24,

1978: 'A year ago most main roads were still fairly safe, at least for convoys, and we travelled outside the cities independently during the hours of daylight. Now it is dangerous to travel alone at any time outside the urban areas, even convoys are under attack, and vast areas of the country are under the control of the guerrillas of the Patriotic Front who decide which transport, public or private, may move on the roads.'

Our forces are now operating in the cities and in the heart of the racist regime — Salisburv. We are intensifying our armed struggle because this is the only way to remove the puppets and force the Smith regime to realize that it cannot survive.

The victories of the patriotic forces are infuriating the racists and their followers, and they have resorted to unparalleled brutality against the population. Thousands of our people have been forced into what are called 'protected villages' but which really are concentration camps, thousands have been maimed, tortured and killed. Countries neighboring on Zimbabwe have been subjected to an unprecedented series of attacks.[4] But the Smith regime is powerless to change the course of events.

The struggle is nearing its end. The front of solidarity with the fighting people of Zimbabwe is growing. We should like to make note of our cooperation with the USSR and Cuba and with the other socialist countries which are giving us invaluable assistance. We express our solidarity with the progressive regimes of free Africa and our gratitude to the front-line states for their unfailing support of our struggle. We are also supported by many people in the capitalist countries. All this strengthens our conviction in the victory of the Zimbabwe people's just cause.

We have resolved to fight to the bitter end. We say 'no' to fascism, racism and exploitation of man by man. We say 'no' to capitalism and imperialism. We say 'no' to fear, to pessimism and to discouragement.

1. For a general outline of the present stage of the Zimbabwe national-liberation struggle see 'Zimbabwe: a turning point,' interview with Joshua Nkomo, in *WMR*, February 1978, p. 115.

2. The March agreement on a so-called internal settlement announced 'transfer' of power to the African majority during the remaining months of 1978 but left the racists and imperialists in all key posts. — *Ed.*

3. The 'Executive' organ of the so-called new administration created on the basis of the 'internal settlement' agreement. — *Ed.*

4. In October 1978 the Rhodesian forces attacked a camp of refugees from Zimbabwe near Lusaka, killing hundreds of old men, women and children. This crime was committed during Smith's visit to the United States. — *Ed.*

A sinister alliance

Peking is among the most energetic defenders of the internationally isolated Chilean dictatorship. That is why Pinochet has been broadly advertising the expanding political and economic relations between the two countries.

The visit to China in October 1978 by Chile's Foreign Minister Hernan Cubillos helped to cement relations between them.

Peking expressed its support for the fascist Chilean junta immediately after the putsch, and ever since, said the Chinese Foreign Minister Huang Hua, these ties have been growing stronger. 'Bilateral relations,' he said during his meeting with Cubillos, 'are steadily growing stronger and in recent years have been developing very well.'[1] At this same meeting it was stressed that these ties have been improving because of a similarity of positions on all the basic aspects of foreign policy. 'This identity of principles,' said the Chilean Minister, 'also results in the emergence of common interests in international affairs.'[2]

In 1978, trade between Chile and China continued to expand. Under a three-year agreement they signed in October, China is to receive 30,000 tons of Chilean copper, as compared with the 17,500 tons it got prior to 1977. China will purchase large quantities of saltpeter and cellulose. During the negotiations between the two foreign ministers, China confirmed that it was ready to double its imports of Chilean copper and to start purchasing iron and lumber. In the first half of 1978, China's exports to Chile were 52.6 per cent up on the same period in 1977. The talks in Peking ended with both countries agreeing to increase the volume of bilateral trade to more than $100 million.

China's growing ties with Chile are in line with its foreign policy of supporting all anti-communist and anti-Soviet regimes. With these aspects of Peking's foreign policy in mind, one will easily see why Huang Hua called the Pinochet dictatorship a regime 'that fought fearlessly against colonialism.' And this of a regime whose main feature is its all-encompassing, growing dependence on imperialist capital, particularly the large financial-monopoly groups in the United States. For Huang Hua Pinochet's 'anti-colonialism' was particularly apparent in the coup d'état against Allende's Popular Front government.

On October 26, 1978, the junta's journal *Que Pasa?* hinted that China was building up its ties with Chile in order to broaden its still

limited presence in Latin America and to penetrate the Antarctic, by using Pinochet as a Trojan Horse. Under an agreement between the two countries, Chinese specialists are to take part in Chile's exploration of the Antarctic.

The negotiations also planned to expand bilateral relations in trade, culture, sports, science and technology. Both countries agreed to exchange military attachés to activate military ties and help to reinforce the dictatorship's apparatus of repression.

The ministers agreed that it was necessary to extend top level contacts. Huang Hua is to visit Chile in 1979, and Chile's Minister of Economics Pablo Baraona will travel to China to continue talks on extending economic ties. The Peking-Pinochet relationship is a glaring example of China's reactionary role in world events. By aiding and abetting all the most reactionary regimes and being a party to their crimes (supporting Mobutu and the enemies of the revolution in Angola and Ethiopia) and continuing its provocations against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Peking is siding with the most aggressive NATO and imperialist forces.

'It is clear that the economic and political aid that China is extending to the Pinochet dictatorship,' says an editorial in the Bulletin of the Communist Party of Chile, 'is not an isolated fact. It corresponds with the chauvinistic deformation that leads the Chinese leadership to reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and to betray the cause of the working class and of the peoples' (No. 30, July-August 1978).

F.R.

1. *El Mercurio*, October 19, 1978.
2. *El Mercurio*, October 18, 1978.

science, culture, ideology

The communists and public opinion

In 1978 our journal began the publication of a series of articles under the heading 'Communists and mass consciousness' (see *WMR* February and June). Within the framework of that series it is planned to hold a discussion of the problem 'The Communists and Public Opinion.' In view of its immense importance and also the fact that this problem has been inadequately studied, the editors propose to consider it not only from the political but also from the scientific-theoretical, sociological angle. In anticipation of further examination and discussion, this article by *Kalman Kulcsar* touches upon some aspects of public-opinion analysis in socialist societies (on the example of Hungary).

NEED FOR IN-DEPTH THEORETICAL RESEARCH

Academician *Kalman Kulcsar*
Director, Institute of Sociology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

To start with, the very concept of public opinion has not yet been defined with acceptable precision. This in itself shows that the corresponding social phenomenon is to some extent indefinite. But there is an imperative need to analyze many aspects of life in modern socialist society which are established by means of the term.

Kant once remarked that for thousands of years lawyers had been arguing over the definition of the concept of law (and we may well add that this argument has continued since his day), although hardly anyone will question the fact that law exists. But when it come to public opinion, some bourgeois analysts cast doubt on the very existence of this phenomenon: they have to deal with the historically limited experience of the present-day bourgeois system and say that public opinion is no more than a 'figment of constitutional law.'[1] It is true that they also emphasize the pragmatic nature of public opinion which is connected with its active role in the life of society and, consequently, with the possibility of using it to legalize and consolidate the existing political system.

Historically, the attitude to public opinion as a 'figment of constitutional law' was expressed, in particular, in its description as some undifferentiated phenomenon or, at best, a phenomenon which is 'arbitrarily' differentiated (by the analyst) into various 'arbitrary groups of the population.' But research in the 30s connected with economic development (especially consumption problems), and also the impact of the 'public' on political and social decisions showed the flimsiness of such an approach. What turned out to be a figment was not public opinion itself but the so-called coherent public, because society actually consists of social classes, of a multiplicity of sections and groups which differ in objective status, and as a result, in interests and opinions. What is more, the task of influencing the public, of 'manipulating' public opinion in capitalist society turned out to be feasible only to the extent to which the profound social differentiation of the public was accepted as fact.

Identification of public opinion with the simple results of a cross poll of the population of this or that country is also nowadays equally obsolete. It has been proved that public opinion is a coherent phenomenon with a definite structure which is identical not with the mechanical, but the organic aggregation of the views and attitudes of people.

It has also been established that polled opinions do not become public opinion simply because they are taken into account when one political decision or another is worked out. After all, on the one hand, opinion can exist as public opinion without the politicians relying on it or even, perhaps, reckoning with it. On the other hand, political decisions can be based on an 'indifferent' opinion, which does not exist as public opinion but which sprang solely from the fact that a group of citizens was asked this or that question.

In other words, the expression of individual or group opinions existing in society as 'public opinion' depends on the weight of this opinion in social terms, the extent of its social impact, that is, the extent to which it represents the concern of the corresponding sections of society.

Various social problems, including political problems, connected with society's social development on the scale of the whole country or its individual regions (city, village, etc.), undoubtedly have a different objective effect on the interests of members of society. At the same time, in each such instance we have to deal not only with an aggregation of interests of individuals but, as a rule, also with the concern which is part of the structure of some group dependence or some other system of social relations.

Now and again this concern is expressed in a highly peculiar way. For instance, the opinion recorded in our country a few years ago

about an increase in rents reflected not so much the concern of the public with the problem being discussed as the desire of citizens to improve their housing conditions. Indeed, this is something that one will discover quite frequently: virtually every social problem has aspects that go beyond the framework dealt with directly in the course of its discussion.

When assessing the character of public concern as expressed in existing public opinion, one should also take into account such of its properties as extensiveness, intensity, etc. Thus, in 1973, a number of measures restricting abortion were worked out in Hungary within a framework of the overall policy for boosting the growth of the population. Quite naturally, it was women within a definite age group that were directly affected in the first place. Indirectly, these measures affected a considerable percentage of families. But a broader approach to these measures — from the standpoint of evaluating their effects on public health, manpower resources, etc. — showed that there was virtually universal concern with the problem in society.

Another highly important fact, I think, is the subjective comprehension by the public of this universal and objective concern. Such comprehension does away with the 'indifference' of individuals and groups to the problem being discussed, and this is the key condition for shaping public opinion.

Finally, when considering public opinion one should take into account that it is always a value judgment. But the expression of a judgment is an intricate process involving a great many factors connected with different characteristics of groups of the population concerned with the problem, those aware or unaware of such concern, etc. Indeed, judgment is always the result of a summing-up of group opinions, which is why it is to some extent subject to the impact of diverse emotional factors and is affected by the factors of change, inconstancy and 'brevity.' At the same time, the operation of these factors is always limited by the purposeful shaping of public opinion by administrative agencies, the mass media, etc.

These question, bearing on a definition of the essential aspects of public opinion and an analysis of its nature, imply not only the need to bring out some *general* characteristics of this phenomenon, which are equally inherent in it in various types of society, but also to discover its *qualitative specifics* within the social, political and other structures of present-day capitalism and socialism.

This is visibly expressed in a consideration of the problem of the subject of public opinion or, ultimately, the extent to which the structure of existing consciousness in socialist society is differentiated. In seeking to establish this specific aspect, sociologists in the socialist countries usually emphasize that in historical terms public

opinion under socialism tends to become more homogeneous and that there is growing unanimity of public opinion on the scale of the whole nation unknown in the past. This is quite natural, considering that socialism produces a historically new phenomenon like the whole people's moral, and political unity.

However, we do not believe that this gives the whole picture. Public opinion under socialism is not only unanimous, but — in a mass of situations — is undisguisedly differentiated according to the stand taken by the various groups of the population.

The factors which determine the existing patterns of mass consciousness and result in differences of views and opinions among people are another matter, and here the difference between the socialist and the capitalist system is also highly pronounced.

Everyone knows that the pluralist pattern of public opinion under capitalism is based on the class structure of society itself, which is marked by acute antagonisms in the condition and interests of various groups and sections of the population. Socialist society overcomes all the antagonisms in relations between social groups, and this itself makes the pattern of public opinion more homogeneous.

Moreover, the remaining distinctions in the condition and interests of various groups naturally produce dissimilarities in their attitudes to various questions. The most diverse characteristics of these groups may operate as factors in practice differentiating the mass consciousness. Thus, a few years ago a study of the public attitude to the prices policy in Hungary revealed that opinions concerning some measures in this field largely depended on the way of life, in particular, the established diet patterns, which were themselves, naturally, also socially determined and closely connected with the division of society into social groups.

Of course, individuals are the immediate vehicles of opinion in society. They also express themselves in an objectivized form by means of individual behavior in which the unique qualities of the individual are always present. But it is also well known that the opinion of individuals belonging to the same sections and groups of the population, that is, with identical conditions of existence (at different levels), all other circumstances being equal, are more or less similarly shaped. This produces a limited number of opinions within the structure of broad public opinion in a nation on individual problems.

Take an example which simultaneously helps to examine the question of the differentiated nature of people's concern with the solution of various social problems.

During a 1970 poll taken to establish the specific features of social life in a small Hungarian town,[2] the following question, among others,

was asked: do you think your town should have greater autonomy? Sixty-five per cent of the intellectuals, 54 per cent of other workers by brain, 51 per cent of highly skilled workers, 33 per cent of skilled and unskilled workers, 24 per cent of housewives, and 14 per cent of manual workers in agriculture replied in the affirmative.

We find a considerable spread of opinion between the various social groups. What are the reasons? They are undoubtedly the different living conditions of these groups, the nature of their activity, the level of education and also a number of other 'more deeply seated' and historically rooted factors. But an essential role here belonged to the fact which above I designated as awareness of one's own concern. It is hard to say, however, which of the social groups gave a closer reflection of the actual potentialities for the town's autonomy, which of the figures were closer to a real assessment of these potentialities: the illusion of the intelligentsia or the unconcern and lack of information on the part of workers in agriculture? After all, there is no doubt that within a comprehensively and consciously administered society the actual role of urban autonomy is not too great and the potentialities for its further increase are fairly problematical.

This means that the low degree of concern (expressed in the answers of those who do not support the idea of extending the town's autonomy) may in this case be an expression both of the real assessment of the situation and of resistance to the proposed changes (which is generally characteristic of the attitude of people with a lower educational standard).

The results of public opinion polls, like those described above, together with considerable difficulties in their reliable interpretation, confront us with a whole range of questions: what are the basic factors determining this or that type of the mass consciousness under socialism? What is the nature, limits and character of unanimity of opinion and differences of opinion revealed within various (similar) sections of the population? How deep, in particular, is the differentiation of public opinion now established, and what are the trends in the development of public opinion (in a nation) from this standpoint?

Unfortunately, we do not think that the time has come to give short answers to these and similar questions, because we do not yet have enough data, and have not carried out the necessary studies helping to bring out the specifics of the functioning of public opinion in a socialist society.

Another problem that needs to be considered here is the *role of public opinion* in a socialist society, especially in its connection with politics. After all, this connection is expressed in a highly peculiar way under socialism, where society is consciously shaped.

On the one hand, in accordance with the main goals of socialism,

the socialist organs of administration act in the light of the basic interests of the working people and with an eye to their needs and requirements. This tends to increase the role of the public in the life of socialist society, including the administration of it (a fact all sociologists have noted). On the other hand, I think, this role of public opinion must be given a differentiated assessment, depending on many factors, above all the type of administrative activity.

Thus, experience in building the new society also adequately shows that public opinion has only an ancillary role to play when it comes to determining the goals in social development. The attainment of these goals is a different matter. Here, differentiated public opinion appears for politicians as an objective factor which needs to be reckoned with when the adopted decisions are realized.

Of course, the problem of formulating society's goals is no simple one either. Public opinion, as I have said, in virtue of its changing nature and inadequate competence, has, in effect, limited potentialities in this sphere. Does this mean, however, that the problem can be successfully solved only through the efforts of professional politicians, specialists in the given sphere of social life, i.e., only through the efforts of professional opinion?

Let us recall in this connection what Gyorgy Lucacs said about the specific ideological tenor of law: 'Considering that . . . the elementary vital interests of the section of specialists require that the latter should visualize their activity within the whole complex as being of special importance, such an approach tends ideologically to create an ever greater gap between law and economic reality.'[3] Without discussing other aspects of this statement, together with the context in which the conclusion is set forth, let me merely emphasize that such peculiar inclinations among specialists are undoubtedly expressed not only in connection with law and not only among lawyers. In the practice of building the new society in the socialist countries this phenomenon was clearly revealed first in some neglect for the economic conditions in developing technology, and then for the social aspects of adopted economic decisions, and eventually in a certain failure to consider the consequences of this or that decision in its impact on the whole complex of social life, on the whole system of relations in society.

Of course, this problem is to some extent solved through the same political activity, because there is the awareness that the politician must think in 'complex' terms, and must, consequently, act in such a way as to take into account and evaluate the influence of the decisions he adopts on every sphere of life in society. In practice, this awareness is realized, apart from everything else, in the organization of collegial decision-making by various (numerous) groups of specialists or, which is the same thing, in formulating decisions on the basis of an

all-round consideration of the information coming in from various contingents of specialists.

At the same time, it is well known that information based on diverse specialist knowledge, in this case coinciding with the interdisciplinary scientific substantiation of the decisions adopted and the forecasting of their consequences, cannot always produce a precise picture of the corresponding sector of reality either. That is why in the formulation of goals it is necessary to consider alongside the opinion of specialists specific information like public opinion. The value and uniqueness of this information lies n the fact that it records the views and moods of various (differentiated) groups of the population, future participants in fulfilling the adopted decisions. At the same time, one must emphasize once again that when we say that political activity connected with the formulation of the goals for society's advance cannot rely only on scientific knowledge and has to be realized with an eye to the state of broad public opinion, this does not imply at all that decisions should be taken simply in accordance with existing public opinion, on the basis of the desires of the broad (non-specialist) public.

The limits for the use of public opinion in socialist administration are, in effect, rooted in the nature of the former. In virtue of its specifics like inconstancy and transience, public opinion cannot always be evaluated as an unconditional and adequate expression of the in-depth characteristics of the given section (group) of the population. Being an indirect expression of the actual interests of people, public opinion can only to some extent serve for predicting the behavior of the given group.

In contrast to opinions, which largely remain on the surface of phenomena, politics starts from the 'substance' of things and is directed at in-depth and essential processes and relations. That is why politics and politicians may and frequently do clash directly with the world of opinions, and especially, as I have said, when formulating and adopting the goals of social development. But even here consideration of public opinion is still necessary in special situations.

It is well known that scientifically grounded policy in principle accords with economic reality and the key trends in the development of society's economy. At the same time, as Engels warned in a letter to Conrad Schmidt on October 27, 1890, in some instances policy, because of the voluntarist element it contains, because of the circumstances dictated by the given historical situation, etc., may also adopt decisions which deviate (temporarily, at any rate) from the requirements of the economy. In such cases the contradictions which arise can be eased or eliminated altogether precisely by means of a fuller consideration of the phenomena occurring in the sphere of

public opinion. (let us note, in parenthesis, that voluntarism in policy also tends most frequently to neglect the world of opinions, which constitute the immediate environment of politics, or is totally indifferent to activating the public.)

The role of public opinion under socialism tends sharply to increase as the goals of social development are realized. This is due to the fact that the public attitude (of this or that section of the population) turns out to be an essential objective factor which the organs of power must necessarily reckon with in the conduct of policy. In realizing decisions it is important to consider the degree of stability of opinions, to have a knowledge of the social phenomena behind these opinions (and which may provide additional information about the social processes affected by the given political decision), to make a correct evaluation of the potentialities for shaping opinions in a direction facilitating effective fulfillment of the decision, etc.

Of course, in socialist society public opinion also has other functions, including the so-called directive function, when (as in a national referendum) it directly determines the steps (including legislative steps) of the organs of administration.[4] But even this view of the role of public opinion is not, as one may think, 'narrowed down.' In contrast to liberal-bourgeois ideology, which insists that the public has primarily a 'directive' function (and this is also done for purely propaganda purposes), we must realize that the numerous historical premises for the development of socialist society (such as, in particular, the considerable differentiation of the population with respect to the level of economic and cultural development, the power of traditional social ties which are only gradually being replaced by new, socialist relations among people, etc.) in many instances make it more difficult for the organs of administration directly to rely on existing public opinion. (This problem is most acute in the developing countries, where the revolutionary restructuring of society and its 'modernization' — in the economic and social sense of the world — sometimes pose problems that cannot be solved by relying on opinions which frequently reflect diverse traditional relations.)

However, in socialist society public opinion, as a factor which needs to be reckoned with in the formulation of decisions and especially in their fulfillment, has a truly important role to play, which tends constantly to grow as society advances.

Public opinion here is equally important in determining the attitude of the population to the adopted decisions, in particular, in evaluating the effects of these decisions. Here is an example of the public opinion poll taken by the Demographic Research Institute of Hungary's Central Statistical Bureau almost a year after the government's adoption of measures to raise the birth rate in the country.

The poll shows that the social phenomena which provided the grounds for taking these measures (and which, consequently, were designed to 'legalize' them and to confirm their necessity on the level of opinions) were not known to the whole population: 20 per cent of those polled showed that they had no information at all on this matter, and this despite the explanatory work which was carried on by the mass media over a long period! As regards the elaborated measures, a majority — 75 per cent — of those polled had definite information (mainly concerning the state's cash grants).

The most important thing, however, was the extent to which the correctness of the adopted decisions was confirmed on the level of opinions. And here, as always, the poll showed a definite differentiation of attitudes. Thus, a majority of those polled expressed satisfaction over the attention which the government had given to the problem and, in addition, praised the efficiency of some of the measures proposed. About 63 per cent of those polled said that the established family grant would encourage parents to have more children. At the same time, all those polled who already had children were much more restrained in this respect than those who had no children. Moreover, the poll showed that in the opinion of 56 per cent of the parents with a child under 14 years, 'the family grant does not at all stimulate a desire to have children.' Similar departures from the average were observed in the evaluation of other measures envisaged by the decree of the Council of Ministers.

What are the conclusions that could be drawn on the strength of this poll concerning the role and importance of public opinion in a socialist society?

First of all, the conclusion that the problem dealt with in the government decreee was a real and urgent problem for public opinion as well, and also that the fundamental line in solving the problem as laïd down in the decree *generally* coincided with the opinion of the population. It was clear, furthermore, that awareness of the necessity for a solution on the level of opinions did not on the whole coincide with the evaluations of the groups directly affected by the proposed system of measures. Finally, the poll revealed that in addition to the measures proposed by the government the population believed it was necessary to take some other measures. Besides, the poll drew the attention of the organs of administration to other problems which did not figure in the decree of the Council of Ministers, but were closely connected with them. The latter result — and this is a constant feature in the practical study of public opinion — is especially important. It confirms the great potentialities for looking to the mass consciousness from the standpoint of discovering in society the problems which on the level of opinions may be realized and recorded

earlier than they are noticed by politicians and scientific institutions. Thus, public opinion under socialism makes it possible to improve the processes of social administration.

In conclusion, let me refer to a definition of Hungarian political sociology according to which 'one of the key tasks of political sociology is concrete analysis of forms, levels and processes in the formation of political will. . . . Political will does not occur and does not lend itself to measurement in a crude, unprocessed form; it arises, in accordance with its definition, as a result of intercourse organized in this or that way. But what are the specifically socialist levels and forms of this process of origination of political will?'[5]

There can apparently be no general answer to this question, considering that the shaping of opinion and will in individual social sections of society depends in terms of subject-matter on the extent to which its members are concerned with the problem, and also on the extent to which this concern has been realized. On the other hand, we may regard it as an established fact that in socialist society the expression and use of public opinion have a considerable role to play in the shaping of political will. The impact of these processes on policy is effected at different levels and in various organizational forms (as will be seen from the public opinion polls that have been taken). We find that public opinion invariably turns out to be closely connected with problems of democracy — both in the broad sense of the word, applied on the scale of society as a whole, and in the sense of democracy in production, and in the working people's place of residence — that is, the problems which in our day are being closely studied and which we must analyze more deeply in order to involve the working people more broadly in the administration of the affairs of society.

1. See, for instance, J. Habermas. *A tarsadalmi nyilvanossag szerkezetvaltozasa.* Budapest, 1971, (J. Habermas, *Strukturwandel de Offentlichkeit.* Neuwied, Luchterhand, 1968, p. 287).

2. See R. Angelusz, L. Varadi. *Kisvarosi kozelet, 1970; Az informaciotol a kozeletig.* Budapest, 1973.

3. G. Lucacs. *A tarsadalmi let ontologiajarol.* Budapest, 1976, p. 486.

4. Concerning the various functions of public opinion under socialism, see B. Grushin. *A velemenyek vilaga.* Budapest, 1971, pp. 109-121.

5. F. Gorgenyi. *Közvelmeny, közügy es szocialista nyilvanossag. Radio es Televizio Szemle,* No. 4, 1975, p. 20.

the press

Book reviews

AN ALLOY OF REVOLUTIONARY THOUGHT AND ACTION

L.I. Brezhnev, *Mir sotsializma — torzhestvo velikikh idey* (The Socialist World, A Triumph of Great Ideas), Moscow, Politizdat, 1978, 656 pp.

This collection is undoubtedly a notable event in modern political writings for many reasons. Taken together, Leonid Brezhnev's speeches, articles and statements included in this volume are unique in compass and depth of analysis of the fundamental problems in the formation and development of the world socialist system, and the shaping of the new — socialist — type of international relations. A characteristic feature of the collection is that it presents historical processes in their actual complexity and contradictoriness. All of this gives a coherent and three-dimensional picture of the great way travelled by the socialist countries in just over three decades.

In his preface to the collection, Brezhnev writes: 'Along this road there have been not only triumphs and victories, but also ups and downs and even mistakes. But life has shown very well that they have chosen the right road to our goals, and that the closer the cooperation among the socialist countries, the fuller their interaction in tackling both national and international tasks, the smoother and shorter the road' (p. 4).

Brezhnev considers the development of the socialist world against the broad political background of the modern world, and this gives concrete events their true historical scale and helps to see the events not as something static, but as the living movement of history.

In abstract terms one could imagine a work on socialist society defining the various features of socialism in a refined form (something that is, after all, not such a rarity in political periodicals today). The distinctive quality of Brezhnev's thoughts, ideas and generalizations comes from the fact that they are expressed by a political leader who is at the very forefront of the struggle for the ideas of socialism. The

propositions put forward in the book have a true scientific authenticity because they are solidly connected with the diverse practice in building the new world and shaping the new relations, and because the theoretical conclusions are being constantly tested in practice. In short, this is a vivid example of the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its enrichment with modern revolutionary experience.

Brezhnev writes: 'The adversaries of communism are inclined to depict the socialist world in monochrome, as if everything in it is standardized. But the reality — and it is the matter of this collection — testifies to the wealth and diversity of the forms and methods of work in the socialist reconstruction of society' (p. 4).

It is well known that over the past several years, the questions bearing on the ways of restructuring society on socialist lines have become highly topical, and that is because socialism and communism are actually being built in a large group of countries, which differ in territory and size of population, in historical and national traditions, and in the level of development. There is also the tremendous attraction to socialism on the part of the newly-free peoples, which in their specific conditions seek ways to restructure society on just, socialist principles. Another reason is that existing socialism is being attacked on every side.

Brezhnev's works present socialist society and its construction in their true light and actual dimensions, so refuting the inventions and distortions which critics of existing socialism are so quick to make. Brezhnev says: 'Whatever the roads chosen, the communists' mission is ultimately to lead the masses to the main goal, to socialism. The experience in the struggle for the victory of the October Revolution has shown that changes of tactics and compromises for the sake of winning new allies are quite possible in revolutionary activity. But we have also been convinced in this: one must never sacrifice principles for the sake of tactical advantages. Otherwise, as the saying goes, one may well keep one's hair but lose one's head' (p. 593).

There has been much discussion over the communists' attitude to the operation of the general uniformities of socialist development, and here again Brezhnev has some profound and interesting evaluations. Noting the importance of the general uniformities of socialist development, which were first expressed in the Soviet Union's practice, Brezhnev believes it necessary to emphasize that with the growth of experience the very notion of these uniformities tends to become deeper and more multifaceted. Besides, he notes, new phenomena and new processes constantly arise in life, and these need to be scientifically comprehended in the light of Marxism-Leninism (see p. 563).

The ruling communist and workers' parties have put in a tremendous historical effort in building socialism. Taken as a whole, the achievements of the socialist community are, undoubtedly, the most vivid revolutionary accomplishment of our day. At the same time, they also present instructive lessons for the future.

The common experience in developing world socialism, Brezhnev says, suggests, among others, the following conclusions:

— The question of power continues to be the main issue in the revolution. It is either the power of the working class, acting in alliance with all the other working people, or the power of the bourgeoisie. There is no other alternative.

— Transition to socialism is possible only if the working class and its allies, having actually taken over political power, use it to eliminate the socio-economic power of the capitalist and other exploiters.

— Socialism can win if the working class and its vanguard, the communists, succeed in inspiring and uniting the working people in the struggle to build the new society and to transform the economy and all the other social relations on socialist lines.

— Socialism can be established only if working people's power succeeds in defending the revolution against any attacks by the class enemy (and such attacks are inevitable, both from inside, and more likely, from outside). (See pp. 589-590.)

Brezhnev's works are keynoted by proletarian, socialist internationalism. Once again, he considers it not as some abstraction, however important, but as a powerful political instrument which the socialist countries use confidently to fulfill their national and international tasks. Brezhnev writes: 'The great concept of friendship is usually seen as a purely emotional category. But I think that there is more substance to the friendship between the socialist countries. It is above all a political category. It is expressed in the historically rooted and deeply conscious line of behavior of the broadest masses of people.

'The communists of the socialist countries are entitled to take pride in the fact that they have shown in practice an example of inter-state relations free from national egoism, permeated with attention to the interests of friends abroad, comrades in the struggle for Marxist-Leninist ideals. Where the exploiting ruling classes have for centuries implanted strife and alienation among nations, we have sown the seeds of friendship that have yielded a great and abundant harvest' (p. 554).

Internationalism has, in fact, become the foundation of the new socialist type of international relations. These relations are quite naturally based on democratic principles, like equality, respect for sovereignty, and non-interference in each other's domestic affairs. At

the same time, they organically include such lofty norms as mutual assistance, the greatest consideration for each other's interests and solidarity.

Brezhnev returns to the events which powerfully demonstrated what socialist internationalism means in action: the struggle for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic in international law, support for revolutionary Cuba, the first socialist state in the Western hemisphere, the epic events in Vietnam, when the heroic Vietnamese people, relying on the support of their friends and allies, inflicted a crushing defeat on foreign aggressors and united their country.

The book gives the reader a good idea of the CPSU's approach to many cardinal problems in present-day world affairs, which also vividly show the Soviet communists' loyalty to Lenin's precepts. But Brezhnev's works also contain important conclusions for the future, which are infused with the spirit of internationalism. He writes: 'We are advancing toward an epoch in which socialism, in one or another concrete, historically rooted form, will become the predominant social system on the globe, carrying with it peace, freedom, equality and well-being for the whole of working mankind.

'This is not a utopia, not some beautiful dream. It is a real prospect. It is daily brought nearer by you and by us, comrades, by our labor and struggle, it is brought nearer by the labor and struggle of millions of our contemporaries. That is the continuation of the cause started by the October Revolution' (p. 597).

A remarkable feature of Brezhnev's collection is that the political evaluations and theoretical conclusions it contains are organically tied in with the vital practical questions in deepening cooperation among the socialist countries in all the key spheres of social life.

This applies to the sphere of politics, in which a full-scale system of treaties between the socialist countries enlarged in 1978 by the Soviet-Vietnamese Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, has already taken shape and is in operation. The Warsaw Treaty is an organic part of this contractual system. For more than 20 years now it has served as a factor of peace and stability in Europe and in the rest of the world, providing a reliable shield for the people's socialist gains.

Brezhnev considers the current and long-term tasks in deepening economic cooperation among the socialist countries, including the shaping of an optimal economic structure, specialization and cooperation on the scale of key industries in some socialist countries, the rational location of the productive forces, the establishment of international socialist joint lines of production requiring the formulation of legal and economic norms for their activity. It also includes the cardinal problem of evening out the levels of economic development

of the socialist countries, which is being tackled in practice within the framework of the socialist community. These problems are especially vibrant when considered against the background of the 30-year activity of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which, Brezhnev says, presents 'unique experience in equitable cooperation among a large group of countries, harmonizing of their national and international interests, and the practice of the principles of socialist internationalism' (p. 444).

Much attention is given to ideological cooperation among the ruling communist and workers' parties. Brezhnev says that the building of developed socialism and communism calls for heightened attention to the development of science and culture and the communist education of the masses. On the other hand, as the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems are ever more firmly established, special importance attaches to the struggle of ideas, invigoration of our efforts in spreading the truth about socialism throughout the world, and combating every type of ideology hostile to socialism (see, p. 490).

Brezhnev gives a comprehensive analysis of the problems in interparty cooperation. In his Report to the 25th Congress of the CPSU, Brezhnev 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 politics, 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 uniformity.

'Of course, much depends on the policy of the ruling parties and their ability to safeguard unity, combat isolation and national exclusiveness, to take account of common international tasks and to act jointly in performing them' (pp. 513-514).

Brezhnev's new book shows the CPSU's multi-faceted activity, as it works with the other fraternal parties in consistently seeking to deepen cooperation of the socialist countries both in tackling the tasks of socialist and communist construction and the vital problems in advancing the great cause of peace and social progress.

Brezhnev's works are keynoted by great conviction in the triumph of Marxist-Leninist ideas. In his short but terse preface to the collection, he says: 'I think that the victory of communism in a group of countries does not require that the capitalist order should disappear all over the world. That is not necessary at all. Considering the external conditions, it requires something else: elimination of the threat of war, a switch of military expenditures to constructive needs, it requires peace, today, tomorrow, for all time. Communism and

peace are the beacon which illumes the path that we and our friends and associates have been blazing into the future' (p. 5).

The collection is infused with the spirit of the present. This makes it certain that it will have a large readership, and that its conclusions and generalizations will be broadly used in the revolutionary practice which has long since become the cause of millions.

N. Shishlin

THE ARMED FORCES AND POLITICS

Jack Woddis. *Armies and Politics.* London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1977, 309 pp.

Every major social change of our era has necessitated participation of the democratic and progressive elements in the armed forces. And in every case this necessity posed a number of strategic and tactical questions upon the correct solution of which the results of the revolutionary process largely depended.

It need hardly be proven that the Marxist-Leninist principles on the military question play a tremendous role in working out such solutions. Notwithstanding all the reformist talk, these principles have lost none of their validity, have not become obsolescent, nor, as the ultra-leftists maintain, are they ossified dogmas or formulas applicable to every revolutionary process, whatever its specific features. Tested in the crucible of history, these Marxist-Leninist principles guide the revolutionary activity of the masses.

This should not be taken to mean that there is no longer any need to analyze the role of the armed forces in each concrete situation. Quite the contrary. The steadily increasing complexity of political struggle imperatively demands an in-depth analysis of events that sheds light on the role the military play or want to play. This approach, we believe, enables us to formulate some theoretical propositions and generalizations and draw certain conclusions concerning the progressive or reactionary role of the military.

That is the purpose of this book. Its author, Jack Woddis, a leading figure in the Communist Party of Great Britain, and widely known for his writings on world affairs, has made a valuable contribution to the understanding of a number of central problems. These include political power and the army; social classes and the political activity of the military; internal and external factors that generate and direct coups d'état; the development of democratic tendencies within the army, etc.

The author's examination of the army's role in the life of society, its contacts and functions are based on Lenin's definition of the nature

of political power, its ability to compel by force if necessary. Woddis demonstrates the fallacy of the reformist argument that today 'political power rests solely or almost entirely with parliament and government' (p. 16), and rejects the ultra-leftist view that political power is simply 'an armed institution ready to repress and shoot down anyone who challenges it' (ibid.). He shows that "'force" or "coercion" or "compulsion" is an essential element of political power but that "consent" or acceptance by a substantial part of the population, even when gained by deception, is also essential' (p. 17).

In his detailed examination of the question, Woddis emphasizes that Lenin's definition of political power contains the key to an understanding of the state. On the other hand, when we regard the state as an instrument, a machine, or a weapon for the oppression of one class by another and the armed forces as an instrument of coercion, the implications of these terms go far beyond their strict verbal meaning. For in reality the 'armed forces are an instrument only in a very particular sense. . . . But whether or not the ruling class is able to rely unconditionally on this institution depends in the last resort not on the equipment or firing power of the armed forces, important as this may be, but on whether the armed forces are prepared to use their weapons against the rulers' opponents. In other words, it depends on social and political factors' (p. 23).

What factors determine the changing position of the armed forces vis-à-vis the masses and the ruling class?

This question requires a careful and concrete analysis of the complex, often contradictory, process of the formation of political consciousness within the army. And having made such an analysis Woddis draws the conclusion that today as never before the armed forces are subjected to the multiform influence of the ideological and political struggle that extends to the general problems of mankind and to the concrete problems of each people and state. In reference to radically-minded officers he writes: 'Naturally they are not entirely divorced from Marxist ideas, and are influenced by the world advance of socialism and national liberation. They live, after all, in the period of the ending of colonialism and the decline of imperialism. But their aims are not, as a rule, of placing the workers and peasants in power, which is essential if these countries are to build socialism' (p. 88).

A large part of the book examines the link between the rise of democratic and progressive tendencies and the changes taking place in the social and class composition of the officers. It is important, he writes, to distinguish between class origins and class functions: 'It would be wrong to think that the petty-bourgeois origin of many officers automatically means that the political power of the state which they establish is that of the petty-bourgeoisie' (p. 87). And he

cites this concrete example: 'The "humble origins" of Batista did not prevent him becoming a millionaire puppet of the United States monopolies; nor could one explain the different role pursued by the leaders of Egypt today with that pursued under Nasser in terms of the different social origin of the present-day rulers; in fact, most of them were in leading positions in Nasser's day, although they have in the recent period been joined by other social forces' (p.88).

Of particular interest is the description of some of the negative features that usually come to the surface in movements led by progressive-minded officers who do not have the support of the democratic, anti-imperialist and revolutionary forces. The author shows that utopian views on complex social problems and a patronizing attitude toward popular movements are by no means rare among the military. 'Radical military regimes can play an objectively progressive role at a certain stage of national development; but this can be only a temporary phase, short or long' (p. 90).

Discussion of general theoretical problems is followed by analysis of some of the more important aspects of political developments in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe over the past ten years. There are chapters on the vicissitudes of armed intervention in the Sudan, the counter-revolutionary coup in Chile, the contradictory nature of the Indonesian catastrophe, the role of the Portuguese armed forces in toppling the fascist regime, the need to bring progressive military men into West European revolutionary and democratic movements, the lessons the British workers draw from the present armed intervention in Northern Ireland.

In all cases the author's analysis is thorough, and he is careful to avoid one-sided conclusions. Thus, his appraisal of the policy followed by the Somali military leaders (it may seem premature and too optimistic in the light of the events after the book's publication) is complemented by the repeated insistence that the future development of the democratic anti-imperialist revolution led by progressive army elements will, ultimately, depend on their aligning with the people's movement.

It should be noted that many of Woddis' conclusions on the role of the military in the revolution are in line with the dominant views of the communist parties and the international movement generally. Apart from everything else, this book shows that the present-day democratic anti-imperialist revolutionary movement can creatively study and solve the pressing problems connected with participation of the armed forces in politics and in revolution, if it proceeds from Marxism-Leninism and a concrete analysis of the situation.

Luis Padilla

In a distorting mirror

INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE ON SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The question of the mass media's objectivity, veracity and responsibility is not new, of course. but it is not an idle question, having lost none of its urgency and topicality. It is daily posed by reality, by the practices of the bourgeois press, television and radio.

Indeed, while it is the function of the mass media to help see and assess the image of the times, to understand the kaleidoscope of developments, what, say, does the reader learn about the world from one of the largest bourgeois publications? Not from the gutter press but from a staid publication aiming to serve people desiring comprehensive information on a wide range of public affairs.[1]

Take, for example, *International Herald Tribune*. It enjoys the reputation of a serious, respectable newspaper. It gives, with some amendments necessitated by the selection of material for the European reader, the viewpoint of two leading U.S. newspapers: *New York Times* and *Washington Post,* together with which *International Herald Tribune* is published.[2] More, it has a large circulation: it is read on either side of the Atlantic. Lastly, it is influential; it carries weight in and often moulds opinion among bourgeois intellectuals, the business world, and in political corridors.

IHT bombards the reader with information (needless to say, from the angle of its class stance) on economic, political and cultural developments in the capitalist countries. Also important is what and how it tells its readers about the socialist world, for this is where the standing and objectivity it is so concerned with are clearly discernible.

Imagine for a moment that you get your information about the socialist community, about its internal situation and foreign policy from the 'snapshots' offered by *IHT*.

Let us take an *ITH* file covering several weeks, say, from Monday, September 11, to Sunday, October 8, 1978. This four-week file contains more than 130 items about socialist countries. Their length and import differ, of course. Alongside the information that in Moscow snow fell on October 1 five days earlier than in the previous year, that a young Czech walked on stilts over a distance of five kilometres, or that the sprinter Valery Borzov had his Achilles tendon operated on, one finds more lengthy and more significant

reports. Conditionally, they may be divided into a number of subject groups: the political and economic situation in socialist countries (more than 50 reports), foreign policy and economic relations (about 30 reports), military policy (roughly the same number), the space program (upwards of 15 reports), and so on.

More than 130 reports, articles and pieces of information in a single month is not little. But what lies behind this figure?

Let us survey the information on the political situation in socialist countries. To believe *IHT,* socio-political life in socialist countries boils down mainly to one thing, the problem of 'dissidents,' or the human rights 'problem.' In some 30 items (of the 50 devoted to the domestic scene, including the economy, in socialist countries) — squibs, interviews, comments and reports — only a dozen names (the newspaper was unable to find more 'dissidents') are given in various stories and combinations. These names move from one issue to another, from one page to another: one received an exit visa, another was still waiting, and the newspaper speculated whether he would or would not be given a visa, in a week or later; one said this, the other said that. The kaleidoscope of the same persons that acquires a different pattern at each twist is evidently designed to give the impression that this is a mass phenomenon, that these are processses of the utmost gravity.

Generally speaking, the socio-political life of the socialist countries does not receive wide coverage from *IHT*. For example, in Poland, apart from the problem of 'dissidents,' which *IHT* evidently believes is mandatory for every socialist country, the newspaper seems to be interested in only two subjects. The first and basic subject concerns the Roman Catholic Church, and the place and role of Catholics. The second is the condition of the peasants, who, according to *IHT*, enjoy a privileged status but are disenchanted with the innovations introduced by the authorities.[3]

If one is to believe the other 20 odd items about the political situation in the socialist countries, even here — whatever the point at issue — there are no grounds for optimism, to put it mildly. Take this report from the GDR.[4] It speaks of queues in the shops for American jeans, foreign-made liqueurs, and so on. The drive for fashion is elevated to the rank of an economic development of paramount importance. True, evidently sensing that it had stretched the point, the newspaper found it possible to add that in the GDR the people could buy what they wanted without queuing up. But this is mentioned only in passing.

As from one issue to another one reads the reports about life in socialist countries one cannot help being amazed at the newspaper's ability to draw unvarying conclusions, no matter what it writes about.

Here, for instance, is the conclusion in a feature story about the State Jewish Museum in Prague: ' ... tens of thousands of artists — writers, painters, film-makers ... remain jobless as a direct result of their political sympathies.'[5] It then goes on to even thinner ice. Reporting about the preparations in the USSR for the Leo Tolstoy anniversary, the newspaper informs its readers that the works of that great writer 'may be read in the Soviet Union without fear of official disfavor.'[6] In short, Tolstoy is allowed, but what about other classics?

Relative to the economic situation in socialist countries, a feature characterizing it, according to *IHT*, is that today even the Soviet Union finds capitalism acceptable. What does this refer to? In a correspondénce from Moscow[7] the reporter writes about private plots of land whose existence is guaranteed by the Constitution. Needless to say, the reporter says nothing of the fact that private plots of land, as other forms of property, were guaranteed by former constitutions, that they are worked only by those to whom they belong. What relation do these private plots of land have to the capitalist mode of production? Is this ignorance on the part of the reporter or deliberate misinformation?

Methods used by the newspaper to report events it cannot ignore are also indicative. Let us see, for instance, how *IHT* reported the harvest prospects in the Soviet Union. On September 13 the information that a bumper crop was expected in the USSR was carried on a page where the 'Business' and 'Finance' sections, that are obviously read by fewer people, usually begin. On September 22 the report that the harvest would possibly set a record was buried still deeper, where it could hardly be noticed amid endless columns of figures. The September 23-24 issue carried a summary of a speech by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, but the newspaper highlighted other words taken from the speech: 'much still remains to be done.'

Of course, we can appreciate that *IHT* editors might or might not find various developments and their significance and impact on the world congenial. However, one thing is plain, it is but a step from subjective views and the corresponding methods of their presentation to misguided assessments, to semi-truths, and then to downright lies.

Considering that this is all that is reported about the socio-economic life of socialist countries, it is hard to believe that it concerns entire countries, each of which has it own complex social organism, countries where advanced, and in many cases unparalleled, heights have been reached by science, where tradition-rich culture — the theatre, literature, music, and the ballet — is developing, coun-

tries that have their own, impressive, dynamic programs of socio-economic advancement. In short, these are countries where many noteworthy economic and cultural events took place in the course of those very same four weeks, from September 11 to October 8. We shall only note one of them which was, unquestionably, of great economic significance for the fraternal countries. In Uzhgorod, USSR, the last seam was welded in that period on the Soyuz gas pipeline jointly built by the CMEA countries to meet their requirements. It would seem that *IHT,* which wrote and continues to write so much about energy problems, could appreciate this fact. However, neither this nor other significant events in the economic life of the socialist community seemed worthy of the attention of its editors.

Of course, we have no intention whatever of imposing our vision of developments on *IHT,* and much less do we plan to convert its editors to the communist faith. All we note is that the newspaper makes no effort whatever to give its readers a cross section of social life in the socialist countries, that despite the countless claims to objectivity, it is hard to find truthful reporting in it.

This concerns not only its reporting of the internal life of the socialist countries. Whatever question *IHT* raises about the foreign policy of countries of the socialist community, the Soviet Union in particular — the situation in Africa, on the frontier of Vietnam and Kampuchea, meetings of leaders of socialist countries with leaders of Arab states, to say nothing of the talks on a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe or the drawing up of a new strategic arms limitation agreement — the principal refrain of the features, reports, and comments is the 'aggressive aspirations' of the Warsaw Treaty states: first, of course, military, and then economic.

In about 30 items carried by *IHT* during the four weeks, the writers fuss over the alleged build-up of the Warsaw Treaty armed forces, supplementing, specifying, and rewriting each other. It does not matter that their information with the invariable mysterious reference to intelligence sources, is contradictory.[8] Evidently, as the newspaper's editors see it, the important thing is not facts (there is nowhere they can be gotten from) but the constantly repeated idea that the Russians are arming, that the 'Russians are marching.'

Of course, being a 'staid publication' the newspaper is careful to close an article of more than 200 lines with a dozen lines of a different content, namely, 'most military and civilian authorities interviewed in Europe believe that the present Soviet leadership will continue defense expenditure at the present level.'[9] Yet these are no more than a dozen lines against the inventions repeated not twice, but tens and even hundreds of times!

One does not have to look far for confirmation of this. It is admitted, for instance, that the Warsaw Treaty countries are showing good faith and meeting the West half-way. And then, on the same page, one reads that countries of the socialist community are deceiving their Western partners at the Vienna talks by patently understating the numerical strength of their armed forces in Central Europe.[10] Or the newspaper carries the pronouncement of a ranking U.S. State Department official, who in one and the same breath declared that in the opinion of the Soviet Union 'the United States had been "dilatory" in strategic arms talks, had acted suspiciously in strengthening ties with China, and had sought to undermine Soviet domestic authority by exploiting human rights issues'[11] and spoke of a 'deployment of new weaponry in East Europe, which "raised uncertainties about Soviet intentions".'[12]

In this way a good face is put on the matter: outwardly objective and unbiased, but actually provocative.

The impression is formed that the subject of war, of a possible military confrontation fascinates the newspaper to the extent that the editors do not consider morbid computations immoral. It turns out that after it is attacked the United States can respond with a 'retaliatory strike' that 'would kill between 20 million and 95 million persons, depending on the effectiveness of Soviet civil defense efforts.'[13] All the indications are that this sort of death arithmetic is not accidental. In this context we recall an interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski printed in *IHT* in the autumn of 1977. The then talkative National Security Adviser to the U.S. President said that 'if we used all our nuclear weapons and the Russians used all of their nuclear weapons, about 10 per cent of humanity would be killed.' He went on to say that this would be, of course, a disaster 'beyond the range of human comprehension' and 'not morally justifiable.' But, he added by way of comfort, 'descriptively and analytically, it's not the end of humanity.'[14]

When one reads this sort of thing one cannot help thinking that the newspaper is deliberately prompting the conclusion that the earth would hardly ever be a scene of cooperation. Take the report that the Soviet Union is building a nuclear power station in Finland. It would be most logical to regard this as an indication of expanding cooperation between countries with different social systems. But *IHT* puts a different interpretation on it, seeing it as 'one of the most serious economic threats by the Soviet Union against the West.'[15] In what way? Obviously it would never enter the head of any *IHT* editor to accuse the capitalist West of mounting an economic assault on the socialist countries on the sole grounds that the FRG or Japan, the

USA or France was selling Poland or Rumania, the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia technologies or factories.

It is interesting to note that the same issue of the newspaper reports that the USSR is purchasing (not selling!) a floating dock in Japan. In its comments it avoids the beaten track of Soviet economic expansion. But there are no bounds to its editors' fantasy. They write that in Europe the fighting would be mainly on land and therefore tanks were important to the Russians and their allies, but in the Far East there would be a naval war and the USSR needed the dock to service naval vessels, including carriers.[16]

The world today is indeed troubled and full of contradictions. But is the image given in the *IHT* daily 'snap-shots' a true one? Look closer at them. They show dim spots and contain dark shades. No, they are not negatives but the photographs themselves. Nevertheless, they are negative throughout. Negative developments, negative foreshortenings, and negative assessments of the life of the socialist community. The photographs are not merely blurred.

They do not mirror but distort, exaggerating and denigrating at one and the same time. They exaggerate shortcomings and denigrate the achievements of the socialist community.

And last. At its recent 20th general conference in Paris UNESCO considered the draft of a Declaration on basic principles concerning the contribution of the mass media to the promotion of peace and international understanding, the development of human rights, and the drive against racism, apartheid, and war-mongering. *IHT* went into a huff over the draft. Irritably attacking and assessing it as an encroachment on the freedom of the press,[17] it did not simply state its own view. It unambiguously declared its stand on the role and place of the press in the modern world generally. In reply to Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, Director-General UNESCO, who asked how it was conceivable for organs of information to hold back from the gigantic effort to promote a new spirit in the relations among men, *IHT* wrote: ' ... even if that were the proper mission of the press, *which it certainly is not* (My italics. — *O.S.*), direction by governments is scarcely the way to carry it out.'[18]

It put its case quite plainly: it rejects the need for peace efforts, for efforts to promote better understanding between nations. What then is its idea of its own mission and of the press generally? Here is its reply: 'Of course, if the press of the world is to make the claim that truthful reporting, not peace and brotherhood, is its mission, that implies a certain obligation to truthful reporting.'[19]

Thus, if one were to believe *IHT*, there is an irreconcilable contradiction between serving the cause of peace and international cooperation, on the one hand, and truthful reporting, on the other.

Thus, according to *IHT* it is in favor of truthful reporting and for this is prepared to undertake the highest obligations.

The newspaper's editors will evidently agree that action is always more eloquent than words. If we read *International Herald Tribune* from this angle we shall see the sort of truthful reporting it plumes itself on and also why it is opposed to the declaration on using the mass media in the interests of peace and understanding between nations.

These ideas come into conflict with, above all, its own day-to-day practice.

Olaf Stanford

1. The widespread definition 'staid publication' is given by a British royal commission for the press in *The British Press. Prepared for British Services by the Central Office of Information,* London, 1965, p. 3.
2. For brevity we shall use *IHT*.
3. *International Herald Tribune,* September 13, 1978.
4. Ibid., September 18, 1978.
5. Ibid., October 4, 1978.
6. *International Herald Tribune,* September 16-17, 1978.
7. Ibid.
8. On October 3, for instance, the newspaper reported sources (?!) as saying that the Soviet Union was annually producing 30 bombers called Backfire by the bourgeois press, and a day later, likewise with a reference to informed sources, this figure dropped to 25.
9. *International Herald Tribune,* October 3, 1978.
10. *International Herald Tribune,* September 28, 1978.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., October 4, 1978.
14. *International Herald Tribune,* October 10, 1977.
15. Ibid., October 3, 1978.
16. Ibid.
17. *International Herald Tribune,* October 27, 1978.
18. Ibid., November 2, 1978.
19. Ibid.

VALUABLE AIDS

Over the past year the Communist Party of Austria has been publishing two series of pamphlets called 'The CPA Informs' and 'The CPA Proposes Alternatives.' The pamphlets are attractively laid out and intended mainly for non-party people interested in politics, as well as the functionaries and rank and file of other parties.

Their purpose is to supply specific and accurate information about the Austrian communnists' stand on current problems that worry the nation and receive special attention in the communist and working-class movement.

Take, for example, a pamphlet entitled, like the above-mentioned series, *The CPA Proposes Alternatives*. It contains four key documents of the 23rd CPA Congress (late 1977): excerpts from the CC report to the congress; the resolution 'For Security, Social Progress, Democracy, Peace and International Solidarity' assessing the situation at home and abroad and formulating the party's tasks; the resolution 'For Disarmament, Against the Arms Race;' and the 'Ten-Point Program' stating the party's views on the necessity for a thorough revision of Austria's economic policy. Also, it gives the text of 'Political and Ideological Principles of the CPA' approved by the 22nd and reaffirmed by the 23rd Party Congress.

Another pamphlet, which deals with some current problems of the communist and working-class movement, consists of articles by Franz Muhri, Chairman of the CPA, and Erwin Scharf and Ernst Wimmer, members of the CC Political Bureau.

Erwin Scharf sets out the party's views on the relationship between autonomy and internationalism and analyzes the attitude of the Socialist International and some social-democratic parties to important aspects of international politics. He points out that in view of the Soviet Union's role in the world revolutionary process, the attitude to it is still the decisive criterion of communist policy. He also stresses that in its relations with fraternal parties the CPA proceeds from the decisions of the Berlin Conference of communists of Europe.

Other articles in the pamphlet — by Ernst Wimmer — show that inasmuch as a different situation obtains in each West European country, it would be wrong to speak of the communist parties using an identical strategy. He denounces the theory of pluralism as an

apologia, writing that while it is of no use to the working class it can be used against the working class and existing socialism.

Franz Muhri's article calls attention to the need to analyze new problems in the world communist movement and to discuss them in a comradely manner. Differences of opinion, Muhri writes, may arise from the diversity of national conditions and experience, but they may also arise where fundamental principles and the experience gained by the entire movement are not taken into proper account.

Among the pamphlets in the series 'The CPA Informs,' mention should be made of *The New CPA Program from the Marxist Point of View*. Appealing primarily to delegates and functionaries of the Socialist Party, Muhri shows with reference to that party's stand on some key problems of the working-class movement that the party has shifted to the right. This trend, he writes, is not always easy to detect, for in recent years the economic crisis has prompted the SPA to include some elements of its 'critique of capitalism' in its program. Further, Muhri sets out the democratic and social alternative evolved by the communists at their 23rd Congress, and points to a number of important demands in the SPA program which may serve as the starting point for joint initiatives by the socialists and communists, as well as by working people belonging to the Austrian People's Party.

Another pamphlet in this series is entitled *Against the Curtailment of Social Gains*. Its author, Anton Hofer, shows that while the economic situation in Austria differs from that in some other capitalist countries due to important peculiarities, the effects of the economic crisis are telling more and more even in Austria. The tougher policy adopted by the employers' unions and backed by some functionaries of the ruling party, the Austrian Freedom Party and Austrian People's Party (traditional parties of the employers), questions the working people's social gains. The author, who heads the left-wing trade union bloc (a group of the Federation of Austrian Trade Unions), specifies, on the basis of a comprehensive and detailed program of demands, the views of Austria's communists on the possibilities and prospects of a social and democratic way out of the crisis.

The pamphlets in the two series have become valuable aids for party activists in their important work among non-party people and socialists.

Peter Lautischer

BACK IN ACTION

Estudios, a journal which Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uruguay, has directed since its foundation (1956), has resumed publication abroad. This is an event of great significance.

Estudios came into being as the party's theoretical journal covering and analyzing political, economic, philosophical and cultural problems. Generalizing the experience of mass struggles, it soon won recognition and prestige. The journal made a notable contribution to the unification of progressive forces and the theory of the Uruguayan revolution by presenting the advanced ideology and role of the party as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the working class.

After the fascist takeover in Uruguay, *Estudios* suspended publication although the party continued its propaganda in other forms. Now that a determined struggle is going on against the dictatorship, it has resumed publication. 'The journal,' says the opening article in the first issue (No. 68 since its foundation), 'will persevere in its mission as an instrument of resistance, as a platform for championing democratic unity in the struggle against the dictatorship.' 'This is the first issue,' the article continues, 'which came out without the participation of Rita Ibarburu, the journal's technical secretary whose heroism in prison and under torture have made her a symbol of all Uruguayan women of today.' Her portrait on page one reminds the reader of the Uruguayan communists' loyalty to revolutionary theory and practice, their anti-fascist staunchness and their confidence in the future of the revolution.

The journal has an editorial column, a column dealing with international politics and two sections: 'Theory and Politics,' with two articles by Arismendi, and 'Fascism in Uruguay.' The issue includes eyewitness accounts and book reviews.

The reappearance of *Estudios* gives new strength to Uruguayan communists at home and abroad. It is a valuable contribution to the international democratic and communist movement.

Sergio Sierra

Multinational firms of Great Britain

John Turner
CP of Great Britain

The evolution of multinational corporations (MCs) in Britain is largely a reflection of the country's place and role in the contemporary world capitalist economy. As far as the number of big monopolies is concerned, Britain is among the leading countries of the world. Of the biggest 500 companies in Western Europe, 135 are British. And while the tune in today's capitalist world is called by U.S. private capitalist giants, the first MCs were West European, primarily British. As the multinationals of Western Europe started earlier, it is they and not the U.S. monopolies that have gone a long way toward transnationalization. Of the biggest 26 MCs (annual sales, over $1,000 mln.) whose 'foreign content,' or arithmetical mean of sales, production, assets, earnings and work force abroad, exceeds 75 per cent, five are U.S. companies and eight, British. They include such firms as Imperial Chemical Industries, Rio Tinto Zinc and British-American Tobacco.

The British MCs are noteworthy for a high degree of foreign expansion involving export of capital. Though based in Britain, they sell twice as much abroad as they export from Britain whereas the biggest West German and Japanese firms sell only 40 per cent abroad compared with export from their countries. In this light, it is probably fair to say that the cosmopolitanism of capital is particularly marked in Britain.

Let us take the manufacturing and processing industries. They are dominated by 40 major companies which derive a substantial proportion of their profits from their overseas production, approximating to half their home production. They include Imperial Chemical Industries, with an annual turnover of $7,000 mln.; Unilever (Anglo-Dutch), $14,900 mln.; British Leyland, $3,900 mln.; General Electric, $3,500 mln.; and Dunlop, $2,200 mln.*

Most of these corporations have expanded greatly in recent years by taking over or merging with small firms. This happened especially in

Continuing the series of reference and statistical data on capitalist multinational companies (see *WMR*, August 1978).

*1976 figures.

1967-68, when more than 5,000 British companies were involved in mergers and takeovers of one kind or another. Nearly 70 of the top 100 companies were bidding for other companies, or were themselves bid for. Of the companies at the beginning of 1967 with a value of £10 mln., or more, over a quarter were taken over.

As well as manufacturing, a number of big British firms invest overseas on a large scale in oil, agriculture, transport, distribution and wholesale trade. Among them are the two giants, Shell (1976 turnover, $33,000 mln.) and British Petroleum ($17,900 mln.). A considerable part of their assets and their employees are overseas, not in Britain.

In recent years many of the British MCs have been rapidly increasing their investment overseas. The annual rate of such investment by all British companies rose from about £200-£300 million a year in the early 1960s to nearly £2,000 mln. in 1975. In 1975 the total value of overseas investment by British MCs was £12,900 mln. (excluding oil, insurance and banking), of which about 60 per cent, or about £7,700 mln., was investment by manufacturing companies. These are 'book figures;' the market value of the investments is a good deal higher.

Yet these firms, which also dominate the home market (it is estimated that by 1980 the 100 largest companies will produce two-thirds of the net output of the manufacturing industry in Britain), have starved industry at home of investment.

The result is that British industry is backward and out-of-date in comparison with its main foreign competitors. Reporting on the British car industry in 1975, the House of Commons Expenditure Committee said: 'Again and again we were told of the damaging effects of a lack of investment, resulting in insufficient power "behind the worker's elbow," particularly by comparison with foreign firms.' A government White Paper in 1974 pointed out that 'in 1971 investment for each worker was less than half that in France, Japan or the United States, and well below that in Germany or Italy. . . . It was significantly less in 1972 and in 1973 than it was in 1970.'

The claim of those who defend the multinationals is that the profits they make abroad benefit the British balance of payments because they are remitted back to Britain. But, in fact, recent remittances have been running at less than a third of declared foreign profits, and the net deficit between remittances and investment abroad has been nearly £1,000 mln. a year. So the activities of the multinationals have not only aggravated the problem of the lack of investment within Britain, but also added to the balance-of-payments deficit.

The government uses the economic problems of the country to try to justify its attempt to reduce real wages and cut spending on the social services. These drastic measures are necessary, say govern-

ment ministers, because only by cutting the consumption of the people and the spending on such 'luxuries' as local council housing, the health service and education can money and resources be freed for investment in the manufacturing industry. Thus attempts are made to justify a policy which will put more profits in the multinationals' pockets at the expense of the working class, with no guarantee whatever that those profits will in fact be used to increase investment at home.

The MCs exert disastrous influence, not only on the national economy, but on government policy at home and abroad. They were enthusiastic advocates of British entry into the Common Market, seeing this as a means of extending their influence and facilitating expansion in West European countries. The result of British entry has proved catastrophic for the British people.

Finally, the British multinational firms are bastions of neo-colonialism. The top five British MCs — Shell, Unilever, British Petroleum, British-American Tobacco and Imperial Chemical Industries — are deeply involved in the exploitation of the developing countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. British investment in South Africa is on a vast scale, and helps prop the apartheid regime there. Among the firms involved are Imperial Chemical Industries, Unilever, Metal Box, Associated British Foods, Tate and Lyle, Dunlop and Rio Tinto Zinc. In August 1978, a further instance of support for racist regimes by British multinationals gained publicity. In glaring violation of the UN decision to deny economic aid to racist Rhodesia, British Petroleum and Shell have for 11 years shipped oil to that regime by the tens of thousands of tons a year.

Operating in Britain as in other major capitalist countries are both 'domestic' and 'foreign' MCs, or multinationals based overseas. The domination of foreign MCs is very much in evidence in Britain. They account for about half the turnover of the car industry, and include substantial sectors of the electrical, telecommunications, computers, chemicals, detergents and other industries. Most of them are U.S. multinationals, including Ford, Chrysler, Vauxhall (General Motors), IBM and Rank Xerox. Their parent companies have often made threats to curtail or close down their operations in Britain unless the workers reduce their pay demands, or unless the companies receive government financial assistance. Thus, in 1975, the Chrysler company threatened to close down its car plants in Britain. A further threat to close down the British operation was made, and in the end the government agreed to give financial aid to the company of up to £162 mln. The government admitted that it would have cost less than this to nationalize the factories concerned, but they preferred to leave them in U.S. monopoly hands. This was the most glaring example of

the blackmailing tactics of foreign MCs in Britain, but it had been preceded by blackmail and threats from many U.S. monopolies, which go on using these methods.

Britain's balance of payments and the position of the pound sterling are particularly affected by the activities of multinational firms. The multinationals also make use of the foreign exchange markets to switch their surplus funds from one currency to another in the hope that by so doing they can benefit from any devaluation which may take place. This was the case in Britain more than once. The huge amounts of money at their disposal precipitated difficulties for the pound and led to a devaluation.

The MCs wield great influence in Britain. They dominate an increasing proportion of home production and distribution, and struggle with each other for new positions on the world market. Their loyalties are not to the British people but to their shareholders, and they operate regardless of the national interest. They constitute a threat to the sovereignty of the British people, to their standard of living and to their democratic rights. They are also a threat to the working people of other countries in Europe and to the developing countries, whose peoples and resources they exploit. For these reasons British communists campaign for action to control the activities of the multinational firms and to take them into public ownership.

IN MEMORY OF HOUARI BOUMEDIENNE

Houari Boumedienne, President of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, was a prominent leader of the national-liberation movement and an outstanding progressive statesman and politician of the Arab world and Africa.

His name is associated with the foremost events in the Algerian people's heroic struggle against colonial oppression and, after the winning of national independence, for reaching the goals of socialism-oriented development.

As head of state since 1965, Houari Boumedienne consistently followed the course of profound changes for the benefit of the working people. The most important of these were the building of the key industries within the state sector, a cardinal remoulding of agriculture, and broad-scale development of education.

Under his leadership Algeria has steadily pursued the policy of coexistence of countries with differing social systems, firmly defended the anti-imperialist content of the non-aligned movement, followed the course of cooperation with socialist and other progressive

states, and worked for unity of the progressive forces in the Arab world.

Houari Boumedienne has always enjoyed respect and prestige among the people of Algeria, in the Arab countries, and on the international scene. Communists and all who cherish the ideals of peace and progress will remember him as a man devoted to the interests of his people, to the cause of national independence and social justice the world over.

IN MEMORY OF A COMRADE

Comrade Sergio Sierra, member of the Central Committee of the CP Uruguay, and member of the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review,* has died after a severe and protracted illness.

Sergio Sierra joined the Communist Youth League and the Communist Party of Uruguay in 1935. From 1942, he worked as a journalist, writing for the anti-fascist newspaper *Diario popular,* the journal *Uruguay — USSR,* and the CPU Central Committee's journal *Ideas;* he was an editor of the party's daily *El Popular,* wrote for the CPU's theoretical and political journal *Estudios,* and contributed to the underground editions of *Analisis y Orientacion* and *Ensayos*. In the past several years, Sergio Sierra was the CPU's representative on *World Marxist Review*.

Sergio Sierra wrote a number of pamphlets and studies on education and culture.

On various occasions he represented the CP Uruguay at international theoretical and scientific conferences.

Everyone who has known Sergio Sierra will remember him as a consistent internationalist and a warm-hearted and sensitive comrade.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England

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

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

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

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

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières
185 rue Ontario est
Montréal, Québec, H2X 1H5, Canada

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St.,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Bagdad, Iraq

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay
Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee
St., Calcutta 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: Russki 6,
'Hemus', Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2,
Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

DUTCH EDITION: Institut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti
Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11,
00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandels-
betrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig,
Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITIONS:

Stephanos N. Papayannis,
Menandrou 66, Athens, Greece
People's Agency,
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus.

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of
Peace and Socialism, P.O.B.
9525, Haifa, Israel.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI,
Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura, Könyv-és
Hirlap Külkereskedelmi Vallalat,
Budapest 1. Fö u 32. Hungary.

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via
della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

MALAYALAM EDITION:
5 Rani Jhansi Road,
New Delhi 55, India.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol
Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I.
Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715,
Oslo 1, Norway.

PERSIAN EDITION:
P.B. 49034, 10028,
Stockholm 49, Sweden.

POLISH EDITION: RSW, 'Prasa-
ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul.
Wronia 23, Poland.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista
Internacional, Av. Santos Dumont,
57, 30 Lisboa-1, Portugal.

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

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

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

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

SPANISH EDITIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este,
No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Empresa Editora e Importadora
C.A., Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget
Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede
6, Stockholm, Sweden.

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

TURKISH EDITION: Agence de
diffusion, 16616 Praha 6,
Thakurova 3, CSSR

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu
sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi,
Vietnam