WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

June 1980, Volume 23, Number 6 $1.00

Ireland / 57

Unemployment / 32

Imperialism, Zionism and reaction / 10

Meeting of European communists / 3

'Convergence of difficulties' / 15

Sudan / 53

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

June 1980, Vol. 23, No. 6

Features

3 Meeting of European communist and workers' parties

4 Present-day anti-communism and ways of countering it
WMR Commission on Science, Culture and Sociological Studies

10 Beating back the drive by imperialism, Zionism and reaction
N. Ashhab

15 'Convergence of difficulties' in face of the facts
W. Klimczak, R. Francis

The Party

20 Toward mature socialism
M. Korom

23 Conference in Havana

24 The growing role of the social sciences
J. Havlin

28 The lessons of six decades
T. Sinuraya

Exchange of views

32 Devastating disease
WMR Commision on Problems of Class Struggle in Developed Capitalist Countries

41 Ways to a new world economic order
I. Totu

45 Technological progress and the crisis of capitalism
K. Gill

Viewpoints

49 Against repression and persecution
G. Mahmud

50 The first Russian Revolution and the Paris Commune
P. Hentges

53 In the dead-end of capitalist orientation
A. Salim

57 Threat to Irish independence
T. O'Flaherty

61 Why Soviet people do not want war
I. Pavlov

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

The press

63 Through the prism of revolution
H. Bahrami

66 Ideas that have gathered strength
E. Weber

67 For working-class unity
L. Paso

69 In memory of Josip Broz Tito

70 Focus on industrial workers
J. West

71 New books

72 Diary

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, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, 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.

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, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

In the USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

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

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

features

Meeting of European communist and workers' parties

Convened on the initiative of the French Communist Party and the Polish United Workers' Party, a Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties for Peace and Disarmament was held in Paris on April 28-29. It was attended by delegations of the Communist Party of Austria, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Denmark, the Communist Party of Finland, the French Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the German Communist Party, the Communist Party of Greece, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Ireland, the Communist Party of Luxembourg, the Communist Party of Malta, the Communist Party of Norway, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Portuguese Communist Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Turkey, and the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, and also by observers from the Communist Party of Belgium and the Swiss Party of Labour. Representatives of all the delegations spoke at the Meeting.

The participants unanimously passed the following Appeal of the Communists to the Peoples of the European Countries.

APPEAL OF THE COMMUNISTS TO THE PEOPLES OF THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

We are worried by the reckless intensification of the arms race.

Peoples of the European countries, you are right in showing vigilance.

The means of destruction and death, accumulated in our continent, which is so very densely populated, or aimed at it, are a major threat to our common destiny. You also realize how monstrous is the squandering of resources and what tremendous means are being diverted from meeting the everyday needs and from the future development of the peoples and nations of Europe. You see what tremendous harm is being done to the cause of peace, to détente, mutual trust and international cooperation by the campaign of military psychosis, which has been launched recently with a view to resuming the cold war.

Yet, there are plans to install in the very heart of Europe new nuclear arsenals; to destroy the achievements of détente. In question are the already signed agreements, negotiations already under way, the existing economic, cultural, sports and human links.

The peoples in our continent have paid dearly in learning the true value of peace, firm friendship and cooperation. The 35th anniversary of the victory over nazism makes us realize better the extent to which peace is one of the primary human rights and a necessary human blessing.

All of us who are building our lives in our respective European countries may lose everything as the result of this dangerous escalation. So let us exclude the very possibility of the destruction of this region of the globe, whose substantial human and economic potential is needed by the whole of mankind, and let us safeguard its natural and historical wealth which is part of mankind's heritage on earth.

Whoever we may be, and wherever we may be living in Europe, we can only stand to gain from the settlement of existing problems by negotiations; we can only stand to gain from the reduction of armaments and armed forces and from progress in disarmament, which meets the requirements of equal and guaranteed security of all states and nations.

The forces exist for the attainment of this goal.

We communists are advocates of peace; we want disarmament, cooperation and friendship among nations. Therefore we say: peace is our common cause, and our common actions will provide for its victory. Together:

Let us work for the cancellation or actual suspension of the implementation of the NATO decisions to produce and deploy new U.S. missiles in Europe, in order to launch effective negotiations on the issue of middle-range missiles under conditions of equality and equal security.

Let us work for the soonest possible ratification of the SALT-2 accord and the continuation of the talks to further limit strategic armaments.

Let us struggle to secure decisive progress at the Vienna talks and for the reduction of armed forces and armaments, let us support all the partial steps aimed at attaining this goal, including the establishment of nuclear-free zones in our continent, guaranteed against the use of such weapons against them.

Let us struggle for the 1980 Madrid meeting on European security and cooperation. Let us make it our goal to ensure further progress in the implementation by all states of all the provisions in the

Helsinki Final Act, especially through complementing political détente with military détente.

Let us work for the convocation in Warsaw of a European conference on military détente and disarmament.

Let us demand the practical implementation of the decisions of the UN special disarmament session.

Let us work to ensure that the funds thereby released would be used for development and for combating hunger, as the non-aligned nations suggest. This is consonant with the interests of all mankind.

Yes, the struggle for disarmament is the paramount issue today!

We, the communists of all the countries of Europe, are ready for any sort of dialogue, consultation and joint action when it comes to the struggle for peace and disarmament. To this end, we want all the peace-loving forces to join together. We say to all, whatever our national origins, our convictions, our way of life — communists, socialists, social-democrats, or Christians and believers of other faiths:

'Peace is our common heritage!'

Gathered at this meeting, we proclaim our desire for an open initiative within whose framework the widest contacts could be made and the broadest possible dialogue could be held. We are prepared, in forms acceptable to all, for consultations and exchanges of views with all the forces in Europe that are resolved to act, in the Helsinki spirit and in anticipation of Madrid, in the interests of continuing the policy of détente and exploring avenues for reducing armaments in our continent.

Men and women of goodwill, let us act together in each country and in Europe as a whole.

Given unity, the cause of progress, happiness and peace will triumph.

Present-day anti-communism and ways of countering it

The 1980s have opened with a further intensification of the ideological struggle and a steep upturn in anti-communism. While it attacks all the three great progressive forces of our time — the world socialist system, the international working class, and the national liberation movement — anti-communism invariably rests on anti-Sovietism and defamation of existing socialism. Acting in accordance with the changes taking place in the world, it varies its tactics, using different ways and means of striking at progressive mankind.

For all communists and democrats, for all who seek lasting détente, it is of the utmost importance to expose the anti-communist ideology and practices of world imperialism. This was emphasized at the 1976 Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties. 'Anti-communism,' its final document stated, 'is and remains an instrument which the imperialist and reactionary forces use not only against the communists but also against democrats and democratic freesoms. . . . In order to clear the way for progress and democratic development, which the people want, anti-communism must be isolated and overcome.'[1]

WMR has regularly featured the problem of combating anti-communism. It now intends to consider various aspects of this problem, primarily in view of the *new* trends and developments in anti-communist activity. This has been discussed by its Commission on Science, Culture and Sociological Studies. Here we present some of the commission's findings.

Changes in the international situation; evolution of anti-communism

By nature anti-communism has been and remains imperialism's reaction to ongoing historical developments such as the socialist system's impressive advances and the extension and intensification of the anti-imperialist struggle in capitalist and developing countries, and also to acute crisis phenomena in any sphere of capitalist society. Anti-communism's ideological and political substance remains unchanged; in the recent period it has been vividly manifested in the massive anti-communist campaign of slander and threats by the imperialist forces, and attempts at discrediting the communist parties and their leaders. However, the march of history affects some of its characteristics and the orientation, forms, and methods of its activities.

Its evolution is taking place in the global context of the fundamental realignment of world forces in favor of socialism and the sharp exacerbation of all of capitalism's contradictions.

The socialist countries now account for more than 40 per cent of the world industrial product. The initiative in international political relations is firmly held by socialism, whose détente policy has won widespread acclaim among the masses. The Soviet Union has achieved stable military parity with the United States, a parity which cannot be changed. In the ideological sphere the theory of scientific communism has become the world-view of hundreds of millions in the socialist countries and of communists in capitalist and developing nations, and has tens of millions of adherents throughout the world.

For the world capitalist system, on the contrary, the past decade has been a period of the most violent economic upheavals, social conflicts and political discredit since World War II. To this day the extremely grave economic crisis of the 1970s con-

tinues to show its effects in the shape not only of an economic recession but also of a serious ideological and political crisis; large sections of the population have lost their confidence in the ability of state-monopoly capitalism to cope with the situation.

Anti-communism is thus acting against existing socialism from incomparably weaker economic, social, and political positions than before. However, the dialectics of the historical competition between the two social systems also manifests itself in the fact that a weakening of capitalism's international positions does not at all lead to a slackening of anti-communism. Indeed, dread of the future prompts state-monopoly capitalism to seek salvation in anti-communism, which is becoming *more and more bellicose*. This is due to the total miscarriage of earlier positive ideals (John F. Kennedy's 'New Frontiers', Lyndon B. Johnson's 'Great Society', West Germany's 'Economic Miracle', and so on) and to an obvious inability to evolve new social and political ideals and programs reasonably attractive to the masses.

Chronologically, the stepping up of anti-communism in recent years coincided with an overall change in the ideological climate of capitalist society, in which the 1970s witnessed the beginning of a shift in thinking from technological optimism to social pessimism. This is seen in the assessments offered by leading bourgeois politicians and ideologists. Henry Kissinger, for one, conceded in one of his numerous interviews that when he was Secretary of State he not only derived historical enlightenment and political inspiration from Oswald Spengler's and Arnold Toynbee's forecast of the imminent eclipse of 'Western civilization' but recommended their books to President Nixon.[2] Professor Daniel Bell of Harvard University, perhaps one of the most authorative sociologists in the capitalist world today, says that unlike old capitalism, which justified itself socially by defending private property, 'new capitalism' has no historical legitimacy.[3] His like-minded 'neoconservative' colleague, Irving Kristol, goes so far as to declare that the Founding Fathers and Adam Smith would have been perplexed to learn that the corporate bureaucracy ruling America is still called a 'system of natural liberty.'[4]

Unable to vindicate capitalism as a 'just', 'ideal', the 'best' or at least 'attractive' society, its advocates try all the harder to present it to world opinion as the 'lesser social evil', in any case compared with the other social alternative, communism and existing socialism, which the anti-communists invariably characterize as the 'greater evil'.

A postulate of anti-communist logic is that the less attractive capitalism becomes, the more communism should be smeared no matter how much this conflicted with reality. A tendency that has lately been gaining ground in anti-communism's overall conception is to portray the opponents not merely as the 'greater evil' but as a direct 'menace' to mankind, meaning either the 'Soviet military threat', or the 'socialist threat to democratic rights'.

This is the main political content of anti-communism and reflects the peculiarities of the current stage of world development and of the changed international situation; the anti-communists use this thesis to disguise their attempts to stop détente and bring about a new cold war. The evolution of the organizational and technical characteristics of the ideology and policy in question accords to a degree with this content. It is marked by a visible expansion of the social and regional scope of anti-communism; an active rapprochement and fusion of its diverse contingents and trends; a switch from relatively spontaneous, disunited, and poorly programmed activities to a wide range of political and propaganda measures in line with uniform strategy and tactics; an immense diversity of methods and means, including a discriminating approach to different countries or groups of countries, different social and political forces, different population groups, and so on.

An ideological substitute

As a set of views, ideas, and concepts, anti-communism is a distinctive ideological phenomenon of our day. It combines a bellicose posture with spiritual poverty, hypocrisy with undisguised cynicism, ample use of scientific and technological achievements in production and the mass media with disregard of scientific arguments and even common sense.

The purpose of every ideology is to substantiate the fundamental, long-range interests of a class or social stratum and formulate the objectives of social development. For all the historical limitations and inevitable duplicity of the ideologists of the ruling exploiter classes in antagonistic societies, these ideologies can fulfill their mission only if they meet at least the following elementary requirements: their founders must at least themselves be convinced of the veracity and justice of the views they propound; these views must contain a social ideal more or less attractive to the population; the advocated ideas and nations must be in mutual harmony, possess a measure of coherence, and must contain no logical contradictions.

Seen from this standpoint, anti-communism in general and present-day anti-communism in particular do not hold water. In effect, they constitute an *ideological substitute* concealing the historical indefensibility and ideological bankruptcy of the reactionary bourgeoisie.

Anti-communism is, first and foremost, a set of cynical falsehoods disbelieved by their own originators.

Further, the anti-communists cannot offer the people anything even remotely approaching a social ideal. They fill this gap with a demagogical apologia for the realities of capitalism and with slander against the communist movement and existing socialism.

Lastly, anti-communism cannot give anything in the way of a convincing and coherent theoretical exposition. Its various proponents put forward countless mutually exclusive propositions.

A typical substitute for an ideology, anti-

communism is, nevertheless, expected by state-monopoly capitalism, its principal inspirer, to function as an ideology in the true sense of the word, that is to say, to cement capitalist society morally and ideologically, counter ideological influences dangerous to that society, and weaken its chief adversaries — the world liberation movement and existing socialism. This contradiction is the source of many of anti-communism's essential features as an ideological and political phenomenon.

To begin with, it is evident that anti-communism cannot achieve its purposes in an open theoretical polemic with scientific communism, with the ideology of socialism. 'Communism', wrote Henry C. Wallich, a bourgeois ideologist and now a member of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Federal Reserve System, 'is a formidable intellectual structure built by first-rate minds over many decades, with an inner logic and consistency that capitalism might envy. The average American, debating with a Russian the merits of their respective systems, would soon find himself in hot water, unless he were exceptionally nimble. An American economist facing a trained Marxist dialectician might find the going even harder.'[5]

Since this was written, the situation has greatly deteriorated for the anti-communists under the impact of existing socialism's steady progress and the sharp deepening of capitalism's contradictions. No attempt to disprove Marxism-Leninism has stood the test of time — neither the concepts 'people's capitalism' and 'integral industrial society', nor the myths of convergence and deideologization, nor yet the theories of 'post-industrial', 'super-industrial', 'technetronic' and other alternatives to socialist society. Some have been discarded even by their authors, while others have been relegated to the backyard of the bourgeois academic community.

This is not to say, of course, that the anti-communists have given up. They persist in concocting new anti-Marxist theories, such as the 'new philosophy' and the 'temptations of totalitarianism'. But in spite of the sensation-mongering by their architects, the only distinction between these theories and their predecessors is probably that the former have sunk deeper into malice. In fact, in an effort to give anti-communism the standing of a theory such diehard champions of capitalism as William Simon, an American 'neoconservative', suggest that capitalism should build up its own 'ideological corps of thinkers' and that 'they must be given grants, grants, and more grants in exchange for books, books, and more books.'[6] However, many of Simon's colleagues are not sure that even big money can buy good theories. A most forceful confirmation of anti-communism's impotence to develop a theory is that Raymond Aron, an extraordinary bourgeois ideologist, has by his own admission had to abandon the idea of writing a fundamental anti-Marxist work which he had cherished for decades.

The anti-communists are even less inclined to give scientific communism battle over the social ideal. Their would-be ideology can offer the people nothing but discredited surrogates like 'consumer society' (as a substitute for the real well-being), 'leisure civilization' (which cannot ensure the full development of the individual) or philanthropy (a timorous attempt to conceal the lack of social justice).

Having little hope of refuting communism and finding no logically sound and scientifically based arguments to convince mankind of the 'advantages' of capitalism over socialism, the anti-communists try harder to move their fight against communism to the sphere of *psychological warfare*. This warfare gives them the opportunity of dispensing with arguments of reason and exploiting prejudice, of suggesting instead of proving, and of using myths and sophisms instead of facts, in short, not of convincing people but of cynically manipulating their minds and behavior, using the mass media and the achievements of social psychology to the hilt.

False antinomies

With the consolidation of 'capitalist civilization' as their aim, the high priests of anti-communism want to prove that the people should put aside their 'group' interests as well as social conflicts and contradictions in the face of the common 'external enemy', communism. Even the disinherited and wronged population groups, they argue, 'stand to lose' as a consequence of the 'threat of communist enslavement from without'. In the camp of their political opponents, however, they try to inspire and encourage directly opposite sentiments, to fuel any dissatisfaction of individuals or groups, assuring them that their enemies are not outside but in the socialist system and urging them to look for 'friends' elsewhere, that is, in the capitalist world.

In conformity with this strategy, anti-communism goes to all lengths to discredit Marxism-Leninism and the scientific ideology of socialism with the aid of renegades and 'repentant ex-communists'. This is also the purpose of its hunt for the signatures of prominent but politically inexperienced personalities in the world of science or culture to anti-socialist lampoons and declarations.

With the ideological struggle developing into psychological warfare the traditional distinctions between the so-called, or official, propaganda of anti-communism and black, or unofficial, propaganda are being steadily erased. Propaganda by the government and other official agencies of the capitalist countries no longer scruples to use clearly provocative methods and devices from the armory of the yellow press, 'anomymous sources', and so on.

But the central hallmark of present-day anti-communism is that it is shifting the main arena of its struggle against communism and existing socialism from the sphere of theory into that of *ordinary consciousness*. When it does so it couples its constructs with subtle psychological indoctrination, which is contra-indicated for theoretical consciousness but has proved effective in commercial advertising and business competition.

Anti-communism has always been characterized by unabashed social demagoguery, political rhet-

oric and sophistry, distortion of the significance of world developments, and juggling with the facts. In recent years it has achieved 'perfection' in the use of these devices, its more favorite ones being false antinomies, or false dilemmas.

The anti-communists want world opinion to regard them as champions of freedom and equality, peace and security, national independence and social justice. However, from what they themselves assert, it is to be inferred that all these ideals and principles are antinomic, in other words, mutually incompatible, as they see it, individual freedom can only be guaranteed to the detriment of equality, which, in turn can only be provided at the expense of freedom; greater security necessitates a continued arms race, while disarmament, on the contrary, reduces security; détente undermines political stability in the world, and national independence (in developing countries) runs counter to economic, scientific, and technological progress. Those who demand greater democratic rights for ethnic minorities, the emancipation of women, and uphold the interests of young people are charged with winking at crime and drug addiction and disrupting public life. The anti-communists suggest that those who declare for law and order should renounce democratic rights. In short, what they are saying is: 'You cannot have everything. Something must be surrendered.' Either inflation, or unemployment; either monopoly domination, or a repressive political regime.

This sophistry, which does its job very well at the level of the politically unenlightened, is strikingly exemplified by 'What Belongs to Whom?', an essay in *Newsweek* by Milton Friedman, Nobel Prize winner. The inviolability of private property, he contends, is a guarantee of the democratic rights and personal liberties of every American. Hence, any attempt to curb the scandalous profits of the oil monopolies amounts to an encroachment on every American's 'life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness'. One has only to allow the state to curtail the interests of these monopolies for it to begin arbitrarily estimating the value of the personal property of every citizen, of his house, furniture, and even collection of postage stamps. As a result, Friedman infers, every American would come to bear the sinister imprint of a totalitarian state: 'Property of the U.S. government. Do not fold, spindle or mutilate.'[7]

Skillful mimicry is another approved device for the indoctrination of the ordinary consciousness. It expresses itself, for example, in the fact that propaganda beamed to the socialist countries is accompanied with professions of goodwill. Anti-communist radio broadcasts combine vicious criticism of socialism's political and economic system with 'sympathetic' advice on how to 'improve' it, what reforms should be carried out, and so on.

To believe the anti-communists, their only concern is for the well-being, democratic rights, and spiritual progress of ordinary people in the socialist countries. One might think that by acting on their advice, all the difficulties and problems encountered by existing socialism would be resolved overnight. The purpose of their 'benevolent advice' is, of course, to weaken and undermine existing socialism. What concern for the interests of the people in socialist countries can the anti-communists speak of when they unilaterally cancel trade, scientific-technical, cultural, and other agreements with these countries, have been maintaining an economic boycott of Cuba for the past twenty years, and are willing to incur substantial losses in order to generate difficulties in socialist countries?

Anti-communist calls for 'liberalization' in socialist countries are equally hypocritical. Those inclined to take them at their face value would do well to remember a passage in Raymond Aron's book *Plea for Decadent Europe*. After theorizing about the outlook for 'liberalization' under socialism, Aron demagogically asserts that Salazar Portugal, Franco Spain, and Greece under the Colonels were incomparably more liberal societies than the communist regimes of Eastern Europe.[8]

In peddling the idea of 'liberalization' in the socialist countries, militant anti-communists in the capitalist countries are engaged in a crusade against liberal bourgeois reformists, whom they accuse of complicity with the communists, of planning to subvert the capitalist system from within through 'excessive' social spending, and what not. Irving Kristol, a pillar of 'neoconservatism' in the USA and an avowed anti-communist, not only demands that American liberals should henceforth be called 'socialists' or 'neosocialists' but even wonders whether the state ought not to limit the individual freedom of those — including liberals — who abuse it 'to subvert and abolish a free society'[9]. This is the real meaning of all the anti-communist talk about liberalization.

Anti-communist propaganda, especially for socialist countries, makes a show of advocating political and ideological 'pluralism', which it would also like to impose on the international communist and working-class movement so as to disunite the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. To demonstrate their alleged political and ideological tolerance, the anti-communist ideologists refer constantly to the 'advantages' of the bourgeois democracies. Yet in some bourgeois countries democratic rights and political freedoms were wrested from imperialist reaction through struggle, at the cost of enormous sacrifice. More, these rights are still largely a dead letter.

The political 'tolerance' the anti-communists boast of is not only nominal and highly selective. It does not extend to numerous sectors of capitalist society — not only the communists but also the socialists and democrats in general. The attitude of the reactionary state-monopoly oligarchy to various manifestations of dissent, of ideological and political 'pluralism', depends primarily on the extent to which they can be reduced to a common anti-communist denominator. The less dissent is left as a result in the pseudo-radical numerator and the more anti-Marxism, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in the denominator, the more tolerantly

and even benevolently the anti-communists treat that political 'fraction'.

This, in effect, is what prompts international reaction in a number of cases to be amazingly lenient torward many trends and individual exponents of petty-bourgeois radicalism, left extremism, and fanatical nationalism, including Maoism. It also explains the tendency that has been growing in recent years toward direct collaboration (chiefly on anti-Soviet lines) between right- and 'left'-wing anti-communism.

Right- and 'left'-wing anti-communists not only 'enrich' each other with slanderous arguments against existing socialism but develop a common anti-Soviet vocabulary quite quickly. The former lavishly supply the latter with the refuse of their reactionary concepts and readily borrow pseudo-leftist phraseology from them, so that even outward distinctions between them tend to disappear. This is perfectly natural, for the common hallmarks of both right- and 'left'-wing anti-communism are hostility for democracy, scorn for the masses, and political adventurism.

An embodiment of reaction all along the line

In order to erect a barrier to the main trend of social progress and prevent the triumph of a just social system, anti-communism also encroaches on every progressive gain of the working people, on the democratic rights and freedoms won by them through struggle, and the humanist achievement and cultural traditions of all nations.

In exposing the hypocritical declarations of bellicose anti-communism, which claims to uphold individual freedom and human rights and to oppose 'totalitarianism', it is essential to reveal what the anti-communists really are after. When presented to the world as they are, without their mask of respectability, they eventually turn out to be not for but against freedom and rights, not against totalitarianism but for total, unrestricted control by the state-monopoly oligarchies over the peoples, including their own.

Anti-communism's social ideal is unlimited power for a handful of allegedly enlightened 'meritocrats' based on an unnatural combination of the achievements of modern science and technology and medieval obscurantism (witch-hunts, religious 'revival', a class hierarchy of rulers and ruled) and on all-embracing manipulation of the consciousness and behavior of the masses backed by repressive law and order. It is this technocratic utopia that one comes across in the futurological forecasts popular among anti-communists.[10]

Bellicose anti-communism personifies reaction all along the line. Anti-democracy, anti-humanism and hostility for the people have always been implicit in it. These tendencies are now strengthened considerably by increasing anti-intellectualism.

This is not to say that the anti-communists include no highly educated or even gifted bourgeois intellectuals, who have linked their personal careers to the fortunes of state-monopoly capitalism. In fact, anti-communist political and propaganda campaigns involve more and more people who have made a name for themselves in science, the arts and letters or even sports and whom the anti-communists win over by exploiting their weak points and political inexperiences and by flattering them as the 'intellectual elite' of the century. However, this tactic cannot produce reasonably effective intellectual constructs; it cannot alleviate the poverty of anti-communist ideology.

Unfortunately, there are many in the world who imagine that bellicose anti-communism is willing to confine itself to attacks against the international communist and working-class movement, and existing socialism. Anti-Sovietism is, of course, the core of anti-communism. It is also true that the anti-communists hate Marxist-Leninist parties more than anything else. But nowadays anyone who does not accept their policies and ideology is seen by them as a sworn or potential enemy.

Against this background one can only wonder at the naïveté of some socialists and social-democrats who have committed themselves to anti-Sovietism and anti-communism in the hope of appeasing the standard-bearers of imperialism, winning their support and thereby remaining in power or assuming it. Very dangerous political illusions are also entertained by those spokesmen of the general democratic movement who seek in anti-communism support for their reformist schemes aimed at some 'improvement' of capitalism.

For the bellicose anti-communists anyone who resists their reactionary aspirations and political adventurism or refuses to subscribe to their retrograde views unconditionally is an enemy with whom only a temporary truce is possible. No concession will satisfy them; they want total surrender. The only thing that makes them list their future victims — communists, social-democrats, petty-bourgeois radicals, liberal reformists, progressive Catholics and bourgeois nationalists — in a definite order is their realization that world reaction cannot defeat all its opponents simultaneously. However, experience has shown that this order may be altered by circumstances. Recent international events, especially in some Latin American countries, have indicated that imperialist reaction does not necessarily settle accounts first with those whom it hates most of all. It often strikes those whom it can suppress easier than others.

Marxist-Leninists have never denied that they have many fundamental difference with other parties and left-wing currents in the working people's liberation movement, let alone with right-wing reformists and pacifists. Nor do they expect adherents of these currents to accept Marxism-Leninism and become supporters of communism. But plain common sense and political prescience ought to make it clear that present-day anti-communism is directed not only against the communists but also against the general democratic and liberation movement as a whole, against all who are involved in it in one way or another.

The struggle against anti-communism is indivisible

Anti-communism assumes numerous forms and takes on one or another hue depending on the bourgeois political trend it is associated with. Accordingly, it has long been classed as liberal, social-democratic, nationalist, and so on. In the 1960s and early 1970s it was the liberal variety that called the tune. In the middle and the closing years of the 1970s state-monopoly capitalism's policy and ideology came to be dominated by the more reactionary trends of right-wing anti-communism linked with the re-emergence of 'neoconservatism' (first of all in the United States but also in Britain, France, and West Germany). At the same time, petty-bourgeois left radical anti-communism became widespread. However, this multiformity of anti-communist ideology and policy has lately been giving way — both in individual capitalist countries and internationally — to more active (overt or covert) unification and cooperation of all existing anti-communist forces.

It should be clear that the only way to resist this opponent is through sound solidarity of the international communist and working-class movement and through powerful unity of all progressive, democratic forces. Because the disguised varieties, hiding behind a mask of benevolence toward political and ideological adversaries are the most dangerous of the numerous anti-communisms, the most unforgivable of all weaknesses in the struggle against anti-communism is an opportunist attitude to it.

'Opportunism,' Lenin said, 'is our principal enemy. Opportunism in the upper ranks of the working-class movement is bourgeois socialism, not proletarian socialism. It has been shown in practice that working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers, the bourgeoisie could not remain in power' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 321). This warning of the leader of the international proletariat is as valid as ever.

Today's strategy and tactics of anti-communism are based, more than before, on attempts to disunite all progressive and democratic forces and set them against one another, for the ideologists and politicians of the reactionary bourgeoisie realize that this is their only chance of success. Therefore, if the principled and consistent struggle against anti-communism is to be really effective, it must be as indivisible as the struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress generally.

In our epoch Marxism cannot be safeguarded against distortions on the part of 'Marxologists' and so-called neo-Marxists without upholding Leninism, which continues and creatively applies Marxism in today's conditions of the working people's liberation struggle and the building of the new, socialist social system.

By striking mainly at Leninism, the anti-communists seek to emasculate the theory of the international communist and working-class movement, to channel the movement into dogmatism and revisionism, divide its ranks, and blunt the threat to themselves from scientific socialism, whose popularity has soared in capitalist countries over the past decade. This is also the aim of the invariably backed (and occasionally deliberately encouraged) anti-communist revisionist attempts to fragment the international communist and working-class movement by means of 'national communism', 'two-Marxisms' — a Western and an Eastern Marxism — and other concepts.

The unity and universal validity of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary doctrine coupled with its creative application to the diverse concrete historical conditions of each individual country comprise, as the fraternal parties have emphasized, the theoretical basis for the international communist and working-class movement, spelling out an ideological guarantee of its historic advances and hence of the ideological doom of anti-communism.

Any opportunist concession to anti-communism, whether in theory or practice and whatever its motivation, merely whets the appetite of imperialism's ideologists, encourages them to be bellicose, gives them new if false hopes, and in the end leads to greater ideological and political pressure on those who are considered more amenable and pliable, to a sort of invitation to the latter to be their hangmen.

Anti-communism is the Janus of contemporary imperialist reaction. But while the doors of the temple of the Roman god closed once in a while to announce the advent of peace, the doors of the numerous temples of the anti-communist Janus, in which the rites of cold war and psychological warfare are performed, are wide open at all times. Imperialist reaction never allows itself even a brief respite in its political and ideological war against Marxism-Leninism, existing socialism, the international communist and working-class movement, and the national liberation movement. But history is inexorable. These doors will not merely close as a result of mankind's subsequent social progress but will be boarded up for good.

1. *World Marxist Review*, August 1976.
2. *The Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. LXXIII, No. 1893, October 6, 1975, pp. 530-540.
3. Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York, 1976.
4. *The Public Interest*, No. 41, Fall 1975, p. 125.
5. Henry C. Wallich, *The Cost of Freedom*, New York, 1960, pp. 39-40.
6. *Kiwanis Magazine*, June-July 1979, p. 19.
7. *Newsweek*, March 13, 1978, p. 41.
8. Raymond Aron, *Plaidoyer pour l'Europe decadente*. Paris, 1977, pp. 462, 466-467.
9. Irving Kristol, *Two Cheers for Capitalism*. New York, 1978, p. 68 (also pp. XIII and 137).
10. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Between Two Ages. America's Role in the Technetronic Era*. New York, 1970.

Beating back the drive by imperialism, Zionism and reaction

Naim Ashhab
CC Political Bureau member, Jordanian CP

The situation in the Arab world remains extremely complicated, unstable and fraught with grave dangers. It is evidently worth while to take a short look back to gain a better and more concrete understanding of it.

The forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction, capitalizing on the weakness and divisions in the Arab liberation movement, have mounted an offensive along every front with the use of virtually all the types of weapons at their disposal so as to deal the movement a heavy blow, to undermine it, and then to liquidate it. The most menacing expression of this drive is the conspiracy embodied in the Camp David accords and the separate capitulatory 'peace' treaty between Egypt and Israel. But for all the efforts of its architects, they have so far failed to involve any other Arab partner in it.

In the Arab world, the initiative is still in the hands of reaction and the right-wing forces, whose camp at first sight appears, on the strength of official statements, to be split into two groups. The first, headed by Sadat, has issued an impertinent challenge to the whole Arab nation, openly collaborating with U.S. imperialist circles and Israel's ruling elite, and preparing the conditions for formalizing an aggressive military bloc against the Arab and African liberation movements, a bloc whose core consists of the three Camp David signatories.

The other, headed by Saudi Arabia, has been trying hard to damp down the tide of popular indignation in the Arab countries generated by Sadat's betrayal and to prevent the emergence of a truly serious threat to the Camp David plans. That was the aim of the Saudi delegation's efforts at the Arab summit in Baghdad in November 1978. As a result of Saudi pressure, its decisions on resisting the Egyptian regime's current line were whittled down to a minimum. But the Saudi rulers have been trying to frustrate the fulfilment even of these minimum decisions, thus facilitating the notorious mission of the Sadat regime. At the same time, they have threatened that if the Front for Steadfastness and Confrontation steps up its activity they will withdraw their financial support for Syria and the PLO as the forces directly confronting Israel on the pretext that the existence of the Front allegedly tends to divide the Arab ranks.

The differences between these two groups are tactical, and do not prevent them in any way from giving loyal service to U.S. imperialism. Taking advantage of the Afghan crisis, these contingents of Arab reaction, together with some Arab and narrow-minded nationalists, are now apparently trying to formulate a suspicious pact to supplement Camp David. The Saudi regime is the spiritual fountainhead and source of material support for Sadat's capitulatory line. The reasons for the public squabbles between them boil down mainly to the following. First, the Saudi rulers believe that with their tremendous financial potentialities they are fully entitled to claim the leading role in the Arab world (especially since the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser), Sadat, for his part, has stubbornly clung to this role, assuming that it must belong to Egypt in any conditions. But whereas Nasser led the forces in the Arab world on the whole taking an anti-imperialist stand, Sadat has tried to compete with the rulers of Riyadh for the status of leader of the reactionary camp.

Second, the ruling Saudi elite finds it hard to give Sadat overt support in view of his patent treachery. Thus, the Saudi rulers, claiming to be the protectors and custodians of Islam, cannot ignore the fact that in his acts of treason Sadat has abandoned the chief Moslem sacred places, notably Jerusalem.

It is increasingly important for imperialism, led by the United States, to help Saudi Arabia maintain its influence in the Arab world and more broadly the Moslem world (on which it has expended billions of dollars) now that imperialist opportunities for direct intervention to suppress liberation movements have been narrowed down. That is why Washington has displayed understanding of — or at any rate, has refrained from objecting to — the stand publicly taken by the Saudi rulers with respect to Sadat's regime, whom the Americans will, of course, instantly sacrifice and replace with another puppet in case they feel that he has become useless as a vehicle of imperialist plans in our region.

An analysis of the shaping situation and the arrangement of the contending forces suggests the conclusion that the struggle now being carried on by the Arab peoples is aimed directly and above all against U.S. imperialism.

Up until 1967, the Arab liberation movement was in a state of direct confrontation above all with the 'old' colonial powers, Britain and France. But the situation changed by the time of the June 1967 aggression. U.S. imperialism, having bolstered its influence in our region at the expense of its Euro-

pean rivals, has become Enemy Number One of the Arab liberation movement. This is borne out not only by the overt and crucial support which the United States gave Israel during the 1967 aggression and the 1973 war, but also its leading and definitive role in orchestrating the Camp David deal and the separate capitulatory "peace" treaty between Egypt and Israel. Washington has ceased claiming that it is a 'go-between' in the conflict, and has publicly emphasized that it is its direct participant, and, in fact, has the final say.

That is why the Arab liberation movement, going beyond the struggle against local U.S. agents and henchmen, must concentrate its fire on the policy and interests of the United States, above all its oil interests, in the Middle East. Meanwhile, Arab reaction has tried hard to focus attention on Sadat's personality so as to divert attention from the decisive role of U.S. imperialism as the sponsor of his betrayal. There is good reason why the Baghdad conference decisions say nothing in condemnation of the U.S. imperialists. What is more, Arab reaction is trying to strengthen its relations with it.

It is certainly necessary just now to do everything to increase the isolation and boycott of the Sadat regime and to give assistance and support to the revolutionary patriotic movement in Egypt so as to bring on the downfall of that regime. But one should never lose sight of the fact that the conspiracy is led by U.S. imperialism. Without serious struggle blocking its policy and hitting at its interests in our region, it is impossible to frustrate the imperialist-Zionist offensive that has gone on since June 1967 and to do away with its consequences: the Camp David accords and the capitulatory 'peace' treaty between Egypt and Israel.

The imperialist powers of Western Europe also continue to play a role in the current developments in the Middle East. They have a common urge with the United States to prevent the Arab countries from putting up any serious resistance to the Camp David conspiracy. The imperialists are sure that the success of this resistance would pose a threat to the interests of imperialism as a whole, because it would fortify the independence of the Arab countries and promote their entry upon the path of economic and social progress and consolidation of their relations with the socialist-community countries.

On the other hand, the West European countries fear another armed conflict in the Middle East which would cut short oil supplies. They are still haunted by the specter of the 1973 crisis, when they were subjected to heavy economic and political blackmail by Washington. That is why they want the Middle East problem to be solved in some way, but as a compromise that would fall short of meeting the legitimate interests of the Arab peoples, above all the people of Palestine. This could involve an attempt to tie in the notorious Allon Plan,[1] worked out by the Israeli Labour Party, with the proposal put forward by Jordan's King Hussein concerning the establishment of a United Arab Kingdom.[2] This is suggested, in particular, by the stand taken by the Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreiski at his meeting with Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, in the course of which the leader of the Austrian socialists failed to make any clear-cut and unambiguous statement in support of the idea of an independent Palestinian state.

In this context, it is worth while to note the spreading talk about some kinds of serious changes that have allegedly taken place in the stand of the West European social-democracy constituting the core of the Socialist International on the Middle East issue, together with forecasts of an early fall of the Likud bloc government in Israel and a return to power of the Labour Party, which is also a member of the Socialist International.

We Jordanian communists recognize that in the recent period the legitimate demands of the people of Palestine have met with a somewhat more positive response in Western Europe, notably during Yasser Arafat's visit to a number of West European countries and his meetings with their leaders. This tactical political success reaffirms our party's view that at the present stage — in contrast to the period following the 1948 disaster — no one can any longer afford to ignore the Palestinian factor in the approach to the solution of the Middle East problem.

At the same time, let us recall, however, that even in the past the highest international fora adopted decisions and recommendations meeting the Arab Palestinian peoples' interests, but these have remained on paper because no painstaking effort was made to implement them. That is why we warn against over-rating the importance of such tactical successes and emphasize the danger of the current efforts by the reactionary and right-wing circles to present diplomatic acts as alternatives to continued and mounting struggle in various forms. The purpose of these efforts is to prevent the Palestinian fighters in the occupied territories and elsewhere from preserving and consolidating the unity of their ranks, and from maintaining and strengthening their strategic alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist-community countries.

Recognition that such an alliance is imperative is the key conclusion from the analysis of the Arab peoples' current struggle. Without reliance on all-round support from world socialism and the Soviet Union, it is impossible to stand up to the united front of the forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction headed by U.S. imperialism. That is why in the present conditions it is highly dangerous to cast doubt on the value of this alliance by claiming, for instance, that the unity of the Arab ranks (on the reactionary forces' terms and under their leadership) can be a substitute for it, or attempting to obscure the difference between our allies and our adversaries.

For the 'old' and 'new' detachments of Arab reaction, including the Sadat regime, slander of the Arab peoples' friends, the Soviet Union in the first place, and efforts to discredit its policy in the region, are commonplace, but participation in such

fraudulent machinations by elements usually ranked among the patriotic forces is a new and highly disquieting factor. Consider the statements by some of them concerning their readiness to 'stand up in defense' of Saudi Arabia in the event that its territory is invaded by Soviet troops! And that is being said at a time when it is not the Soviet Union but the United States that threatens to occupy the oil fields on the territory of the Arab countries with the use of a special task force specifically set up for that purpose.

The task of beating back the ongoing offensive by imperialism, Zionism and reaction, which is aimed against the Arab liberation movement as a whole, calls for unity and more vigorous struggle by the patriotic forces not only within the national framework but also on the scale of the whole Arab world, with a special role played by the specific and intimate relations and ties between the Arab peoples based on their common territory, language, culture and spiritual legacy, which are expressed in the natural urge for Arab unity.

Since Sadat's visit to Israel and the signing of the Camp David accords, there has been a series of acts and developments on the pan-Arab level: the Arab Peoples' Congress, the meeting of leaders of some Arab countries within the Front for Steadfastness and Confrontation, the Baghdad summit, the Syrian-Iraqi rapprochement, and so on. One has to admit that Arab reaction, still holding the initiative, has managed largely to block and paralyze their effect. Even the activity of the Arab Peoples' Congress has run into conflict with the policy of encroaching on democratic freedoms, so hampering fulfilment of its primary task, which is to muster the masses of people in the Arab world for the struggle.

The Jordanian Communist Party has, on the whole, supported these acts, although in varying degree and with some reservations, because it is convinced that if the line of effectively resisting Sadat's betrayal and the Camp David deal prevails, the important negative aspects of the Baghdad summit or the Syrian-Iraqi rapproachement, for instance, would be largely reduced if not eliminated altogether. But our party has never turned a blind eye on these negative aspects and has warned about their possible grave consequences.

As for the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front, we regard it as a qualitatively new phenomenon in the Arab arena, as an embodiment of the slogan put forward by Nasser back in the 1960s: 'Unity of Purpose Before Unity of Ranks.' The invigoration of the Front's activity can give the whole Arab world an impetus in the right direction, and wrest the initiative from the hands of Arab reaction, forcing it to join in positive measures for fighting the Camp David alliance. We believe that the effort to rely on unity of ranks on the basis of a minimum program means trying to get the whole Arab world to march in step with Arab reaction. Conversely, going beyond the acts of reaction means creating real conditions for putting pressure on it and forcing it to meet the commitments it had to assume under pressure from the Arab peoples.

The problem of Arab unity and the Palestinian problem are the two fundamental pan-Arab issues over which the struggle in the Arab arena developed above all and continues to develop today. Since the 1920s, the communists have been the most sincere champions of Arab unity meeting the interests of the masses. Life has shown that attempts to build this unity on any other principles are totally unfounded. The communists' warnings in this respect have been borne out by the unsuccessful attempts to achieve unity, including the most important of them, the unification of Egypt and Syria, whose break-up we regard as a major nation-wide defeat.

It is more than 60 years since the emergence of the Palestine problem, and over 30 years since the day the Palestinian people were expelled and scattered all over the world. In that period, various nationalistic approaches have been tried to solve it, but these have invariably proved to be unworkable and have always inflicted much sorrow and torment on the Palestinians and the other Arab peoples. The communists — both Arabs and Jews — were the first to propose realistic and revolutionary solutions for the problem at the various stages of its history. They did not sermonize but were always in the thick of the struggle. We can now say with justifiable pride: life itself has confirmed that only a fundamentally internationalist approach like ours can produce a successful solution. The sober-minded circles among the Palestinians have been moving through bitter experience to positions which are close to ours.

Just now, imperialism, Zionism and reaction are trying very hard to put an end to the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and to get this problem off the agenda. Washington, hinting at possible changes in its attitude, wants the PLO to announce its recognition of UN Security Council Resolution 242.[3]

Our party recognizes this resolution despite the fact that it does not deal with the Palestinian problem from its political aspect but as a problem of refugees. But it is quite obvious that the demand that the PLO should accept the resolution before the United States and Israel accept and respect the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and its own state springs from the urge to invalidate that right and to provoke a conflict among the Palestinians and the Arab world as a whole.

The participants in the Camp David alliance seek to impose on the Palestinians in the occupied territories a plan for setting up an 'autonomous administration' and have been casting around for potential quislings prepared to join Sadat in his betrayal and collaborationism. At the same time, the Israeli authorities have been putting through far-reaching plans to colonize the occupied territories and change their demographic make-up and status. The Israeli Zionist elite has declared that it will not stop its aggression in Lebanon until it destroys the Palestinian resistance forces, makes Syria pull out its troops from Lebanon, so winning that country

over for Camp David and depriving the resistance movement of its main bases.

But all these efforts also testify to something else, namely, that the attempts to sidestep the Palestine problem have failed and that it remains an insuperable obstacle in the way of the Camp David plans.

For all the importance of pan-Arab problems, we believe that it is not right, as some contingents of the revolutionary forces in the Arab world do, to exaggerate their weight and influence on the individual countries' national problems. To consider the pan-Arab factor as the main motive of the struggle now, in the conditions of concrete Arab reality, means to regard a desirable goal (Arab unity) as existing reality.

But neither the problem of Arab unity, nor the Palestinian problem, for all their importance, have exerted the crucial influence on the 1958 Iraqi revolution, or on the revolution in Algeria, on the revolutionary changes in both parts of Yemen, or the events in the Sudan. The national factor — the growing struggle against the British military presence and the sharpening of social problems under a corrupt ruling elite — was also the main one in the Egyptian revolution of 1952. Farouk's betrayal of the Palestinian cause helped to expose the corruption of his regime and the growth of acute discontent with it, but had only a secondary role to play in the developments. The patriotic forces in Egypt, seeking to mobilize the masses for the struggle against Sadat's treacherous line, also emphasize the problems of their own country in the first place.

Even in Jordan, where the destiny of the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples are interlaced and more intimately connected than any other Arab peoples, our party has come to realize that in rousing the Transjordanian masses for the common struggle one should not start chiefly or only from the Palestinian problem.

As for the Palestinian problem itself, an exaggeration of the role of the pan-Arab factor (although pan-Arab support is the key condition for effecting the Palestinians' national goals) could provide a cover for encroachments on independent poltical decisions by the Palestinians. That could lead to their complete subordination to pan-Arab decisions which, depending on the nature of the forces dominating the Arab arena, could be both reactionary and conciliatory.

Exaggerated emphasis on pan-Arab problems tends to coalesce with the concept put forward by some petty-brougeois nationalistic trends and is expressed in the establishment of political organizations seeking to spread their activity throughout the Arab world. Experience shows that such forms of organization do not meet the requirements of concrete reality.

An objective consideration of the importance and place of the pan-Arab factor does not at all mean its minimization or a relaxation of efforts to make the utmost use of it in the struggle. The task here, we believe, is to avoid any unbalanced assessment of the interaction of the basic motive forces behind the battles now being fought in various sectors of the Middle East front.

What are the main causes for the state of crisis in which the Arab liberation movement finds itself since the June 1967 aggression?

Some hold that the main cause is rooted in objective conditions: the discrepancy between the potentialities and resources of the liberation movement, and those of the enemy. Those who advocate this view now and again arbitrarily separate the balance of forces in our region, which is taking shape not in favor of the liberation movement, from the balance of forces in the international arena, which is on the whole favorable to it.

By contrast, others assert that the objective conditions have already matured and that the crisis is rooted exclusively in the immaturity of the subjective factor: the revolutionary leadership, its programs and tactics. In this context, communists in the Arab countries are attacked by some revolutionary democrats and accused of taking a passive attitude, lagging behind events, and so on. Such assertions testify to a loss of patience, something that may result in adventures, but also reflect the urge on the part of some petty-bourgeois revolutionary trends to divest themselves of responsibility for the fact that their programs and practical acts have proved incapable of overcoming the crisis, and so shift the responsibility onto others.

We Jordanian communists have always recognized that, like everyone who works and fights, we have made mistakes, especially in tactics and concrete activity, but we believe that the correctness of our general line and our approach to the basic problems has been tested and borne out by life. In our view, the continuing crisis of the Arab liberation movement has different causes, among them two root ones.

First, the fact that the big Arab bourgeoisie, which had earlier vacillated between patriotic positions, on the one hand, and an urge to compromise with imperialism, on the other, has been finally pushed into joining the enemy camp in the new international situation by the following circumstances:

— the emergence of a possibility to arrange within the framework of neo-colonialist policy a kind of 'partnership' between the imperialist monopolies and the local bourgeois elite, with the latter being the beneficiary of some of the extracted profits;

— a further growth and invigoration of the mass movement which intensifies the fears of the big bourgeoisie for the future of its class privileges.

— a change in the structure of the capitalist class, in which sections not connected with material production, notably the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, have come to prevail. In the Arab world, an important role in this respect has been played by the tremendous growth of petro-dollar revenues, both in a direct form and in the form of large handouts by the oil-producing states with reactionary regimes, Saudi Arabia in the first place, to influential groups in the apparatus of power in some other Arab countries.

Although the big bourgeoisie is historically bankrupt, it will take some time to bring out its political bankruptcy, a period in the course of which a natural diferentiation and regrouping of forces will occur within the framework of each country and the Arab world as a whole. The maturing of this objective factor cannot be hastened by political or administrative decisions. This calls for some time which can, of course, be reduced through the operation of the subjective factor, the struggle of the revolutionary forces.

Second, the fact that the leadership of the anti-imperialist regimes has been monopolized by some strata of the petty and middle bourgeoisie. This kind of social make-up of the leadership, which in the 1950s substituted for the bloc of the feudal and big bourgeoisie, was an advance, but since the 1967 aggression, it has demonstrated its inability to cope with the growing difficulties and the ever more complicated tasks. The vacillations, hesitations, narrowly selfish views and interests, which spring from the class nature of these strata, make them apprehensive of the masses for fear of losing their power, cause them to take a suspicious attitude to their allies in the international arena, and spread much confusion at crucial moments of confrontation with imperialism and reaction.

However, the oft-expressed view that the petty bourgeoisie has been worked out as a class does not provide any real alternative, and it would be suicidal to adopt it in our undeveloped society. The Jordanian CP believes that what is needed is an end to the monopolization of power by the petty and middle bourgeoisie, a guarantee of political democracy, an opportunity for the most consistent revolutionary classes to play a fitting role in government, and more room for actual participation in the leadership by other progressive national forces. It goes without saying that such participation should be arranged within the framework of the alliance based on mutual respect. Democratic Yemen is a relevant example.

The masses in the Arab countries have learned from their own bitter experience that there is nothing to the claims that democratic rights and freedoms are being curbed in order to defend the 'revolution', as the lifting of such curbs would allegedly give the reactionary forces a free hand. But it is the clamp-down on democracy that was one of the causes behind the 1967 defeat, which started the current crisis in the Arab liberation movement. It is now ever more obvious that unless the clampdown ends, there can be no hope of successfully mobilizing all the forces for resisting the offensive of imperialism, Zionism and reaction.

Apart from these two basic causes behind the continuing crisis in the Arab national-liberation movement, there are a number of secondary ones. In particular, as a result of the virtual ousting by the United States of its European rivals from the Middle East the possibilities for using inter-imperialist contradictions affecting the positions of ruling reactionary and conservative circles in Arab countries have been narrowed down.

There has been a marked increase in the financial support to various political parties and organizations, including those taking a progressive revolutionary stand, on the part of ruling regimes in Arab countries. In immediate practical terms, such support does, of course, enhance the capability of these parties and organizations. But in political terms, especially when democracy is curtailed, when each ruling regime seeks to impose its own standpoint by every possible means (short of a democratic dialogue), it may become an element slowing down their healthy development. Dependence on external financial aid sometimes undermines the positions of the recipients, their ability correctly to assess the objectively shaping situation.

For all the complexity of the situation in the Arab world, for all the hindrances and impediments to the national movement and its growth into a mighty revolutionary tide under whose pressure the initiative would be wrested from imperialism, Zionism and local reaction, positive trends have also appeared on the Arab scene.

The year 1979 was one of upswing and qualitative growth in the struggle of the working class and other working people in countries ranging from Morocco in the west to Lebanon in the east. In the first four months of the year, 50 million man-hours were lost through strikes in Morocco. In Tunisia, there is a fresh upswing in the movement of workers and other working people who have recovered from the campaign of terrorism started to suppress their action in January 1978. In Egypt, there were strikes in the main industrial centres: El Hahalla el Kubra, Helwan, Alexandria, etc. In the Sudan, strikes were staged by the industrial proletariat, the agricultural workers of Al-Giezira, and by other sections of the working people. Since July 1979, the strikes have been accompanied with mass demonstrations whose participants came out against the dictatorial regime's economic policy and repressive acts. In Lebanon, a general strike was held by workers for the first time since the outbreak of the civil war, and spread across the whole country, including areas under the control of the isolationists. Even in the occupied territories, there has recently been evidence of a sharpening of class conflicts. Action by electric-power workers in Jerusalem reflected the extent to which the national struggle is interwoven with the class struggle, when the latter, even in its economic form, at once and not just eventually, acquires the character of political struggle for national liberation as well.

All of this is not only a sign of the growing revolutionary ferment in our region, but also a clear indication that in the subsequent changes the working people, the working class in the first place, will play a leading role, while these changes will, in consequence, differ qualitatively from those which occurred in the Arab countries earlier, notably in the 1950s.

The mounting struggle and the spread of revolutionary attitudes, the active resistance and rebuff to the schemes of imperialism, Zionism and reaction by the Arab masses — once again de-

monstrated by their resolute opposition to the Camp David accords and the separate capitulatory 'peace' treaty between Egypt and Israel — the winds of revolutionary change blowing across Afghanistan and Iran, the strengthening of the progressive regimes in Democratic Yemen and Ethiopia, the growing strength of our allies in the international arena, and the continued change in the balance of forces in their favor — all of these are for us a source of faith in the inevitable triumph of our just cause, whatever the difficulties and obstacles we have to encounter on the way.

1. It provided for the establishment of Israel's 'border' along the Jordan River, and along this border of a 15-25 km 'security' belt that would be 'sovereign Israeli territory', the official annexation of the Gaza strip and negotiation with Jordan of a redivision of what remains of Palestinian territory. — *Ed.*

2. According to this proposal of March 1972, Jordan was to be 'transformed' into a 'United Arab Kindgom', consisting of a Jordanian region — east of the River Jordan — and a Palestinian region — on the West Bank. — *Ed.*

3. Adopted on November 22, 1967, it laid down some basic conditions for settling the Middle East conflict. — *Ed.*

'Convergence of difficulties' in face of the facts

Wieslaw Klimczak
PUWP representative on *WMR*

Robert Francis
CP Belgium representative on *WMR*

Over the past several months, the world press has carried many analytical surveys, comparisons and forecasts to show what the world has to its credit when entering the 1980s and what is in store for it in the future.

The tone of the bourgeois commentators' assessments and judgements is fairly bleak. There is no side-stepping the obvious facts: the capitalist economic mechanism is back-firing, a fresh tide of inflation and monetary upheavals is rolling up, and there is growing unemployment. Even the most rabid adherents of the capitalist system have to admit that the Western world is in the throes of economic difficulties and social contraditions. But these pessimistic tunes have a 'comforting' note. There is a suggestion that the crisis situation is characteristic not only of capitalism, and that economic cataclysms are a general uniformity of our day, applying equally to the socialist countries, where there is a slow-down in the development of production and where there are basically the same difficulties.

The meaning of this analogy seems to be so important that it is even being underpinned with an ideological basis, a theory of the 'convergence of difficulties'. *The New York Times*, for instance, claims that economic difficulties make the two systems kin.

This is a new approach and it is, perhaps, of some interest. Let us recall that the idea of the convergence of the two opposite social systems was initially backed up by positive factors of development, above all the scientific and technical revolution which, it was said, does away with the class struggle and the need for a social revolution and creates the prerequisites for an 'erosion' of socialism. In this connection, Brzezinski said that the United States was the social laboratory of the whole world.[1] But the hopes of using scientific and technical progress to tone down and ease the organic defects of capitalism turned out to be an illusion, like the imperialist hopes of a 'degeneration' of the socialist system. Now we find the idea of the convergence of the two systems being deduced from the opposite, through a reference to difficulties.

But perhaps the authors of this idea do have grounds for formulating the question in such terms? Do capitalism and socialism face difficulties of the same order and character? Is it right to say that these have common causes, are interconnected and have similar consequences? Let us try to sort things out.

Before characterizing the present economic and social situation in the capitalist world and the efforts of its ideologists to make use of a refurbished idea of the convergence of the two systems, it is worthwhile to consider the preceding period in retrospect.

Bourgeois economists usually regard the 1950s and 1960s as the 'golden age' of post-war capitalism. By the start of that period, the West European countries and Japan, having somewhat recovered from the devastating consequences of the Second World War and relying on generous financial aid from the United States, entered upon a period of intensive economic growth. The extensive renewal of fixed capital made for the growth of investment activity both in the private and in the state sector of the economy, in contrast to the upheavals of the inter-war period. Business activity was also promoted by the inequitable exchange with the economically backward periphery of the capitalist world which ensured among other things, an unlimited supply of fuel and energy resources at low prices.

The growth of state-monopoly regulation of the

economy, the extension of the sphere of social consumption (education, public health and housing construction), and the unfolding of a 'social partnership' system by the social-democrats averted, bourgeois commentators believed, the possibility of any serious rifts emerging in capitalism's socio-economic system. The chorus of bourgeois ideologists announced the start of an era of crisis-free development, of 'universal welfare' and 'harmony'. However, they had very soon to change their tune.

The past decade rubbed off the gilt which capitalism had acquired in the preceding period, bringing out its organic defects with fresh force. The state-monopoly regulation of the economy did not — and could not — prevent (not seriously, at any rate) the operation of an objective law of capitalism discovered by Marx: the upward phase of the economic cycle is sooner or later followed by a crisis of overproduction. It cannot, of course, be denied that in the 1960s the system of state-monopoly regulation in the United States, for instance, did to some extent ease the cyclical fluctuations and stimulated relatively high rates of real economic growth (an average of 4 per cent a year). But later on it displayed its limitations in solving the problems which arose from the merger and synchronization of the cyclical crisis and the inflationary process.

For all the improvements in the system, it is incapable of taking into account and directing the operation of numerous economic factors along lines the capitalists want. Thus, even the complete elimination (a hypothetical case) of the non-monopoly spheres of production cannot do away with competition which gains in acerbity and has ever more unpredictable consequences with the growth in the number of its monopoly 'subjects'. The experience of the United States and countries with more developed capitalist programming, which lays down the framework and methods of state intervention in the economy (notably in France), shows that in practice this programming is constantly subjected to heavy distortion by the sway of haphazard capitalist processes, inter-monopoly contradictions, the struggle between labor and capital, etc.[2] This explains, incidentally, why long-range economic forecasts in the capitalist countries are so unreliable and contain so much guess-work. Take the forecasts made by the OECD for the 1970s from the high-point of the 'golden 1960s'. For the largest of the 24 OECD countries, the anticipated growth rates from 1970 to 1980 were 50-100 per cent above the actual rates.

The involved economic processes in the centers of the capitalist world resulted in a marked change of some essential characteristics on which the myths about crisis-free development and universal welfare had but recently been based. These myths gave way to more realistic assessments, like the following one. *Foreign Affairs,* which has close ties with U.S. ruling circles wrote in the autumn of last year: 'Persistent, high inflation and low, halting growth, along with high unemployment, unstable exchange rates and sluggish investment, are the symptoms of an economic disease that economists call stagflation, a rare malady that had not previously afflicted the industrial West.'[3]

While this diagnosis may be laconic, we find that it does bring out the most important elements of the present state of the capitalist economy. Let us consider the problem of inflation. The relatively fast economic growth of the capitalist countries in the 1960s was attended by a relatively moderate, 'creeping' growth of prices, which in most instances did not exeed 4 per cent a year. Later the situation took a different turn. The pace of inflation markedly increased, and at the end of the 1970s was frequently expressed in double digits. Despite the notions widely accepted by businessmen, economists and politicians, the growth of prices, as a reflection of the growth of aggregate cash demand, was no longer connected with any economic upswing or a reduction in unemployment. On the contrary, in the mid-1970s came the deepest post-war crisis, while the decade as a whole was marked by a considerable increase in unemployment.

The high inflation makes the crisis phenomena especially acute and gives headaches to many governments. The attempts to stem it by measures like raising loan interest or cutting the working people's incomes not only deepen the crisis processes in the economy but also sharpen the social contradictions. Our bourgeois opponents could, of course, say that the capitalist world had known very much harder times in the past, like the Great Depression of the 1929-1933, and still managed to overcome the difficulties and to rise to new heights in the post-war period.

But, first, the attainment of the 'new heights' had much too high a price for mankind, which was plunged into the Second World War (for its origins undoubtedly lay in the economic upheavals of that period and the inter-imperialist contradictions).

Second, the contemporary world radically differs from that of the past. The economic potential of the centers of capitalism is, of course, higher than it was in the pre-war period, but the basis of that system has been markedly narrowed down, above all, because of the existence of the world socialist system, whose might has been steadily growing.

Third, of fundamental political and economic importance is the loss by imperialism of its old colonial and semi-colonial hinterland. The developing countries as a whole have become a key element determining the situation in the world. They have demanded ever more insistently an improvement of the terms of commercial and economic relations with the developed countries, and have already succeeded, in part, in putting an end to the plunder of their natural resources by foreign monopolies.

Finally, the balance of forces in the citadels of the old world itself has changed. The antagonism between big capital, on the one hand, and the working class and all the other working masses, on the other, has been deepening. In the United States, Gus Hall said in the Report to the 22nd Convention of the

Communist Party USA (August 1979), 'corporate profits have more than tripled in the last 10 years . . . They are the result of the sweat, blood and toil of the workers, speed-up and cuts in real wages . . . The high rate of exploitation of our working class and the resulting surplus-value continue to increase at a fast clip.'[4]

The working class in the capitalist countries has been stepping up its resistance to the monopoly drive, the policy of mass redundancies, the growth of unemployment and the steadily rising cost of living and growing military expenditures. This resistance has never been so strong and organized.

Consequently, there is good reason to assert that the situation in the capitalist world at the beginning of the 1980s differs fundamentally from the situation during the Great Depression and in the early post-war decades. Nor does it matter what the looming economic recession will look like in this or that country or in the developed part of the capitalist world as a whole. The point is the emergence of a number of new economic, social and poltical factors — internal and international — which make for a further deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system.

Let us now consider the situation in the socialist world.

To lend a semblance of objectiveness to their claims about some 'marking of time' and even about a 'crisis' in the economy of the socialist countries, those who talk about a 'convergence of difficulties' usually refer to the slow-down of economic growth rates in some of these countries.

Before examining this thesis in substance let us say right away how irrelevant its peremptory assessments are. The new society is crisis-free, and the use of the term crisis with respect to socialism is designed to cover up this truth. Here again, statistical data are also most convincing in the historical perspective. Three decades ago, the CMEA countries turned out 18 per cent of the world's product, and now they turn out roughly one-third. At that time, they accounted for only 15 per cent of the world's national income, and today for 25 per cent. In the 1970s, their national income increased by 60 per cent, while their industrial production has been developing half as fast again as that of the Common Market countries. How then can one talk about some 'marking of time'? These conclusions clearly amount to wishful thinking.

However, in some socialist countries the pace of economic advance is indeed slower than it was in the past. But this fact should not be treated in an abstract manner, without a consideration of the new scale and the concrete tasks of their current socio-economic development (let us also note that there is no absolute 'gross' decline, because every percentage point of growth in physical terms amounts to an increase of a much greater volume of output).

In the mid-1970s, many socialist countries in the main completed a historically-rooted stage in the development of their economy, above all, of their industrial structure through the use of extensive factors. At that stage, industrial output increased at a stable and high rate,[5] but the sources of development on the old basis had been considerably narrowed down.

The switch to intensification of the economy, something that has now become the main line in its further upswing, is known to require definite structural shifts, large-scale additional inputs and the solution of complex scientific and technical problems. This is all the more so considering that we have to deal with a multi-sectoral economy which has attained a high level of development. That is why somewhat lower rates in the growth of production were justifiably *planned* in some socialist countries for the five-year period which now draws to a close, with quantitative factors ceding priority to qualitative factors.

Consequently, there is a new stage, but its content has nothing in common with the bourgeois propaganda assertions that when socialism moves into the industrial phase it loses its dynamism and all its other advantages.

Let us turn by way of comparison to the latest data relating to the period in which the socialist-community countries are completing fulfilment of their five-year plans. In 1980, their national income is to go up as follows in accordance with the published plans: in Bulgaria by 5.7 per cent, Czechoslovakia 3.7 per cent, GDR 4.8 per cent, Hungary 3-3.5 per cent, Poland 1.4-1.8 per cent, Rumania 8.8 per cent, and Soviet Union 4 per cent. According to the latest OECD report issued at the very end of 1979, there is to be a 'zero' growth of the GNP in the developed capitalist countries; at best it will come to 0.3 per cent, with a drop in Britain by 2 per cent and the United States by 1.25 per cent.[6] We find that the statistics put a totally different light on the matter.

What is perhaps even more important is the qualitative distinctions of the in-depth processes which determine the rates of economic growth in each of the opposite social systems. By way of analogy, let us say that the planned slow-down of these rates in some countries of the socialist world amounts not to a fold-up of forces under the blows of an insuperable elemental force, as our political opponents suggest, but to a regrouping of these forces for further effective advance.

Does this mean no difficulties at all? No, the difficulties are there. And it is because they are real difficulties and the problems of socialist construction are highly complex that some corrections have to be made in economic policy to pull up the lagging echelons, to improve the mechanism of economic management and planning on the state and local level. There is a search for ways to extend the working people's practical participation in this sphere, i.e., for ways to improve the democratic principles and the practice of production management.

The strength of the socialist system lies not only in the possibility of bringing out and scientifically explaining the causes of the difficulties which arise, but also of finding, on that basis, the economic instruments to eradicate the shortcomings instead of toning them down. These problems and ways of

solving them were subjected to all-round and constructive analysis at the congresses of fraternal parties, plenary meetings of their central committees and other forums held at the end of the past and the beginning of the present year.

The difficulties of economic development at the present stage spring above all from the very need for a general modernization of the material basis of production with an eye not only to each country's requirements, but also to the ever deepening division of labor within the CMEA framework. Earlier on, when formulating the tasks of moving to the consistent use of intensive factors, the communists were aware that this would be no easy thing. Since the mid-1970s, when the external conditions of economic activity became more complex, this further tightened the state of the resources — material and financial — required to fulfil the outlined programs. Besides, for a number of years bad weather — harsh winters and droughts — had an influence on the development of production.

In the capitalist society such objective difficulties fall as an additional burden on the working people and are overcome mainly at their expense. That is quite impossible under socialism, as it would clash with the very humanistic substance of the new system, in which economic development above all serves the well-being of the people. The main task is steadily to raise their living standards, and that is the purpose of ensuring a steady growth of production, optimal distribution of the national income, and a balanced rise of real wages and their material back-up. Unfavorable circumstances under socialism, whatever they are, cannot be overcome at the expense of the basic interests of the population. In Poland, for stance, where because of crop failures and for several other reasons the present five-year period has been a very difficult one for the economy so that a part of the planned targets had not been met, the basic social goals were nevertheless attained at the cost of intense efforts, and regardless of some disproportions in development.[7] On the other hand, the steady growth of living standards leads to an expansion and a qualitative renewal of the structure of requirements and stimulates new material and spiritual needs. Consequently, with the build-up of the economic potential the task of their ever fuller satisfaction becomes more complicated.

To all this are added the subjective difficulties which arise as a result of the momentum of the preceding stage, when quantitative growth of production was the main thing, and also a result of organizational and managerial shortcomings. It is because of such negative factors that it has been impossible everywhere to advance in enhancing the efficiency of production and quality of workmanship as life requires; the end results of economic activity frequently turn out to be below our potentialities, disproportions arise, and there are shortages and a lack of reserves. That is why there is now a persevering concentration of efforts in socialist countries, in the light of the concrete experience and lessons drawn from the development of each of them, on the main problems of labor-productivity growth, acceleration of scientific and technical progress, improvement of product quality, and better planning and management.

We find, therefore, that the socialist world has its difficulties and they cannot but exist, for such is the dialectics of any development. Lenin said that these could be called 'merely the growing pains of the new, socialist society' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 42, p. 82). In this sense, the 1970s do not differ in principle from earlier decades. As before, the difficulties facing capitalism and socialism are phenomena of a different order, with a different meaning. One cannot, of course, close one's eyes to the fact that there is some interconnection between them. Some of the problems faced by the socialist countries, as we have said, are compounded by the general state of the world economic outlook and prices, the burden of defense expenditures in view of the arms race imposed by imperialism, and the need to help the developing countries.

The influence of the capitalist market on the economic situation in the socialist world should not be exaggerated, but it would also be wrong to underestimate it. This applies especially to international trade. Those who try to cast doubt on the economic strength of the socialist-community countries usually present the 'incontrovertible' argument that some of them have balance-of-trade deficits. But what are their origins? They spring mainly from the fact that world prices for many goods which they traditionally export have been going up much more slowly over the past several years than the prices of the goods that they import, and this tends to put a strain on the whole financial and economic mechanism.

Over the past several years, external circumstances, prices and the conditions on international markets have tended to develop even more unfavorably than had been anticipated, economists from some socialist countries facing economic difficulties have pointed out. At the same time the adaptation to the changing conditions has not been sufficiently rapid. Consequently, we have here once again temporary, subjective factors which can be overcome by the efficient planning of production and external economic relations.

Consistent deepening of socialist economic integration and all-round cooperation within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance open up especially broad possibilities for doing this, as for overcoming other difficulties. This helps to enlarge the scale of specialization and cooperation of production, rational exchange of raw materials and fuel, and balanced export and import. Consider, for instance, the energy problem, which is becoming ever more acute under capitalism, and which socialism tackles on a totally different basis. The long-term planning of guaranteed deliveries of fuel resources with a favorable system of mutual settlements, and the pooling of efforts in many sectors pave the way for fulfilling complex economic and technical tasks in the development of the power industry. The great Soyuz gas pipeline is under joint construction. A

collective program has been drawn up for specialization and cooperation in the making of equipment for atomic electric-power stations until 1990. Research on the joint development of new energy sources is gaining in intensiveness. The development and introduction of progressive technologies designed to economize on electric power, fuel and other resources are being consistently coordinated.

There is a similar joint and effective activity on every sector of the economic front in the socialist-community countries, and this is a guarantee of the successful overcoming of the difficulties that arise and of further dynamic development. In this context, special importance is attached to the latest, 33rd, session of the CMEA, at which programs for long-term cooperation were agreed and multilateral agreements signed for the current decade, and for some items, for a much longer period.

The advanced social system and its economic mechanism, which is based on truly democratic and internationalist principles, opens horizons for conscious creative effort and involvement of masses of people in socialist emulation, which is an invaluable instrument for accelerating economic progress. All of this gives the communists and the peoples of the socialist countries a sense of optimism and confidence in their strength even in face of the much more complicated tasks. That is why at the November 1979 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev had good ground to say, when characterizing some outstanding problems, that the main thing was: 'Whatever the sector of work one takes, everywhere one sees tremendous potentialities and tremendous reserves for successful advance.'

Consequently, the picture of the world as it entered the 1980s confirms one home truth: the old remains old, and the new is new. Each of the two opposite social systems has its own historical road to travel. The socialist countries started out on this decade without mounting crisis upheavals like those which are organic to the capitalist society, without social disasters, run-away inflation, mass unemployment and pessimistic forecasts. In the light of all this, any unbiased person, we think, will realize the worth of all this talk about a 'convergence of difficulties'. The difficulties in development under socialism and under capitalism are not the same at all, and the prospects before them are totally different. The general crisis of capitalism has continued to sharpen and deepen, while the new system is brimming with young and healthy forces, and the growth problems, however complicated, merely herald the period of its maturity.

1. See Z. Brzezinski, *Between Two Ages. America's Role in the Technetronic Era.* New York, 1970.
2. *Le Monde,* December 4, 1979.
3. *Foreign Affairs,* Fall 1979, p. 103.
4. *Political Affairs,* October 1979, p. 3.
5. Here are the rates for the CMEA countries as compared with the industrial growth rates in developed capitalist countries: 1956-1960, 10.6 per cent against 4.1 per cent; 1961-1965, 8.3 and 6.1; 1966-1970, 8.3 and 5.4; 1971-1975, 7.8 and 1.8 per cent (*Interaction of the Economic and Political System in the Socialist Countries at the Present Stage,* Prague, 1977, p. 33).
6. *Le Monde,* December 21, 1979.
7. In 1979, for instance, industrial growth in the social sector was lower than that planned and came to only 2.8 per cent, but the output of consumer goods went up by 4.1 per cent. Despite the fact that the produced national income was lower than that planned, the cash incomes of the population went up by 9.5 per cent, etc. —*Trybuna Ludu,* February 9, 10, 1980.

CORRECTION

We apologize for the error in the May 1980 issue of *WMR.* The first line of the fifth paragraph on page three should have read: 'After the victory over the Third Reich, the peoples . . .'

the Party

Toward mature socialism

Mihaly Korom
Member, Political Bureau, and Secretary,
HSWP Central Committee

Hungary's public life and production effort today bear the beneficial impact of a recent event of lasting significance, the 12th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. The highest authority of Hungary's 800,000 communists confirmed that the policy of the party, which is leading the nation in building mature socialism, is correct and meets the people's fundamental interests. It set targets for the next five years.

The congress was held last March but preparations for it began months before. In December 1979 the CC published theses for the congress in which it summed up what had been accomplished since the 11th congress, analyzed shortcomings, and formulated key tasks for the future. The theses were discussed at party meetings and the high degree of political commitment which communists showed at these meetings translated itself subsequently into new achievements in industry and other spheres. They commanded the close attention also of non-party people. Following a practice that has justified itself, the CC requested the All-Hungary Council of Trade Unions, the Patriotic People's Front, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Council of Cooperatives, and the All-Hungary Communist Youth League to comment on the theses and send in their suggestions.

The discussion of the theses in party organizations and the opinions expressed by various organizations and individual citizens showed again how very closely the party is linked with the people. We noted with deep satisfaction that the people recognize the party's leading role, are united closely behind it in building the new society, and contribute tangibly to the implementation of our policy. The participants in the discussion were unanimous in their opinion that the party assesses the situation of the country objectively and that the tasks planned by it for the period ahead are well-considered. It was said everywhere that while continuing its policy, which had proved sound, the HSWP should at the same time show greater consistency and determination in its day-to-day work. The working people undertook to help the party in this respect more energetically and to support it in every possible way.

In view of the consensus among the communists and the people as a whole, the 12th party congress put it on record that the domestic situation was stable, the power of the working class was solid and growing stronger, and the nation's socialist unity was becoming more effective. The party successfully performs its role as society's leading force. Visible results have been achieved in building a developed socialist society and bringing nearer the long-term goals formulated in the party's Program Statement five years ago. The people's material and cultural wealth has increased in the past few years. People's Hungary has been working for peace in common with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and with the progressive, peace-loving forces of all continents, thereby creating favorable external conditions for socialist construction. The party has persevered in its effort to ensure closer unity of the international communist and working-class movement.

Its foreign policy is constructive and follows the same line as that of the fraternal parties of other socialist-community countries. Now that the world situation has worsened and the terminology of the cold war years is in use again, we emphatically condemn the policy pursued by aggressive imperialist forces interested in the arms race and opposed to peace and social progress. We also condemn the reckless activity of the Peking hegemonists, who are aggravating international tensions against the true interests of the Chinese people. Hungary, like its Warsaw Treaty allies, counters these hostile tendencies with a readiness to seek political solutions for international disputes and with support for proposals aimed at stopping the arms race and safeguarding equal security of the two world systems, while keeping armaments at a lower level. In upholding the idea of détente and remaining loyal to the spirit of the Helsinki Conference, we are willing to join in any steps likely to avert war.

We know that our friends all over the world are gratified by socialist Hungary's mounting strength. This found expression in the speeches of delegations from 35 fraternal parties that attended the congress and in numerous messages of greetings sent to the HSWP from abroad. These sincere manifestations of international solidarity inspire our communists to new achievements in building a mature socialist society. We consider that progress in our effort adds to the international influence of socialism.

The 12th congress was in session shortly before the 35th anniversary of Hungary's liberation from the nazis by the Soviet Army. This circumstance prompted a look back at the road we have travelled, at what was the most significant stage in our national history.

In 1945, after centuries-long oppression, the liberated Hungarian people were enabled to set about building a new society. The legacy left to us was grim. World War II, into which Hungary was dragged by its reactionary, anti-Soviet ruling classes, brought it to the brink of national catastrophe. The pro-fascist government's anti-people policy cost the Hungarians 600,000 lives. The country lay in ruins. Our people began the work of rehabilitation under the Communist Party's leadership. The work accomplished in those years and the milestones of our socialist development are seen in the following facts and figures.

Prior to liberation, Hungary was among the backward countries of Europe. In 30 years of people's rule our national income has grown nearly fivefold. Real per capita income has gone up in the same period by nearly 250 per cent. Over a million flats have been built in the past 15 years alone, allowing nearly half the population to move into new homes. Every citizen has enjoyed free social insurance since 1975. Almost every family has a radio, a TV set, a washing-machine, and other durables. Upwards of 90 per cent of eight-year school-leavers continue their studies. About 40 per cent of school-leavers enter universities and other institutions of higher learning.

Economic progress is a major aspect of socialist development which the party constantly supervises. The congress pointed out that the fifth five-year plan of economic development was being successfully fulfilled in the main, although considerable difficulties had to be overcome, due largely to a deterioration of the foreign economic situation. It concerned itself chiefly with shortcomings in our own work and with ways of rectifying these shortcomings as speedily as possible. All the delegates saw this approach as a prerequisite of consolidating what has been achieved and providing conditions for further progress. Still, some targets of the five-year plan are not likely to be met no matter how hard we work.

As for the sixth five-year plan now being drafted, the congress did not consider it advisable to specify targets in figures but decided on the main lines only. Its decisions say that the party's economic policy, while taking account of the actual situation and bearing in mind long-range objectives, must adjust to changing conditions and that the growth rate of the national income must be in harmony with processes making for higher efficiency and quality of output. This will make our products more competitive on the world market and improve our economic and foreign trade balance.

Special attention is being given to squaring revenues with expenditures, commodity stocks with purchasing power, jobs with the work force, and investment funds with building capacities. It must be remembered that the foreign economic situation will remain unfavorable for a long time to come. This means that we must draw more on internal resources, improve management and organization, and promote cooperation.

The congress emphasized that a greater effort should be made both in the upper echelons and at grass roots if we want to fulfil the tasks we have set ourselves. Everyone must give all his knowledge and energy to his job wherever it happens to be — in the party, government, mass organization or any other sphere.

Active participation in the international division of labor is also an important factor for the country's progress. This concerns primarily multilateral cooperation with the socialist countries and economic activity within the framework of the CMEA. This is exceedingly productive cooperation, which contributes substantially to the development of all the CMEA countries, including Hungary.

In its economic policy, the party takes into consideration the general laws governing socialist construction and the specific conditions of national life. On the basis of social property in the means of production and a socialist planned economy we use commodity, financial, and market relations existing under socialism to achieve our goals. We hold that the system of economic interests put into effect through economic regulation should contribute primarily to the development of smoothly operating factories and cooperatives. The need to make better use of these instruments prompts work collectives to look for potentialities and resources in their own sphere, for ways of making production more efficient. The congress re-emphasized that economic management should contribute to the accumulation of enterprise funds and lead to wage increases.

Socialism is a society in which every person has the right to work. The formalization of this right in the constitution and the abolition of unemployment are a great historical and politcal achievement. People are quite right when they say: 'He who works will prosper.' But no two jobs are alike. Much still remains to be done to raise productivity, which is lower than it is in some other socialist countries, and to eliminate wage-levelling completely.

In the early years after liberation, when the party abolished unemployment, the important thing was to guarantee every working man or woman a satisfactory standard of living. Now that this important social problem has been resolved and the economy has risen to a qualitatively different level, the interests of society demand consistent application of the socialist principle of differentiating remuneration according to the quantity and quality of work. This principle is supported more and more by the people but to carry it into practice much must be done in the sphere of centralized regulation and in the work collectives themselves.

Economic management is always in the focus of the party's attention. Speakers at the congress insisted that it should be more flexible and efficient, that decisions should be coordinated with greater care and carried out more vigorously and consistently, and urged executives to organize and direct basic economic processes accordingly. They noted that in addition to promoting centralized management and strengthening the foundations of our

planned economy, it was essential to go further in encouraging the initiative and autonomy of factories and cooperatives and refrain from unnecessary interference 'from above' in matters within the latter's jurisdiction. They said that the decisive role in this respect must be played by economic executives, who should use their powers without hesitation and do their job competently. The party wholeheartedly supports those who show initiative, are receptive to new ideas, never hesitate to assume responsibility, and are ready to take reasonable risks.

An important condition for accomplishing the tasks facing the party is to continue extending socialist democracy.

Many delegates spoke of the development of democratic principles as an important characteristic of our system. Experience has shown that this encourages the people to take a greater interest in both major and minor aspects of public life, an interest that expresses itself in criticisms and suggestions by millions of citizens that help improve work. Direct participation in public affairs spells out rule by the people. The more socialist democracy gains in strength and scope, the bigger the advance we make towards public self-administration.

Sound forms of democratic management have developed in the party, as well as in government agencies, public institutions, and mass organizations. What matters now is not to create new forms but to make better use of existing ones. These include trade union organizers' councils, production conferences, and meetings of socialist work team leaders. The councils, for one, not only give economic executives their opinion on the latter's performance but have a say in how the social and cultural funds of the given enterprise are spent. This is also the case in cooperatives, whose employees have lately begun to form trade unions of their own. The trade unions have, on the whole, improved their work; they are now more active in defending their members' rights, which is in keeping with democratic principles and helps overcome any conflicts that may arise between the workers and the management.

All these forms have become part of our life. They complement and enrich one another. Socialist democratic institutions are expected to play a still greater part in ascertaining and coordinating diverse social interests and in meeting society's basic requirements. To be able to do this, they must combat every sign of formalism in all spheres of public work.

Socialist democracy demands that executives should keep staffs adequately informed and heed the opinions, suggestions, and criticisms of work collectives. To enable democratic institutions to perform their role more efficiently, the congress found it necessary to state that executives must render detailed and comprehensive accounts of their work. People in industry and other economic fields are offered new opportunities to influence the appointment of executives and supervise and assess their work. Our aim is to fortify the workers' realization that they are not merely job-holders but exponents of working-class power.

The congress stressed, however, that to further socialist democracy it was indispensable to improve civic discipline and put an end to laxity. It is very important that party, government, economic, and non-governmental bodies, executives, and the people as a whole should be uncompromising toward behavior alien to socialist standards, regardless of who is guilty of such behavior. The rights of every member of society are inseparable from his duties. Under socialism no one should be allowed to merely watch the effort of others and yet demand for himself as large a share of the benefits as is due to those who have produced them. Nor is it enough to invoke the law; work collectives and every fair-minded person taking a firm stand against undesirable phenomena and reprehensible behavior must have a say. This approach is needed if we want to enhance the socialist characteristics of our society.

The worker-peasant alliance, which is the political foundation of our system, is growing stronger from day to day, as is the socialist unity of our nation. Cooperation between the working class and the cooperative peasantry is acquiring a new content thanks to the identity of their interests. The intellectuals, who are linked by close bonds with the workers and peasants, participate actively and effectively in socialist construction.

The communists know well that the new society can only be built on the basis of the unity of all working people and through the joint effort of all classes and social groups led by the working class. Workers, peasants, and intellectuals, men and women, veterans and young people, Hungarians and people of other nationalities, atheists and believers, communists and non-communists all work in concord to attain their historical common goals. This is a great achievement of the party and the socialist system. The party will continue to promote national unity.

The HSWP always follows the principle that a non-communist may hold any key post in our country except a party post. We have tens of thousands of non-communists in leading positions in government, the economy, and other public spheres. Their knowledge, hard work, and loyalty serve the people's cause and help strengthen working-class power.

In spite of differences in world-view, there are common tasks on which we can and do cooperate with churches and believers. These tasks include participation in building the socialist society, the struggle for peace, the protection of human dignity, and the effort to provide a secure and happy life. We insist that communists and non-communists, atheists and believers alike should observe the constitution and other laws. Our socialist system neither grants nor allows privileges to anyone.

This policy is based on Marxist-Leninist principles. It serves the people's interests and helps mobilize millions for devoted labor and public activity. The working people expressed their support

for the party's general line by launching a socialist emulation movement in honor of the 12th party congress and the 35th anniversary of liberation. It was a rousing experience to listen at the congress to delegates from work collectives reporting on the fulfillment of commitments and announcing their intention to continue the emulation movement. This was also the subject of numerous letters and telegrams received by the congress. We realized that all our working people were attending the communists' forum indirectly, so to speak.

The party's work style and more particularly the methods used by it as the leading force of society are conditioned by the fact that its interests fuse with those of the working people. Janos Kadar put this very well in the CC Report. 'The Party,' he said, 'puts itself in the service of the people. It guides but does not issue orders, leads but condemns any abuse of authority . . . The party has confidence in the masses and the masses follow it. We have every reason to call this a great achievement brought about by the common will of the HSWP and the Hungarian people.' These words were specified and amplified by many delegates who took the floor.

A realistic assessment of the situation in the world and in our country, an objective summing up of results, a critical and self-critical examination of shortcomings, and a sober formulation of further tasks are methods which the party strives to apply in its work. Whatever the subject raised by delegates and whatever the issue discussed by the congress, the working man was always central. Indeed, whether dealing with foreign policy matters, economic development or the molding of the people's consciousness, we think primarily of man, whose interests are what the Communist Party serves.

Much remains to be done to build a developed socialist society in Hungary. We do not forget that this is a time when views running counter to socialist ideas have not yet been fully overcome everywhere and that now and then they even gather fresh vigor and affect people. We take this into account because we are realists. We know — and this is an important lesson of our party history — that the materialization of Marxist-Leninist ideas is not an automatic process. The only way in which we can demonstrate that ours is a just cause is through political work and day-to-day effort, through concrete deeds, and we must widely use agitation and propaganda to this end. We counter bourgeois views with our ideals and see our chief method not in administrative measures but in persuasion through discussion. As for administrative sanctions against exponents of hostile ideology, we apply them only when our laws are violated.

Our party has achieved political, ideological, and organizational unity. However, we are well aware that we must go on working day after day to maintain and strengthen this unity, which is a bulwark against the complex external and internal conditions in which we are building socialism. This is why we never sit back; neither our own people, nor our foreign friends would forgive us if we did. The communists' tasks have never been easy, and so our struggle will continue until the whole of mankind goes over from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom, as Frederick Engels put it, to the epoch of the new history of mankind.*

Hungary's communists work with conviction and in unity for a peaceful and happy future for their people and for all mankind. The 12th HSWP congress was an important stage in this effort. The tasks we have set ourselves are feasible if difficult. They will be the program of our party and people in the coming years. Our party is looking ahead with a confidence which rests on the people's support of its realistic policy.

*Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1959, p. 391.

Conference in Havana

An international theoretical conference with 'The Class Structure of Latin American and Caribbean Countries' as its subject took place in Havana on March 26-28, 1980. It was co-sponsored by the CC of the Communist Party of Cuba and *World Marxist Review*. The participants represented 33 communist, workers', socialist, and other revolutionary organizations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua (Sandinista National Liberation Front), Panama, Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Papers and information were sent in by the Communist parties of Bolivia, Haiti, and Martinique and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. The participants included a *WMR* delegation led by Pavel Auersperg, CC member, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Executive Editor of *WMR* on behalf of the CPCz.

The conference met shortly before the fifth anniversary of the Havana Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (June 1975), whose final document stressed that the social revolution on the continent was inevitable and would pass through an anti-imperialist stage. It was from this standpoint that the theoretical conference examined the problem, which is very important to the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement.

Opening the conference, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the CC Political Bureau, Communist Party of Cuba, described it as both scientific

and political. The conference, he said, is devoted to 'a problem agitating people not only by its rich ideological content but by its concrete significance for our own tasks in struggle'.

Delegates gave concrete examples to show the importance of the 1975 conference's conclusion that U.S. imperialism is the chief enemy of the Latin American peoples and that the three revolutionary forces of today — the socialist community, the international working class, and the national liberation movement — are their external allies in the difficult struggle for social liberation.

The conference records will be published in forthcoming issues of *WMR*.

The growing role of the social sciences

Josef Havlin
Secretary, Central Committee, CP Czechoslovakia

Our working people, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, are engaged in fulfilling a truly historic task set by the 14th and further elaborated by the 15th Congress of the CPCz: building a developed socialist society. Our experience, like that of the fraternal communist and workers' parties, shows that this is an extremely difficult task. The transition from the foundations of socialism to a developed socialist society entails more than a quantitative growth of the indicators of socio-economic, socio-political and spiritual progress. It is not just an improvement of the existing elements of the socialist economic system, culture and ideology but also profound qualitative changes and the attainment of a new and very much higher level in all the spheres of life in society.

The fulfillment of this historic task entails extensive and all-round use of science as a productive force and an effective blend of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism. This, for its part, makes new and unprecedented demands on theory, on the social, natural and technical sciences. Here, special responsibility devolves on the social sciences, whose task is to shed light on the lines of society's advance and to map out the concrete ways for tackling the numerous social problems.

In this context, Gustav Husak said in the CPCz CC Report to the 15th Party Congress:

'The urgent and exacting tasks of the current stage of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia, as well as international developments, the need to elaborate questions and clarify trends of social and economic development in a long-term perspective, place new demands on the creative application of Marxist-Leninist theory and the development of the social sciences.

'The effectiveness of scientific cognition and the application of its conclusions in practice are increasingly dependent on the interrelationship between the social, natural and technical sciences, on a comprehensive theoretical approach, and on close cooperation and mutual enrichment of basic and applied research.[1]

This is a clear expression of the idea that a developed socialist society, as, of course, the process of its construction, requires an ever deeper comprehension and consistent use of the uniformities of social development, especially those which, as the experience of the countries within the world socialist system shows, are of universal significance for the progress of socialism.

Today, the social sciences in Czechoslovakia concentrate on the problems in building a developed socialist society which are considered as a complex. Among the primary ones are the activity of the Communist Party and the growth of its leading role in social life, and also various aspects of the world revolutionary process, the strengthening of the socialist community and the implementation of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence.

The main lines in the development of the social sciences, as laid down by the 15th Congress of the CPCz were then concretized in the resolution of the Presidium of the CPCz CC concerning a Coherent Social Sciences Program after the 15th congress of the CPCz (June 1977). This program, which emphasized the priority of basic, long-term research into social problems is an expression of the party's line of developing the social sciences in accordance with the new demands of our day. At the same time, it continues the line mapped up in earlier party resolutions, notably that of the Presidium of the CPCz CC (May 1974) 'The Development, Present State and Tasks of the Social Sciences in Czechoslovakia'.

The new program, in whose elaboration and implementation extensive use was made of the experience of the USSR and other socialist countries, is above all an important instrument for the planned management of science. Its goal is to bring together the leading creative forces in the country and to concentrate the facilities of the numerous scientific establishments along the main lines of activity. This means not only the institutes of the Czechoslovak and Slovak Academies of Sciences, but the whole complex of research centres which exist in our higher schools and in the sectoral

scientific organizations. The fact that this program has been adopted itself shows that a greater role for the social sciences in the building of a developed socialist society is inseparable from the growth of the party's leading role, improvement of the mechanisms of planning and management, and greater control of the execution of decisions.

The new style of management in social science has taken shape in this country on the basis of a principled and critical party approach to analyzing the experience gained by the social sciences in the country in the 1960s, notably in connection with the crisis in the party and society.

The ideological differentiation which then arose had a negative effect on the state of the social sciences and in many instances led to serious departures from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, an underestimation of cooperation with scientists in other socialist countries and a denial of the importance of the state plan. The mandatory nature of the plan was frequently ignored and its content now and again reduced to a mere listing of short-term tasks unconnected with the in-depth processes in socialist development, which made it possible to infiltrate unscientific theories and views.

The fundamental directives adopted immediately after the April 1969 Meeting of the CPCz Central Committee, which inaugurated the shaping of the new party leadership, marked a resolute swing in overcoming the deep crisis in the party and society. This determined the lines of the beneficial changes in the sphere of science, notably social science. The ideological defects were gradually overcome, the Marxist-Leninist principles of social research were re-established, fruitful cooperation with scientists in other socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union, resumed and the authority of the state plan was consolidated.

In the period between the 14th and the 15th congresses of the CPCz, the social sciences in Czechoslovakia made a great stride forward also in the sense that scientists succeeded in harmonizing the results of basic research and the needs of social practice. A positive role in this process was undoubtedly played by the state plan for scientific research for the fifth and sixth five-year periods, which became an effective instrument for management and control in this area.

The elaboration of the Coherent Social Sciences Program was preceded by the party's realistic assessment of the actual potentialities of research centers, their fulfillment of earlier assignments and their personnel potential. Here, especial emphasis was laid on the personnel back-up of the program and the effort to overcome the fragmentation of forces resulting from the orientation of a sizable part of the personnel on particular and inessential problems. That is why important creative results are already expected along some lines within the framework of basic research as envisaged by the state plan.

Analyzing our experience in fulfilling the Coherent Social Sciences Program and pondering the further development of social knowledge in Czechoslovakia, we pay serious attention to the fact that fundamentally new and unprecedented research programs arise today and will tend to do so in the future in social science as in natural science (and frequently in direct connection with the latter). To implement them the relevant facilities will have to be found in due time.

Fulfillment of the Coherent Program has already yielded definite value results in terms of the organization of research management. In particular it has become clear that the conceptualization of assignments implies extensive use of cooperation among individual research centers and within them, on the one hand, and of all-round international cooperation with appropriate institutes in the USSR and other socialist countries, on the other. Leading scientific workers and centers are increasingly concentrating on the theoretical content of research, on methodological problems and the formulation and substantiation of final recommendations which are of a synthetic character.

Today, all the prerequisites have been created for the further development of the plusses of the Coherent Program, which have been brought out in practice, in a state plan of basic research for the seventh five-year period. Special importance is attached here to the thematic orientation of the new research plan, meaningful ties between basic and particular tasks, and further concentration of resources. In more concrete terms, this will mean the establishment within the framework of each social science of effective proportions between basic and applied research, in the light of the need to develop the former at a faster pace. This will also take into account the specifics in the development of the individual scientific disciplines, their influence on the progress of the relevant scientific fields and the new ties which arise between the various fields. Much effort will have to be made to provide the social sciences with the necessary material, technical and organizational facilities, especially in the processing and use of information, and the use of mechanization and automation in various types of ancillary work.

Specifying the further development of the social sciences in the 1980s, the Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee emphasized in its Report to the March 1980 CC Plenary Meeting:

'The CPCz Central Committee demands that the social sciences should keep in step with the requirements of society and developments in other socialist countries and throughout the world. We shall above all support research aimed to settle key problems in our time, like the growing role of the working class, the development of the socialist state system, the development and integration of our nations and nationalities, the operation of economic laws under socialism, the improvement of the management and planning of our economy, social relations, culture and man's spiritual development, problems which shed light on complex international developments and our place in the world revolutionary process.

'The solution of all these questions requires that the social sciences should more boldly analyze the

phenomena which worry us and attain greater depth in theoretical cognition. The creative Marxist-Leninist approach to meaningful problems in our economy and the whole of social life must become the basic principle underlying the activity of scientists, theorists and propagandists.'[2]

Czechoslovak society has entered a period of its development in which the greatness of the goals of socialist construction and the considerable difficulties arising from the attainment of these goals are seen with special clarity. A responsible quest for ways of solving the objectively arising problems requires a mustering of all the forces and a revaluation of the methods of work in accordance with the new conditions. Here, social science can substantially help society.

We seek to make group (collective) activity of specialists in many fields of science the core of the whole of research within the framework of a complex elaboration of important and socially meaningful problems in building developed socialism, so that theoretical activity in the social sciences should be closely tied in with the people's life and work, and the CPCz's transformative practice.

And this concerns not only the new five-year period. Our own experience, and that of international socialist integration in science, provides sufficient ground even today to ponder a program for the development of social sciences in the 1980s and 1990s and to envisage the meaningful key problems which will have to be analyzed and solved by then.

There is no doubt that in the subsequent decades priority in the social sciences in Czechoslovakia will still be given to the problems of building a developed socialist society and the prospects of its further advance. That is why paramount importance will attach to the research in political economy, philosophy, scientific communism, historiography, the juridical and other sciences which will have to formulate theoretical and practical prerequisites for solving these problems.

We are now faced with the task of working out an all-round scientific forecast for the whole period of construction of a developed socialist society up until the year 2000. It must include a definition of the strategy of the necessary socio-economic, scientific and technical changes, the establishment of the priority and continuity of the individual stages of advance, the formulation of the goals of social development, and an analysis of the factors and mechanisms which can secure the attainment of these goals. In the USSR and some other socialist countries, work on these problems is in full swing. This helps us to study the experience of our friends in a broad international context, which sheds more light on the basic uniformities underlying the historical development of the socialist society, the ways and means for the effective management of the social organism and for the mastery of the objective and subjective factors operating in it. Participation in solving these problems simultaneously gives us the opportunity to work out the truly scientific approach, in accord with the principles of socialism, to the solution of so-called global problems of our day and to counter the bourgeois notions of the future of our planet, which are a far cry from the truth, with Marxist-Leninist views.

In this connection, I must say that a qualitatively new task being set before the social sciences by the construction of a developed socialist society is to enhance their influence on progress in the natural and technical sciences. The practice of socialist and communist construction requires that the social sciences should no longer remain a general philosophical, methodological foundation for natural science and technology, but should — on the basis of an ever deeper cognition of the uniformities of social development and its ways and goals — take an active part in defining the tasks and lines along which natural-science, engineering and technical research have to go forward. That is one of the new aspects of the party's policy in the management of science. This means that the general trends in natural science and technical research should not only ever more fully meet the needs of society but also more effectively promote the solution of concrete and meaningful problems of social development, above all those connected with the transformation of the material and technical basis of socialism into the material and technical basis of communism.

Another responsible task of our social sciences is to produce an in-depth theoretical analysis of the development and interconnections between two broad processes which relate to especially important changes in society's life in this new decade. On the one hand, there is the intensification in the development of the productive forces and the growing efficiency of the whole economy, above all on the basis of accelerated scientific and technical progress, whose scale and pace in our country still fall short of the potentialities and requirements of socialism and lag behind the rapid advance of the scientific and technical revolution in the world. On the other hand, there is the further acceleration of our society's social development on the basis of the full use of the advantages of socialism, the improvement of the socialist way of life, and education of a highly conscious and creatively active individual meeting the requirements of the epoch of mature socialism.

Along both these lines we set before the social sciences the task of working out, on the basis of the available results, complex research programs for a fundamental advance in the scientific cognition of the relevant phenomena and processes. We expect that this research will help to formulate development alternatives in science and technology, and also in the economy and the social sphere itself, and to select optimal variants of such development.

The complex approach to the balanced construction of a developed socialist society increasingly suggests the following conclusion: the above-formulated socio-economic problems can be successfully solved and the diverse difficulties we face today and which we shall face tomorrow can be overcome only if there is further development and

consolidation of socialist relations among men, the relations of production which are based on cooperation, on the principle of 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work', and also the relations among individuals in every other sphere of social life. That is one of the key topics for scientific research in the new decade.

The Marxist-Leninist methodology and the growth of technical facilities in social research provide extensive potentialities for analyzing the class structure of our society, and so for producing a reliable scientific basis for the whole complex of research in the social sciences. The main accent here is on doing more and more to improve the planning of socialist production and the management of the intricate processes in building developed socialism. Realization of complex research into the deepening of socialist integration is an important task before the social sciences on the scale of the socialist community of nations.

The logic underlying the construction of developed socialism steadily increases the importance of research into the role of the subjective factor as an expression of the objective uniformities of history. Comprehension of the complex dialectics of the objective and the subjective in the course of socialist construction increasingly tends to become the central philosophical and methodological problem before the social sciences over the immediate and subsequent stages of their development. In a more concrete form, it appears as a series of problems relating to how the working class realizes its leading role, the party enhances its guiding role, all the forms of the working people's productive activity are perfected, the political system of socialism and socialist democracy further developed, and the process in which the nations and nationalities inhabiting Czechoslovakia are brought ever closer together is unfolded.

The prospects before the social sciences working on the ideological aspects of social life are also connected with the growing importance of the subjective factor. This concerns, in particular, social psychology, the theory of culture and art criticism which have to be more active and effective than ever before in tackling practical problems. An important contribution to improving ideological work must also come from our historians, who, apart from everything else, must meet their old debt to society: to provide a synthetic review of the historical development of the Czech and Slovak peoples, and to bring out in the light of Marxism-Leninism the progressive legacy in their history which is of much importance for solving the problems before us.

The high demands made on the social sciences we have been considering are all the more relevant since in the forthcoming period our country, as a component of the socialist community, will take part in the new stage of the class confrontation in the world which is to determine the future of mankind. A profound theoretical examination of the problems of the revolutionary struggle for peace and socialism, of the processes going forward in the developing countries, and a further critical analysis of present-day state-monopoly capitalism, which takes into account the new forms and methods of its economic, political and ideological practice, are undoubtedly a key sector in the activity of our social sciences over the next few decades.

The future tends ever more tangibly to influence the present day, inspiring the communists to seek new ways to achieve the most humane goal, that of defending and consolidating peace throughout the world. Mankind must pool its efforts and create a world climate that would help to continue the peaceful competition between the two socio-economic systems, so completely realizing Lenin's idea of peaceful coexistence. Here, there is only one reasonable alternative: to deepen détente and to halt the attempts by imperialism, sharply intensified over the recent period, to start another cold war. The social sciences, studying international relations and world development processes, have an active part to play in tackling all these problems.

An essential characteristic of research in the socialist part of the world is, increasingly, the fact that it is being carried on through mutual cooperation, whose main lines are determined by the ruling communist and workers' parties. At regular meetings of CC secretaries of the socialist countries' fraternal parties on international and ideological problems it is now common practice to exchange views in the social sciences and discuss and adopt joint documents determining the tasks and prospects for the development of social studies. Such cooperation helps our parties and peoples to build socialism and communism and makes an invaluable contribution to organizing research into the new problems which arise in the course of the class struggle in the world arena, to the ideological struggle against imperialism and revisionism.

The international socialist pooling of forces in the social sciences takes on ever more efficient forms. Apart from a number of long agreed programs within the CMEA framework and broadly developed bilateral cooperation, multilateral cooperation is being ever more frequently practised at the present stage. The Long-Term Program for Multilateral Cooperation of Scientific Institutes of the Socialist Countries in the Social Sciences is the highest form of integration in this field, and it determines 13 main lines of such cooperation, including 77 programs being tackled within the framework of permanent forms of joint activity, and another 15 goal-oriented programs. This document records the new relations in the international socialist division of scientific labor which harmonize the needs of individual socialist countries and the international interests of the whole socialist community.

The establishment of an international information system in the social sciences has also done much for this cooperation. Here, the USSR Academy of Sciences has had a big role to play. The information provided within the framework of this system, the thematical collections and bibliographical year-books concentrating on the key problems of social studies and various aspects of

the struggle against bourgeois theory and propaganda are of invaluable assistance.

A remarkable result of the conferences of CC secretaries of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, we think, is that the above-mentioned Long-Term Program closely ties in research carried on in party and academic scientific centers. Here, we in Czechoslovakia have attained the first few promising successes. The fact that the coordination of the international social-sciences program for the next five-year period has been entrusted to our Academy of Sciences is an appreciation of the active role of Czechoslovakia's scientific forces in socialist international cooperation and an expression of the high confidence in them.

For Czechoslovakia, international cooperation in the social sciences, above all cooperation with the Soviet Union, is a vital necessity. Being a small country, Czechoslovakia naturally does not have at its disposal the research potential which could provide a satisfactory answer to the whole range of questions arising from the tasks of building a developed socialist society. Socialist integration in the social sciences helps us to take an active part in extensive research projects which create real perspectives for a marked extension of the limits of scientific social knowledge.

The state plan for basic research in Czechoslovakia from 1976 to 1980 and the Coherent Social Sciences Program were worked out with an eye to international cooperation in the given field and the differentiation of the tasks it suggests. The high effectiveness of this approach has been demonstrated by the results of the work in analyzing the developed socialist society, criticizing bourgeois and revisionist ideology, the research in modern history, the study of the character and social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution, etc.

Of course, when considering our successes and taking pride in our contribution to the socialist countries' cooperation in the social sciences, we cannot but be aware of our failings and the still outstanding problems. There still is, in particular, parallelism in our research, the best forces are not always mustered for international cooperation, as a result of which our participation is frequently not of an adequately high level, and we do not always succeed in implementing the valuable results in practice, etc. But there is no doubt that these shortcomings will be overcome in the futher development of the social sciences in this country and in other socialist-community countries.

The social sciences, resting on the foundation of the Marxist-Leninist social theory, have been fulfilling their historical role by making a fitting contribution to the construction of a socialist and communist society.

1. *15th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.* Prague, Orbis, 1976, p. 66.
2. *Rude Pravo,* March 27, 1980.

The lessons of six decades

Tomas Sinuraya
Member of the Leadership,
CP Indonesia

It is 60 years since the foundation of the Communist Party of Indonesia, a working-class party whose history is inseparable from our people's life and struggle, from the world revolutionary movement.

The Communist Party has to mark its 60th anniversary with the country still ruled by a reactionary military regime conducting an anti-communist and anti-popular policy. But today there are ever louder demands by the growing forces of the opposition for democratic transformations. Patriotic attitudes have struck deep roots in social life. There is growing discontent among the people with the 'new order'. That is quite natural. Fifteen years ago the reactionaries had enough physical strength to crush the progressive movement and to seize power with the help of bureaucratic capitalists dressed up as generals. But being essentially an anti-popular and anti-national force, they have proved to be totally helpless, when faced with the task of giving the country a positive program for development, and of proposing an ideology and political line that a majority of the people would accept.

Although in the recent period imperialism has intensified its aggressive moves in the international arena, the world situation as a whole is marked by long-term positive changes favoring the struggle for national liberation, democracy, peace, progress and socialism. The revolutionary process continues to develop and to rise to new heights. Such is the dialectics of the historical changes today, in this epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Our people will throw off the fetters of the reactionary power! In marking the 60th anniversary of the party, the communists and all the other working people of Indonesia redouble their energy in the fight to bring on this day.

The working-class movement in Indonesia originated at the beginning of the century. The first few trade unions which were then set up came out for an improvement of the socio-economic conditions of the working people, who were ruthlessly exploited by Dutch colonialism. The working-class movement gradually spread virtually across the whole territory of Indonesia. The growing activity of the

working class helped to consolidate a broad front of anti-colonial struggle, which flared up anew in the 20th century and gave it unprecedented dimensions.

The teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which in that period became the revolutionary program of masses of working people in many countries of the world, also reached Indonesia, giving its proletariat a reliable ideological weapon in the struggle to change the existing order.

The Great October Socialist Revolution headed by the Bolshevik Party and Lenin, its great leader, had an especially strong impact on the working-class and national-liberation movement in Indonesia. The experiences of the October Revolution demonstrated the need to set up a vanguard party of the working class capable of fulfilling the tasks of its own emancipation and of that of the whole people from every form of oppression and exploitation.

The founding of the CPI on May 23, 1920, resulted from the fusion of the working-class movement with Marxism-Leninism and simultaneously met the objective need already existing in the country for the formation of a vanguard revolutionary force capable of raising the liberation struggle to a new level. The CPI expressed the vital intersts of the working class and all the other working people, and acted as a patriotic and anti-imperialist party. The communists started work among the masses, the workers in the first place, mobilizing them for action, strikes and demonstrations against the colonialists. As soon as the party was founded, it decided to join the Communist International.

The communists' chief task during the colonial period was the struggle for national liberation, of which a milestone was the 1926-27 anti-colonial uprising in Java and Sumatra led by the CPI. Despite the defeat and the reign of terror and reprisals subsequently mounted by the colonial authorities, who passed death sentences on communists, that heroic action enhanced the spirit of anti-colonial protest among the masses. The uprising showed that the colonial authority was not so strong after all, that it could be shaken, and that it could be overthrown. It also showed that the colonialists regarded the CPI's activity as a grave threat to their positions.

The party drew important lessons from that uprising. The communists were confronted with the problem of asserting a consistent Marxist-Leninist line in the Party, of working for its monolithic unity, of close unification with broad masses of people and the international working class and of establishing a national-unity front of all the anti-colonial forces based on an alliance of the working class and the peasantry. The lessons of the uprising subsequently helped to take a scientific approach to defining the content of the Indonesian revolution, its stages, its motive forces and allies.

From 1927 to 1945, the Communist Party, outlawed by the colonial authorities after the 1926-1927 events, had to operate in clandestine conditions. That was the period of intensive revolutionary effort which had an important and even crucial role to play in paving the way for the future victory of the national-liberation movement in Indonesia.

The Communist International always gave much attention to the CPI's activity, and its support was especially important after the defeat of the 1926-1927 uprising, when the problem was to revive the CPI as a national force. In order to restore the party ranks and to create the conditions for successful party work, the communists had to have a political line that would be broadly accepted by the Indonesian people and the country's patriotic organizations. It was the historic Seventh Congress of the Comintern which helped us to formulate such a line.

Re-established in 1935, the Central Committee of our party put forward the task of consolidating its ranks and establishing national cooperation among all the liberation forces acting against colonial domination and the threat of fascism which then loomed over the world. Soon, within the framework of a united anti-imperialist and anti-fascist front, a number of associations were set up in which, communists and nationalists cooperated. This helped to improve the organization and cohesion of the patriotic anti-colonial and anti-fascist forces. During the years of the Japanese occupation (1942-1945) they mounted a resistance movement so bringing on the decisive national victory, the winning of independence in August 1945. The arrival of that great day was accelerated by the Soviet Union's brilliant successes in routing German fascism and Japanese militarism, successes which helped the national-liberation movements in many countries to score their victories.

A natural result of the correct line pursued by the Communist Party on the eve of independence was its conversion into a most authoritative force of the working-class and liberation movement in Indonesia.

For our country, party and patriotic circles, the decades between 1945 and 1965 were a time in which the gains of the Indonesian revolution were consolidated and developed. But that was also a time in which the communists faced many hard trials. Internal reaction, supported by imperialism, sought to kill the content of independence and to undermine the influence of the revolutionary forces, always directing its main blow at the CPI, the vanguard of the revolution. Let us recall the bloody drama in Madiun in 1948, when thousands of communists died,[1] the rightist Sukiman government's 'August raid' on the communists (1951), the separatist uprisings in Sumatra and Sulawesi in 1956-1957 that aimed to split up the country and overthrow the legitimate government of the republic, which the rebels accused of having pro-communist sympathies; let us recall the activities of the fanatical Dar-ul-Islam gangs of terrorists which threatened the country's security and which saw the communists as the main 'evil', and finally the most sanguinary event of all in which this period culminated, the counter-revolutionary coup in September and October 1965 carried out by 'military careerists', generals of the armed forces led by

Suharto against the anti-imperialist government of President Sukarno.[2]

The reactionary military inflicted their main blow on the Communist Party of Indonesia, which was falsely accused of complicity in the anti-government conspiracy and even of leadership in it. Hundreds of thousands of communists then died in the massacre staged by the rightist generals and their accomplices. The repression and persecution directed against our party continue to be part and parcel of Suharto's 'new order'.

One especially important lesson to be drawn from that period is the following: so long as the CPI was guided by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, i.e., so long as it truly expressed the will of the working class and the other working people, stood up for their interests and pursued a policy of close unity with the international communist movement especially with the CPSU, the party found the right solutions for the problems that arose, overcame the difficulties, coped with the moves by its enemies, and advanced the revolutionary movement, enhancing its prestige in the country and beyond its borders. From 1945 on, the communists, in alliance with other patriots, succeeded not only in beating back the attacks of reaction but also in systematically building up their influence and gaining important positions in the country. That was why in the late 1950s the Communist Party became Indonesia's major political party.

But as soon as the party leadership departed from the well-tried Marxist-Leninist principles, there came retreats, all the way to heavy defeats. The most devastating part was played by right and 'left' opportunism which infiltrated the party, and especially by Maoism, an ideology which is alien and hostile to the working class and which in the first half of the 1960s so weakened the CPI that it was unable to withstand the blows of reaction during the 1965 events.

Despite the grave trials of that period, our party and its central leadership have now been re-established. The CPI is once again guided in its activity by Marxism-Leninism; it has set as the central task before the communists the demand to continue the struggle against reaction and imperialism, and for the Indonesian revolution, for transforming the country into a truly independent, free, democratic, progressive and peaceable country, seeing socialism as its future. This work is now being carried on in very difficult underground conditions. The revolutionary forces have been sharply weakened and disorganized by the anti-communist terrorism, and to this day feel the effects of the blows by reaction. All of this requires that we should give special attention to strengthening the party and its cooperation with other patriotic forces.

The authorities are clearly alarmed over the growing discontent in the country, a natural reaction by the population to the anti-popular line, the failures in the socio-economic sphere, the corruption and the dependence on imperialism. The discontent produces more and more opposition movements whose influence has been growing both in town and country. Action against the regime tends to assume diverse forms, ranging from criticism of the authorities in the non-government press to massive demonstrations. Despite the ban, workers stage strikes ever more frequently, and protest actions by young people and students, and actions by peasants have been gaining in scope. In the recent period, there are ever louder protests from the national intelligentsia while the national entrepreneurs speak aloud about the oppression and domination by imperialism. Some statesmen — military and civilian — have made statements in the press testifying to the sharpening of contradictions within the ruling circles. A number of influential newspapers in the capital have disagreed with official Jakarta's foreign-policy stand with respect to Vietnam, Kampuchea and Afghanistan, and with its policy of supporting U.S. imperialism. In their publications, the communists expose the policy of the imperialists and the regime's anti-popular line and ideology, and urge the people, the working people in the first place, to act against domestic and international reaction.

Our party is working to establish national cooperation of the forces opposed to the regime for a joint struggle for democracy, and for socio-economic and political changes for the benefit of a majority of the people. The communists emphasize that such cooperation should be voluntary and should be based on respect for the ideological, political and organizational independence of its participants, an approach which rules out the imposition of leadership by any one force on the rest of a condition of cooperation. We believe that this will create the possiblity of setting up a national unity front.

In urging the cohesion of the opposition circles on a democratic and anti-imperialist platform, we take into account not only that which is common to the situation in many developing countries where, as in Indonesia, there are many different patriotic strata and groups and where the problem of their unity is extremely acute. It is the situation in Indonesia itself which convinces us that there is a need for cooperation. There is no patriotic force or organization in the country which is now capable of fighting the regime on its own, let alone exercising leadership of this struggle. The main reason is the tremendous losses suffered by the national and patriotic circles over the nearly 15 years of the 'new order'. Cooperation is the only way open to the patriots.

With such cooperation, it will be easier to overcome the anti-communist prejudices which regrettably persist among some patriotic forces. Although this will certainly take time, we are sure that such prejudices should not in themselves be an obstacle to the establishment of ties among all the opposition strata and groups. After all, national cooperation on a democratic basis would serve the common cause, the common struggle to establish a democratic order in the country. We have learnt a great deal from the experience of party activity over the

CPI's 60 years, and we are not afraid of the difficulties in the struggle for the unity of patriots, however great these may be.

We shall continue to carry on a relentless struggle against the anti-communism of the 'new order', to expose its propaganda, its actual deeds and to tell the people about its crimes. We did that again recently in the document *Reply of the CPI to KOPKAMTIB*,[3] which says, in part, 'Our enemies' assertion that there is no place in our country for the ideas of communism, for communists, that they are alien to the Indonesian people, are false through and through. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism live and triumph all over the world, and they have also proved their viability on Indonesian soil, as they have on the soil of every other country in the world.' These are the ideas which now most fully express the profound democratic aspirations of the masses. By putting forward concrete demands which everyone can understand, the CPI demonstrates its adherence to the interests of an overwhelming majority of the people, and makes the masses feel that its struggle is inseparable from the people's interests, and that it is aimed to re-establish justice and democracy, and is against the crimes perpetrated by the regime in our long-suffering country.

In this context, let us recall the problem of political prisoners in Indonesia. For years, the authorities have been keeping in prisons and concentration camps hundreds of thousands of communists and other democrats without any legal grounds. For nearly 15 years now, the CPI, other patriotic forces, like communists and democrats in other countries, have been perseveringly fighting for the release of the Indonesian political prisoners. Under pressure from international public opinion and the opposition within the country, the authorities were forced to decide on their release but continued to keep in prison those who are classed under the notorious 'category A' (these are persons who had allegedly been directly involved in the 'September 30 movement').

What has this broadly advertised release amounted to? First of all, the former prisoners were forced to meet a number of conditions which are humiliating to human dignity (repudiation of their ideological convictions, etc.); second, having been released from prisons and concentration camps, they were not allowed to go free but were settled in strictly specified areas, virtually places of exile; third, they have been deprived of the elementary civil rights (participation in political life, the right to work in government, to say nothing of military establishments, to study in institutions of higher learning, and even to live in cities); fourth, the former prisoners must regularly report to the police, and many of them are prohibited from leaving the area of their settlement without the knowledge of the authorities; fifth, official circles have openly declared that in the event of 'disorders' the former prisoners would be the first to be arrested. The authorities have even threatened to shoot them on the spot if they turn out to be involved in popular disturbances.

Our party demands genuine release of all the political prisoners without exception. They are innocent, they have committed no crimes, they are patriots and fighters for the people's happiness. The authorities must not only restore civil rights to the former political prisoners but also compensate them for the material losses they have suffered. The communists demand of the regime explanations and admission of responsibility for the disappearance without trace and murders after 1965 of CPI leaders, members and supporters, members of their families, and the systematic killing of progressives and democrats. The CPI calls on public opinion in Indonesia and throughout the world to support these just and humanistic demands.

The Indonesian revolution is a component part of the worldwide revolutionary process and its destinies largely depend on the general course of developments in the world. We attach tremendous importance to the growing might of the socialist community headed by the Soviet Union, the crucial bulwark of the revolutionary forces of the globe, and rejoice at the fresh successes of the working-class and national-liberation movements.

The CPI wholeheartedly welcomed the historic victories of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, who defeated the aggression of the U.S. imperialists and the Peking hegemonists, the victory of the people of Iran, who overthrew the corrupt regime of the shah, the victory of the April revolution in Afghanistan, which has now, following the overthrow of the treacherous Amin regime, entered a new stage, the victory of the people of Nicaragua, who overthrew the fascist regime of Somoza, a puppet of U.S. imperialism, and many other successes by African and other peoples in their fight against imperialism and reaction. Our party puts a high value on the effective international proletarian solidarity of the socialist community with the liberation struggle all over the world.

But one cannot close one's eyes to the sharp step-up in the recent period of activity by international reaction, above all U.S. imperialism and its allies which now also include Peking's hegemonist leadership. Confronted with the weakening of their positions everywhere and with the threat of their further undermining, they have recklessly decided to step up the confrontation between nations, brandishing the bogey of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, and trying to return the world to the cold war. This adventurist line poses a direct threat to détente and security and is aimed to block the way of the movement for national liberation, democracy, progress, peace and socialism, and to stem the revolutionary process. Like other fraternal parties, we resist the new moves and plots of the imperialists and the Peking leaders, and expose anti-Sovietism and anti-communism whatever its form. We express solidarity with the socialist community and with all the anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces. The CPI believes that its duty is to continue strengthening the unity of our movement.

The CPI's six decades of struggle teach us that the Marxist-Leninist line, reliance on the popular forces, solidarity with the socialist system, the international working-class and communist movement and the whole front of the national-liberation movement has been and continues to be the only correct one. Guided by this line and the principles of proletarian internationalism, our party continues the struggle. We believe that the day of victory will come, and that democracy and socialism will triumph on Indonesian soil.

1. In 1948, the rightist Hatta government used the tense situation in the Madiun area following clashes between various military units to mount a massive reign of terror against the Communist Party and the left-wing forces.
2. Satyajaya Sudiman. "September 30: Truth and Lies", *WMR*, May 1980.
3. See S. Sudiman, ibid.

---

exchange of views

Devastating disease

UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

Employment, one of the key problems within the whole complex of relations between labor and capital, has now become unusually acute and has riveted the attention of political parties and organizations representing different classes. Unemployment has socio-economic roots and is built into the very structure of capitalism, with its own specific mechanism of origination and functioning. This mechanism needs to be studied if one is to propose realistic and effective means for easing the problem, which is exceptionally urgent and which is theoretically important and complex.

The Commission on Problems of Class Struggle in Developed Capitalist Countries set up a creative group to discuss this question. It was chaired by *James West*, CC Political Bureau member, CP-USA, a member of the *WMR* Editorial Board, and included *Polichronis Vais*, CC member, CP Greece, a member of the *WMR* Editorial Council, *Rodney Ohman*, representing the Left Party — Communists of Sweden on the Journal, and *Vladimir Golubkin*, a staff member of the Journal.

Below we present the results of their discussion.

Unemployment is based on the fundamental production relation of capitalism

Unemployment is not a periodical phenomenon of the capitalist economy. It is, in fact, a continuous process which may slacken now and again, only to flare up with fresh intensity.

Unemployment in the capitalist world has now assumed proportions which are unprecedented over the past several decades. According to the International Labour Organization, in 1977 there were 15 million unemployed in the developed capitalist countries which is about as many as there were in the 1974-1975 crisis period. By the end of 1979, just under 16 million were jobless in the OECD countries (excluding Portugal and Turkey). Experts have estimated that this year unemployment in the 24 OECD countries could top 20 million. One should bear in mind that these figures do not give a full picture of the state of things because they are usually understated and need to be essentially corrected on the strength of trade-union data.

Contemporary unemployment is a complex phenomenon. It is a contradictory reflection on virtually all the most important processes in the capitalist countries' economy: the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, which in the recent period has become chronic and all-embracing in many countries, the scientific and technical revolution, the state-monopoly regulation of the economy, the changing market outlook, and shifts in the spheres of distribution and consumption. Unemployment has become a key element and a most important synthetic characteristic of the working people's condition, which has a substantial effect on many of its other aspects.

The participants in the creative group concentrated on the following questions: characteristic features and causes of unemployment in close connection with the uniformities of the general crisis of capitalism; the socio-psychological, economic and political consequences of unemployment; the policy of the ruling circles of capitalist countries in regulating labor resources and ensuring employment; democratic programs for combating unemployment, and the communists' programs.

When dealing with the peculiarities of present-day unemployment, the participants in the discussion noted above all its massive and wide-ranging character. It has hit virtually the whole of the capitalist world, every sector of the economy (rang-

ing from the services to the most modern industries), all the trades and skill categories (from the unskilled laborer to the scientist), both sexes and all age groups. An important feature of its dynamic has come to light: it appears to have spilled over the framework of the cyclical movement of reproduction. Far from being reduced in the period after the 1974-75 crisis, the reserve labor army has, in fact, grown.

Why has the problem of unemployment become so acute? What has been the role in this process of the economic upheavals which hit the capitalist world in the first half of the 1970s and of the other longer-term factors?

The economic situation in the capitalist world in the second half of the 1970s was marked by an unstable revival with residual post-crisis phenomena reflecting both the instability of the world capitalist economy and the ineffectiveness of state-monopoly measures for regulating economic life. Among the causes behind the slower revival of the economy, as compared with earlier cycles, are the in-depth structural changes in the mechanism of social reproduction and international economic relations, and also conjunctural factors, including slack and uneven investment aimed mainly to modernize and rationalize production, and the inflationary growth of prices.

When considering the dynamic of three interconnected indicators — production, employment and unemployment — *two* characteristic points need to be singled out: *first*, economic growth has not led to a corresponding growth in employment, and *second*, the increase in employment has been paralleled by a growth of unemployment or, at best, its maintenance on a large scale.

The *first* is due to the fact that the expansion of production was as a rule based on the installation of new hardware and technology, rationalization of technological processes and a growth in the productivity of labor, which was steadily intensified. Consequently, these are important structural changes proceeding under impact of the scientific and technical revolution and inducing a transition from the extensive type of production to the intensive type, with all the resulting consequences for the labor market.

These changes were stimulated by governmental 'structural policy' designed to modernize and rationalize production, which under capitalism naturally leads to non-cyclical and permanent redundancies. (It was emphasized that this occurs only under capitalism because mass unemployment is not an inevitable concommitant of the development of industrial structures of present-day society. This will be seen from the socialist countries, where, despite the high level of industrialization, the working people are guaranteed social security, full employment, rising living standards and education. Technical progress under socialism is also attended with a reduction of manpower requirements in some industries and sectors of the economy, but with economic planning the redundant workers are retrained in due time and fill the jobs created by the steady expansion of production, which develops without crises, proportionally and in a balanced manner.)

Intensive development means that an ever larger share of investment does not go into the building of new production facilities and the creation of new jobs, but into the technical improvement of existing facilities. Thus, in the recent period, 75 per cent of all investments in the FRG have gone into rationalization of production and installation of new fixed assets in place of obsolete ones, and only 25 per cent into the expansion of production facilities. This raises the efficiency of production with an insignificant increase in investments and reduced the demand for labor-power even when production continues to grow. According to the Institute of Economic and Social Studies of the Association of German Trade Unions, from 1970 to 1976, the number of jobs in the FRG industry dropped by 13.7 per cent, and gross investments by 23.9 per cent, while actual production capacities increased by 11.6 per cent. Studies show that the use of microprocessors and computers tends to increase the rate at which the new technology erodes jobs, so that within the next decade the country will have half a million redundant people in industry and 1.2 million in office work, and that within 15 years one-half of all the jobs in the FRG will be threatened.[1]

One should also note that with the growing cost of imported energy resources, raw materials and foreign technology, which means a growth in production costs, businessmen increasingly prefer to economize by cutting back payrolls, and this leads to the expulsion of labor from production. Labor costs are another factor which stimulates the replacement of living labor by materialized labor.

The *second* phenomenon is due to the growing influx into the labor market of young people and women, whose numbers tend to outrun the growth of the active population, and this produces additional pressure on the labor market. Unemployment among young people and its consequences are undoubtedly among the most serious and explosive phenomena. In the EEC countries alone, it has hit about 2 million people under the age of 25 years. In all the capitalist countries the number of unwanted young people has been growing faster then the total number of jobless. There was the baby boom in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and its effects have been intensified by the fact that young people have to look for their first job just when unemployment is worst. There is also the low level of skill and shop-floor training by the employers, who use apprentices as unpaid and unskilled labor. There are also the defects in the school and university system which is incapable of satisfying the basic socio-economic requirements of present-day industrial society: the higher schools have become temporary and highly packed shelters for school dropouts who have failed to find a job and will hardly be able to find one.

The question of the causes and the inevitable existence of a reserve labor army under capitalism was theoretically analyzed by Karl Marx, who

showed that it was a phenomenon immanent in the capitalist mode of production and was determined by the law of surplus-value and the general law of capitalist accumulation, Marx wrote: 'Capitalistic accumulation . . . constantly produces . . . a relatively redundant population of laborers, i.e., a population of greater extent than suffices for the average needs of the self-expansion of capital, and therefore a surplus-population.'[2] The main reason for the origination of unemployment is the capitalization of surplus-value, which results in a change in the organic composition of capital through the introduction of new hardware and technology. Marx said that 'with the growth of the total capital, its variable constituent or the labor incorporated in it also does increase, but in a constantly diminishing proportion'.[3]

The laws discovered by Marxist science are still valid in the conditions of social production that have changed under the impact of the scientific and technical revolution, acute structural crises of the economy and the growing state-monopoly character of its development. However, many new aspects have appeared in the 'behavior' of unemployment. The connection between the changing organic composition of capital and employment is not as straightforward in present-day conditions, with the growing importance of the contradictions between the structure of demand and the supply of labor-power (by trade, skills, educational standards, sex, age and race, and economic sector), and when cyclical fluctuations of production tend to increase. Nevertheless, the categories of the Marxist labor theory of value, surplus-value and rate of profit continue to provide the most reliable clue for clarifying the in-depth causes of present-day unemployment, its scale and dynamic.

Maximizing profits is still the basic law of capitalism. Meanwhile, even if the degree of exploitation remains the same, an unchanged rate of surplus-value may also be expressed in a falling rate of profit because the constant capital may grow faster than the variable capital used. Capitalism seeks to resist the tendency of the rate of profit to fall by applying various tough curbs on the working people, notably measures resulting in a marked reduction in the number of workers per unit of capital and in their loss of skills.

When profits are threatened, businessmen use ever more refined methods to slice the number of jobs or at least not to create new ones. They will even close down their plants. Thus, Chrysler announced its intention to close the main plant of its Dodge Division at Hamtramck, Michigan. The plant has been making profits. Why then is it to be closed down? Because, says the *Daily World*, the paper of the U.S. communists, 'as the corporations have become giant monopolies, they are no longer satisfied with anything less than maximum profits. If the "pickings" are less than what they calculate "maximum" should be — and if they think they can find better "pickings" somewhere else — they move on. For the corporations, labor power is a commodity to be bought and used like any other commodity. And the worker is not a person, a human being with human needs, desires and feelings, but something that can be used or discarded at the convenience of the company — like scrap or a piece of machinery.'[4]

Monopolies operating in countries which coordinate their policy within closed economic groupings act on the same logic. Thus, the 'Steel Plan' drawn up by the Eurofer cartel, which is dominated by West German concerns, starts from the assumption that one-third of the steel capacity in the EEC countries is superfluous. The plan for giving the industry a shot-in-the-arm envisages the fold up of 60,000 jobs, while the steel barons continue to receive billions from the government and also from the community. A'European Plan' has also been drawn up for ship-building and entails a 50 per cent reduction in personnel. There is another plan for the textile industry to help the monopolies speed up their restructuring of it and to transfer their mills to Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America. For the workers this will mean more dismissals and unemployment (from 1970 to 1975, the labor force here was reduced by 500,000).

Thousands of jobs are exported with the capital and hardware being moved to other countries for intrusion into their economy. That does not mean, of course, that this helps to solve the problem of employment in the host country. With the corporations' advanced technology, this only builds up the organic composition of capital, so resulting in a relative reduction in demand for labor. The establishment of 6,000 multinational enterprises in the EEC from 1961 to 1969 led to the dismissal of 400,000 persons.

Take Greece as an example. Has the influx of foreign capital been beneficial for its economic development? The French company Pechiney, exempted from taxes and making use of lower electricity charges, is engaged, with insignificant costs, in the working of Greek bauxites, processes the ore and exports all the products, forcing Greece to reimport its own aluminium. But perhaps foreign capital helps the country to get rid of unemployment? Not at all. According to trade-union estimates there are over 200,000 unemployed in the country, out of a population of 9 million. Greece's entry into the EEC is bound to aggravate this problem, because it will mean even greater power for the international monopolies and the closure of small and medium enterprises incapable of withstanding the competition. As for Greece's agriculture, in which 30 per cent of its active population is employed, the Commission of the European Communities in Brussels said quite bluntly: 'There is a need for reorganization requiring a rapid increase in labor productivity in this sphere and, consequently, a marked reduction in the number of jobs.' Pitharoulis, Chairman of the progressive trade union association ESAK-S, quite reasonably asks: 'What are we going to do in a community which already has 6.5 million unemployed?'

One of the causes behind the reduction in em-

ployment is the decentralization of production: companies wind up some operations at their enterprises and pass them on to others with a small labor force for it is more profitable to buy the ready-made product. Here they display much inventiveness.

For instance, the management of Urmet, a company in Turin which makes telephones, has set up about 20 tiny enterprises each employing from five to ten workers. These do the work formerly done by dozens of people. This practice has given rise to a 'peripheral' economy extensively employing female and child labor. But illegal, unregistered labor is the Italiam companies' most important 'discovery'. This is a social evil which has assumed alarming proportions precisely through the increase in output and without official hiring of new workers. In four years alone (1973-1977) the number of 'illegal' workers has increased from 2.5 million to 4 million. They work in very arduous conditions, without any social security, and labor protection and for a pittance.

The interaction of unemployment and inflation requires close security. In the epoch of crises under classical capitalism, these factors cancelled each other out, inflation ran a short course and unemployment was the chief evil. Thus, during the 1929-33 crisis in the United States, when the number of unemployed reached 13 million, prices dropped by 38 per cent as compared with the precrisis period. Nowadays there is the unusual combination of these two devastating diseases which are endemic to capitalism, a phenomenon which has been variously explained. Some believe that inflation and unemployment operate as factors intensifying each other. After all, inflation erodes the population's purchasing power and contracts consumer markets, so slicing order books in industry, reducing production and entailing redundancies. Other (the neoclassics in bourgeois economics) hold that the rise in unemployment helps to reduce the inflationary price spiral.

In this connection, the participants in the discussion noted the fresh flare-up of interest among bourgeois economists in the Keynesian theory of employment, which is based on the premise of an inverse proportion between employment and real wages. Keynes held that the only way to increase employment is to reduce real wages. This, he believed, could be done in two ways: by reducing money wages and conducting a flexible monetary policy. 'In fact,' he said, 'a movement by employers to revise money-wage bargains downward will be much more strongly resisted than a gradual and automatic lowering of real wages as a result of rising prices,'[5] Keynes believed that the growth of prices was favorable, for it stimulated investments in economic activity, and the main thing, "consumers" pass incomes into the hands of the capitalist class.'[6] It is not surprising that this doctrine provided the basis for using inflationary pressure to accelerate economic growth and attack the working class.

The so-called Phillips curve provides empirical confirmation of this Keynesian theory. (It is named after a New Zealand scientist who used British data for 1861-1957 to establish a statistical correlation between the changes in nominal wage rates and the level of employment in industry. This subsequently came to be regarded as evidence of a stable causal nexus between inflation and unemployment, whose quantitative values were inversely proportional to each other.) The participants in the discussion noted that life itself had dealt a palpable blow at these theoretical constructs (in almost all the capitalist countries the growth of inflation has not been attended with a reduction but with a growth of unemployment) and stated the following: this kind of reasoning provides justification for anti-labor economic policies, and induces employers to install new labor-saving technologies, which makes it possible to expand output with smaller labor inputs. The idea that inflation can be combated by increasing unemployment so as to influence wages implies a growing scale of waste of manpower and material resources, and the maintenance of excess productive capital relative to the available living labor. This also means a build-up of the in-depth causes behind inflation and unemployment.

Summing up the causes of unemployment, the participants in the discussion emphasized that (for all the importance of concrete causes) it springs from the fundamental production relation under capitalism: capitalist property which economically separates labor-power from the means of production and allows their combination only through the purchase and sale of labor-power. By its objective nature, capital seeks to obtain the greatest possible mass of living labor (and above all surplus-labor) from the smallest possible number of wage workers.

Social calamity

Some general rise in living standards and improvement in the social security system as a result of forced concessions by the bourgeoisie have eased the once-fatal connection: the loss of a job jeopardized a worker's very existence. Still, even today the loss of jobs is for many a social calamity.

A person who has been deprived of work for a long time sees no prospects before him. His chances of obtaining a new job dwindle with the length of time he is unemployed, because his skills become obsolete and are partially lost, and his capacity for complex labor adequate to the scientific and technical revolution deteriorates. Many come to have a sense of uselessness, inferiority and depression which frequently results in hard drinking, drug addiction and even in crime. It is a gross violation of human rights to keep active and willing people from engaging in socially useful labor.

For society as a whole, mass unemployment means above all great economic losses. After all, this amounts to the moral depreciation of the labor, creative potential of millions of working people, the withering away of capital spent on the formation of complex labor-power, which alone is capable of keeping the scientific and technical revolution in motion. For it means the waste of labor resources, society's chief and most valuable productive force,

testifying to chronic underproduction, a gap between the size of the actual product and that which could have been turned out with a more rational use of man-power. But that is not the whole point. According to U.S. Senate estimates, with the growth of unemployment by 1.4 per cent a year, U.S. society stands to lose nearly 7 billion dollars a year because of the growing number of sick people, higher mortality and the large subsidies for the maintenance of hospitals and jails.

But it is the working class that is first hit by unemployment. Last year, for instance, France had 1.7 million jobless, of whom 800,000 were workers. At that time, one worker in twelve was jobless, but specialists expect the proportion to go up by 1983 to one in ten. A part of the French monopolies' strategy on employment is to close down plants for a kind of 'political dismantling' industrial areas which have long been social battle grounds (the 'red belt' in Paris, Alsace, and Lorraine) and also various industries.

Because of the working people's fear of losing their jobs, the employers are able to raise the level of exploitation and intensity of labor. In other words, because a part of the working people are forced to be 'idle', capital steps up its plunderous use of the other part. Unemployment provides the monopolies with additional opportunities for the capitalist 'rationalization' of production and for tightening up discipline.

A study carried out by the West German Metal Workers Trade Union among 100,000 workers in industry in the Stuttgart area, one worker in three declared that he does not dare to see a doctor for fear of losing his job. The overwork and the stress keep growing, the workers declare, and they feel this at the end of the hard day. Fear of unemployment, the facts show, has the same psychological effect as actual unemployment.

With millions out of jobs, the question of forced overtime has become highly acute. In 1976, working hours in Italy's chemical industry, for instance, were cut by 40 per cent as compared with the previous year, but the number of hours worked overtime increased by 32 per cent. The pace of work and the loads are being constantly reviewed at the top, especially at small enterprises, employing several dozen workers where the trade unions find it hard to stand up for their interests. A report by Sweden's Central Statistical Bureau makes it clear that many Swedish workers and employees have to work much longer than the hours laid down by the law: one in five persons between the ages of 25 and 44 years works more than 11 hours daily. The U.S. press has reported on the 'squalid and oppressive working conditions' which are reminiscent of the early days of the industrial revolution.[7]

Attempts are being made to use unemployment for intensifying the pressure on wages and professional training. Understatement of skill levels, loss of skills and reduction in professional training have become organic elements of the policies of governments and employers. Making ever more extensive use of understatement of skill levels, employers seek to pay less than the full value of labor power.

It is not surprising, therefore, that for all the contingents of working people both in the active and the reserve labor army reduction of unemployment and increase of employment have become of *primary* importance.

Improvised mix of casual measures

Consequently, unemployment tends to change the situation on the labor market in favor of capital. The fact is, according to *Harper's Magazine*, full employment means that some of the inequality in the distribution of income between some sections of the working people is eliminated, as Blacks and members of other national minorities (in the USA, a quarter of Black working people are jobless. —*Ed.*), young people and women are invited to share in the 'American pie', and puts a check on the inordinate appetites of the corporations. Once the problem of employment is solved, the U.S. labor unions could have seditious ideas about renegotiation of working conditions, participation by workers in framing production policy and other 'radical nonsense'. A sharp shortage of jobs has helped the corporations to extract countless valuable concessions and privileges from local and federal authorities, to quieten students, and to move further to the right the axis of U.S. policy which is already the most conservative in the industrialized world.[8]

This also applies to other capitalist countries with some corrections in the light of their specific concrete conditions. Unemployment makes it easier for capital to keep the price of labor power below its value and so to cut costs. This is so obvious for the monopolists that they have invented the idea of 'normal' unemployment, i.e., a definite level of unemployment which is allegedly naturally required by present-day industrial society. What lurks behind this idea will be seen, for instance, from the publications of the Munich Institute of Economic Research. The existence in the FRG of 950,000 unwanted workers (4 per cent of the total number of working people) is presented as 'normal' unemployment, and the capitalists believe that when unemployment tends to drop below a definite level it is 'abnormal'. In that case they speak of a 'tight' labor market and a consequent growth in the value of labor power. They try to "normalize" the situation, for instance, by importing labor from other countries, and send such immigrant workers back when they are no longer needed, so exporting their difficulties as well.

Meanwhile, the army of people who are outcasts from production presents a grave threat to the very foundations of capitalism. Hence the urge to prevent it from assuming socially dangerous proportions, and to avert conflicts which could destabilize the political system. But in so doing, the capitalists make sure of securing their profits. It is in the light of all these circumstances that one should examine the mechanism by means of which the state acts on the processes of reproduction and the market outlook in the capitalist countries, and seeks to regulate labor resources and provide employment.

For the purposes of state-monopoly regulation of the labor market a diverse set of economic instruments has been produced including goal-oriented investments funds, means for stimulating the geographical, trades and skills mobility of labor, public works, anti-cyclical regulation of state investments and industrial contracts, etc. But one is still left with the impression, the participants in the discussion said, that the capitalist system prefers to pay off the unemployed. It does this all the more willingly because the cost of unemployment benefits paid out to reduce the social tension is covered chiefly from income tax or social security tax, whose main burden is borne by the working people themselves.

In most capitalist countries, preference is given to short-term measures for combating unemployment. Among the first steps taken by many governments was the raising of professional training and retraining standards, but these measures are frequently haphazard and no more than nominal. Only a tiny number of places is available, and those who complete these courses are not guaranteed jobs, for the ideologists of capitalism generally are not inclined to include the right to work among the basic democratic human rights. As a result, these people are frequently retrained into unemployment. Now and again, this justifies the suspicion that the only purpose of these measures is to cover up the true proportions of unemployment and to reduce its percentage of politically acceptable levels.

Some EEC countries have introduced temporary financial incentives for employers to induce them to take on more young people, but the wisdom of this decision has been questioned even by the EC Commission. The trade unions have made no bones about this: to allow employers to have financial benefits under the pretext of helping to fight unemployment means to throw a part of the necessary funds into the coffers of the monopolies.

The official measures are above all a response to acts of protest and a means of calming tempers and creating the impression that something is being done. They are aimed against the social consequences of youth unemployment like crime, hard drinking and drug addiction, and are designed to keep young people as a reserve labor army for capital and to redistribute the costs of education in favor of employers to the detriment of the working people in their capacity as tax payers.

Consequently, there is an improvised mix of largely casual measures. State-monopoly circles and their experts are prepared to combat unemployment only to extent to which this meets the interests of big business, and does not affect its profits. This will be seen from the United States, where the level of unemployment is now much higher than in the pre-crisis year of 1973, while corporate profits are 20 per cent higher than the 1973 figure.

According to *Harper's Magazine*, it continues to be a fact that in U.S. conditions a 'moderate' level of unemployment gives a great many advantages to those who have the real wealth and who live in clover. It is quite obviously naive to expect the rich and the lawyers, economists, politicians, information specialists and others who work for them openly to declare their preference for unemployment. But among a close circle of friends these men are usually much more outspoken. They say that there is a need for a respectable and reasonable explanation, a convenient theory that displays concern for the hardships of the unemployed while making it possible to avoid any realistic action aimed to change the situation that has taken shape in the United States. In summing up, the magazine said that the United States would begin to move to a truly high level of employment in the economy only when it becomes politically possible to reduce the power of the money-bags and to diminish the inequality in incomes and affluence.[9]

These measures are ineffective because of their anti-working class character: they are aimed to deal with the effect instead of the cause, which is the private capitalist character of production and the power of the monopolies. Meanwhile, the latter prefer to invest their capital and organize production in countries with cheap labor. The export of capital by many big corporations has been growing much faster than investments at home. Thus, in 1978, total FRG investments abroad came to DM 150 billion. From 1970 to 1976, the top ten West German monopolies increased their production abroad three times over. West German subsidiaries abroad employ nearly 1.5 million workers and employees (as compared with 7.5 million persons working in the FRG industry itself).[10]

In this context, one will easily realize why big capital and the governments have changed their strategy with respect to immigrant labor. Over the past several years there has been a growing tendency to create the impression that unemployment could be got rid of by sending immigrants home. But take France. Macro-economic studies have confirmed and elaborated the conclusions obtained empirically in industrial sectors that a reduction in the number of immigrants by 150,000 persons will provide only 13,000 additional jobs for French working people, while the growth of industrial production will slow down and the foreign-trade deficit go up by 4 billion francs.[11]

Consequently, the monopolies' arguments turn out to be untenable. The present policy on immigration could perhaps be explained by the purposes and methods in redistributing forces aimed above all to ensure the profitability of vast amounts of capital, but on a broader basis. This helps to establish extreme conditions of exploitation in the Third World countries allegedly for the purposes of their development while pursuing a policy of austerity and privation in the developed countries for the sake of their competitiveness owing to external factors. The use of immigrant labor on a national basis becomes less necessary in such conditions: it is now no longer cheap labor that is brought to where the capital is, but capital that goes abroad to exploit cheap labor.

The monopolies believe that direct exports are not enough to secure markets, and so the establish-

ment of production and commercial subsidiaries has become one of the main methods of present-day competition. A French weekly says: 'This is a ruthless war in which the working people are pawns, a war which does great harm to the national economy. The free play of competition yields results like closure of plants (as sudden as their opening), instability of the national economy and loss of jobs by thousands of working people.[12]

There are any number of examples to illustrate this. Here are only two of them: the French company St. Gobain-Pont-a-Mousson has invested 60 per cent of its capital abroad, which has not prevented its management from waxing lyrical and claiming that it is a 'ship plying all the oceans, but keeping its flag and port of registry French'.[13] Very little was said about the reduction in the number of personnel at its enterprises in France. Another French company, Rhone-Poulenc, closed down five plants with 6,000 people only because it decided simutaneously to expand its production in Brazil. We find that the monopolies prefer to invest their capital abroad and to dismiss their workers in France.

Let us note the political nature of some company acts, namely their anti-nationalization strategy. When a subsidiary is set up as a mixed company with foreign participation and the shares are divided equally (as Rhone-Poulenc has done with the British ICI and Sandoz in Switzerland) this is an attempt to change one's nationality in order to avoid nationalization. Nor have the capitalists made any secret of this. The president of the Banque de Paris et de Pays-Bas frankly declared: 'To internationalize is to make nationalization in France psychologically absurd and technically complicated.' Consequently, the working people have every reason to be alarmed over the elimination or reduction in the scale of any French enterprise.

In some countries, government programs provide for shorter working hours and longer holidays in order to increase the number of jobs, the incidental costs being covered at the expense of the working people through higher taxes.

The Danish government, for instance, hopes in this way to increase the number of jobs by 1982 by 35,000, with unemployment running at 185,000. This way out of the situation does not seem very convincing either to those who are about to be dismissed or to those 15,000 school-leavers who go straight into the army of unemployed. This question naturally arises: why did the Volketing reject the communists' program although it envisaged provision of jobs for 100,000 people even in 1979? The answer is a simple one. First, most of the members of the Volketing, representing the interests of big business, were quick to realize that the plan would cut into the monopolies' profits. Second, adoption of the plan would mean abandonment of the government plan aimed to reduce the balance of payments deficit through a 5-6 per cent increase in the output of export-oriented industries, and not through the provision of new jobs, by boosting labor productivity and rationalizing production.

Consequently, unemployment is presented as an inevitable evil which has to be combated only through rationalization and a higher rate of profit. In accordance with this logic, dismissals for economic reasons, which increase unemployment, are presented as a means of working for employment, and the sharpening of competition on the labor market, as a means of boosting earnings in the future through a resumption of economic growth.

The duplicity of governmental policy on employment in the capitalist countries is expressed in the tactics on personnel issues. For instance, in some state enterprises in France (communications, energy, medical services and transport) there is a shortage of tens of thousands of workers, but instead of taking on people for permanent employment their management make use of temporary workers. This is advantageous to the authorities for two reasons: these people are not given any guarantees of employment; in the presence of unemployment, especially among the young who make up the bulk of the temporary employees, the authorities can command unconditional obedience and suppress any forms of 'bad moods', i.e., a desire to fight for one's rights.

State-monopoly capital makes use of unemployment to pursue its prices and incomes policy. Theoretically this is aimed to reduce the inflationary pressure by holding down the growth of aggregate social demand. But in practice this policy invariably amounts to no more than a means of keeping wages down. These are the purposes pursued by the governments of many capitalist countries through their cutting of budget spending on social insurance, education, etc., together with legislative wage-freezes. But the profits of big business and the interests of the military-industrial complex are never affected, while the freezing of prices, in effect, remains a dead letter.

The democratic alternative

The basic causes of unemployment have their roots in the capitalist relations of production and can be eliminated only together with the latter. That does not mean, of course, that it is not possible to ease the grip of unemployment within the framework of the capitalist society. Concrete approaches to this problem spring from the peculiar state of the labor market, the balance of class forces and the development of the political struggle. But in any case there is an obvious need for measures like curbs on the power of the monopolies and deep-going democratic transformations. Because unemployment tends to become increasingly structural, the search for ways of tackling it must go beyond the efforts to improve the economic outlook. There is a need for reorienting economic, above all investment policy. The most rational version is one that takes most account of the criterion of employment, i.e., a new line of industrial specialization through the development of a complex of labor-intensive industries.

Tremendous importance, speakers in the discussion said, would also be attached to the abandon-

ment of the arms race and a switch of the economy from arms manufacture to the solution of urgent social problems. After all 'defense' spending linked with capital — intensive industries on average provides half as many jobs as spending for civilian needs.[14] Besides, the militarization of the economy at the expense of growing tax payments by the working people tends to limit paid-up demand and accordingly civilian production, so ultimately reducing the use of labor resources. The employment situation would undergo a radical change, say, in Greece if the 71.2 billion drachmas ($1.9 billion) appropriated this year for military purposes — roughly 20 per cent of the country's expenditures — were used to satisfy the working people's vital needs. In the United States scientists at the University of Illinois have estimated that such an approach would create almost 7 million additional jobs.

Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, says: 'Firing up the arms race is madness, not just from the viewpoint of peace, but also from that of the economy. It is up to the people of the United States to put a stop to this madness. The more quickly this is done the less will be the damage, the sooner we can begin an attack on our real problems. As a starter there should be a transfer of $100 billion from the military budget to useful, peacetime, job creating projects, including the rebuilding of our cities.'[15]

The draft new program of the Association of German Trade Unions emphasizes that means of conducting economic policy like distribution of investments, overall economic plan, workers' participation in management and control over economic forces must above all serve to achieve and guarantee full employment. In all their plans and decisions, companies must take into account the principle of maintaining and creating jobs. The trade unions do not oppose technical progress because it is a 'key factor in raising the general standard of living and lightening work'. But they want to prevent the growth of labor productivity being effected at the expense of the workers: 'There must be complete protection for workers and their families against the anti-social consequences of structural changes in the economy.'

Such an approach testifies to an understanding of the irreversible nature of the scientific and technical revolution. It cannot be stopped or 'abolished', as is being suggested by those who express the anti-technical and technophobic attitudes which have been spreading in the capitalist countries in the recent period. Nor can it be 'humanized', because the main law of capitalism — the development of production and the use of scientific and technical progress for extracting surplus-value — remains fully in force. But conditions can be created to prevent the advance of the scientific and technical revolution from resulting in mass redundancies and growing unemployment. This problem can be solved successfully only through general democratic control over the economy, including the use of new technology, through broader actual participation of all the working people, the working class in the first place, in the management of production at every level.

The strike by 200,000 steel workers in West Germany which lasted for six and a half weeks and ended in January 1979 helps to see the gist of rationalization problems. Their main demand was a guarantee of employment and a reduction of working hours from 40 to 35 a week, which could help to provide more jobs and to stop the steady reduction in the number of jobs in this industry: it is expected that from 1975 to 1983 a total of nearly 45,000 would be wiped out. What is even more important over the long term is the West German trade unions' demand for a greater say in decisions on employment. Thus, supervisory boards are usually authorized to endorse only large investments, say, a new plant. Now the workers want a say in decisions concerning existing enterprises, notably the installation of automatic equipment which does away with jobs. The workers also want the right of vetoing the appointment of company personnel directors responsible for hiring and dismissal.

At the TUC conference in Blackpool in 1975, over a thousand delegates unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that the take-over by workers of enterprises in protest against the employers' intention to stop production is a legal means of trade union struggle for retaining jobs. This was the TUC's open declaration of war against the monopolies and bourgeois legislation which qualifies that form of struggle by the working class as a 'criminal act'. In the period from early 1974 to the spring of 1976, there were nearly 500 occasions on which enterprises were taken over and run by workers in Britain, France and Italy.

The Swedish trade unions believe that the state investment fund should not be shaped through the levy of taxes on the population but through 5-10 per cent deductions from the annual profits of business. They say that there is a need for a new trade-union strategy, namely, a drive against big business and the power of the bourgeoisie.

By its mounting activity, the working class has declared that it will not accept any policy based on the assumption that nothing can be done to change the cyclical framework in which social production develops and which is set by capitalist greed for profit. *The Daily World* reported that 'people before profits' was the slogan of 1,500 laid-off steelworkers who went from Youngstown, Ohio, to Pittsburgh, 75 miles away, to demonstrate at the headquarters of the U.S. Steel Corporation to demand that it keep its Youngstown plants open. Despite the efforts of the bourgeois mass media to camouflage the class basis of unemployment, there is growing understanding among the working people of the true causes of this disease. This will be seen from the results of a poll among unemployed, taken by the Cologne Institute for the Study of Social Opportunities: over 60 per cent of those polled blamed the social system for the unemployment.

Trade-union action is increasingly designed not for self-defense against the crisis but for promoting the creation of a new model of development which

makes it possible to pull out of the crisis. Here the communist parties have a big part to play, for they have undertaken the task of formulating the democratic alternative to state-monopoly capitalism. Organically tying in current and long-term tasks in the anti-monopoly struggle with general problems of socio-economic development, they provide fresh impulses to the processes of social reconstruction and so, in contrast to the reformists, ensure the unity of the tactical and strategic goals of the working-class movement. The communist parties believe that up to now the working class has had greater success in demanding higher wages, pensions, benefits and social payments and shorter working hours than on the problems of unemployment. The fact is that the solution of the employment problem entails deep transformations on the state and national level. In other words, in order to pull out of the structural crisis — the structure of production, distribution of the national product, investments, etc. — there must be a radical change of these structures themselves. This requires that the working class should rise to a new stage in strengthening the unity of its ranks, in determining its strategy and tactics, and in formulating complex measures in the concrete political context of individual capitalist countries.

The Left Party — Communists of Sweden, for instance, has put forward a national program to create jobs, to renew the country's production life and to change its orientation. It is based on the following fundamental propositions: unemployment can be reduced even without economic planning, but if it is to be reduced more substantially there is a need for some structural reforms affecting the conditions of capitalist production and power. Otherwise, the creation of new jobs will not keep pace with job elimination. When the struggle for jobs attains a definite political level and scope it develops into a struggle against the very economic system which breeds unemployment. Changes in the property system and power structure become inevitable: 'The struggle for jobs is the struggle for power'.

The communist parties' struggle for the solution of the most acute socio-economic problems is evidence of the communists' readiness to place their growing authority in this trying period at the service of the working people's most vital interests. The program put forward by many communist parties have brought together new proposals and most of the traditional socio-economic and political demands of the proletariat on questions of employment. Here are some of them:

— an effort to limit the export of capital, to change the monopolies' investment strategy, to rationally determine the share of new industrial and housing construction, expand activity in labor-intensive manufacturing, the services, education, culture and public health; development of cities and transport; improvement of the environment and assistance to small business;

— reduction of the work-week to 30-36 hours with an increase in real earnings, longer holidays and earlier old-age retirement (men at 60 and women at 55 years);

— extension of the term of mandatory secondary school education to 12 years, extension of the system and improvement of the quality of occupational training.

The documents of the communist parties establish a direct connection between employment and the effort to end the cold war and the nuclear-arms race, to deepen détente, and to develop trade and economic ties with the socialist countries.

The fundamental distinction between the communist parties' socio-economic programs and the social-democratic platforms, and the tasks of the trade unions which confine themselves to economic struggle lies in the fact that the former stand up for the vital interests of the working class not only as society's chief productive force but above all as its leading social, revolutionary force. The communists set tasks which not only rouse the masses to struggle but whose realization even now helps the working class to develop more rapidly and to enhance its role and importance in production and society.

The communist parties' programs can be effective because they are aimed to eliminate the causes of the crisis in the sphere of employment. At the same time the communists are clearly aware that within the existing structures any set of measures can lead to no more than limited success. The monopolies and governments constantly seek — and will continue to seek — possibilities for neutralizing the working people's achievements in the struggle for their rights. The communists seek to connect the solution of the unemployment problem with the task of changing the existing social system.

1. The scientific and technical revolution certainly stimulates the opposite trend as well, which is the attraction of labor-power through its involvement in new lines of production and industries. But the trend that prevails is the erosion of jobs in social production, a most acute problem for some categories of working people.
2. Karl Marx. *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 630.
3. Ibid., p. 629.
4. *Daily World*, June 28, 1979.
5. J.M. Keynes. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London, 1936, p. 264.
6. J.M. Keynes. *How to Pay for the War*, London, 1940, p. 6.
7. See, for instance, an article entitled 'Return of Sweatshops — They Flourish Anew' in *U.S. News and World Report*, January 14, 1980, p. 73.
8. *Harper's Magazine*, No. 2, 1977.
9. *Harper's Magazine*, No. 2, 1977.
10. *Horizont*, No. 33, 1978.
11. *Cahiers du communisme*, August-September 1979, p. 39.
12. *L'Unité*, April 28, 1978.
13. *France nouvelle*, March 22, 1977, p. 18.
14. According to the Machinists Union in the United States, $1 billion spent on arms creates 45,500 jobs, while one billion spent on the civilian sector creates from 59,000 to 88,000 jobs, depending on where the money is spent.
15. *Daily World*, February 14, 1980.

Ways to a new world economic order

Ion Totu
CC member, Rumanian Communist Party;
General Director, Central Institute of Economic Studies

Whatever the angle from which we consider the world economy, the fact that many countries continue to be classified as underdeveloped is one of the basic problems today. Eloquent data testify to the dimensions of this problem. Just now, three-quarters of the world's population produces only 20 per cent of the world's gross product. The countries recently liberated from the colonial yoke have roughly 60 per cent of the proved natural resources, 70 per cent of all the land fit for farming, and two-thirds of the world's active population, but they account for only 7 per cent of the world's industrial and for roughly one-third of its agricultural output.

These countries' economic backwardness, produced and aggravated by long imperialist domination, is projected not only into the past. The gap between the development levels of the leading capitalist countries and the erstwhile colonies has continued to widen. Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the RCP, has emphasized that, 'as a result of the imperialist powers' policy of exploiting the peoples in every way, the gulf between the economically developed capitalist countries and the underdeveloped countries is deepening.'[1] This is fully borne out by the facts. At the beginning of this century, the per-head national income in the underdeveloped and developed countries was expressed as a ratio of 1 to 6, in 1930 as 1 to 7.5, in 1960 as 1 to 10, and 1978 as 1 to 15. It has been estimated that unless the existing international economic order is drastically transformed, the ratio could be 1 to 25 by the end of the century.

Let me emphasize that these proportions are based on national-income averages per head of the population. The actual gap is much larger. Thus, the per-head income in 26 least developed countries, on the one hand, and in the United States, Canada, the FRG and Japan, on the other, can now be expressed as a ratio of 1 to 40. Twenty-five years ago, the per-head GNP in the economically most developed country was 30 times greater than that in the least developed. Today, it is 100 times greater. In 1978, 28 underdeveloped countries with 25 per cent of the world's population had a GNP under $200 per head. In 10 of these, it was under $100.

Everything done within the framework of 'development decades' has proved to be totally inadequate for overcoming underdevelopment. In the first half of the 1970s, only one in four developing countries recently liberated from the colonial yoke managed to have their GNP grow at an average of more than 6 per cent. In most of these countries, the figures were only 3-5 per cent, which, considering the population growth, means only a 1.5-2.5 per cent growth per head. In one-third of the developing countries, the per-head GNP grew slower than the population. In other words, over the past few decades, per-head income for two-thirds of the globe's population increased at an average of less than $6 a year.

All of this is reflected in a steady worsening of living conditions: starvation and malnutrition, disease and illiteracy, decline in employment and inadequate consumption. According to FAO's latest estimates, at least a billion people suffer from malnutrition or even from downright starvation, and their diets are very much lower than the minimum physiological norms. It is believed that this stunts the physical and mental development of at least one person in three. A high death rate generally, and child mortality in particular, lack of public health systems or only embryonic ones, illiteracy, shortage of housing, etc., all of this has an effect on the potentialities for economic activity and tends further to sharpen the problem of satisfying human requirements.

These problems retard the advance of humanity as a whole. The economic disproportions in the world which spring from the small economic potential of many countries greatly hamper international economic flows, and limit the growth of world production and demand despite the potentialities of the current scientific and technical revolution.

Underdevelopment is the product of colonialism and stems from the inequality and injustice in relations between states caused by imperialist policies. The economic lag of a large number of countries and the continued worsening of their condition relative to the developed countries are evidence that the existing international economic order is obsolete, and that there is a need for fundamental transformations whose content, scale and interdependence would ensure the establishment of a new order. On the strength of an in-depth analysis of the actual state of things in the world, socialist Rumania, together with other states and progressive forces, has actively advocated its conceptual elaboration. The Rumanian view of this question is a contribution by the RCP and Nicolae Ceausescu to the creative development of modern revolutionary thinking and practice.

In 1965, the ninth congress of our party noted the changes which had taken place in the world in favor of the forces of socialism, progress and peace, but pointed to the danger of growing underdevelop-

ment as a result of the imperialist powers' policy. The following principles for economic and political relations among states — respect for each country's sovereignty and independence, equality, non-interference in domestic affairs, repudiation of the threat of force, and mutual advantage — were also formulated at that time.

Since then, the RCP has analyzed the key problems of socio-economic progress giving much attention to the shaping of new-type international relations. Special importance in this context is attached to the documents of the party's 11th congress in 1974, and the program it adopted for building a fully developed socialist society and advancing Rumania toward communism. On the basis of a coherent conception, taking into account the long-term perspective, they formulate and examine the possibility of establishing a new international economic order, and map out the main lines for realizing it. At the same time, documents clearly expressing the Rumanian view of the matters bearing directly on the elimination of underdevelopment were laid before various international institutions. Among these were the statement 'Rumania's Stand on the Question of Establishing a New International Economic Order', which was circulated at the UN Special General Assembly in 1975; the statement 'Rumania's Stand on Matters of Disarmament and, Above All, of Nuclear Disarmament', which was made at the UN Special General Assembly in 1978; and a message from the President of the Socialist Republic of Rumania to the Fifth UNCTAD session in Manila in 1979.

Our party's conception on the question of establishing a new international economic order is a coherent system of theoretical principles and conclusions combined with concrete proposals. One of its specially characteristic features is the clear definition of the origins of underdevelopment, and of the ways and forces capable of ensuring the socio-economic progress of developing countries. The RCP Program says: 'The Rumanian Communist Party believes that the underdevelopment of a number of states is the direct result of the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy of domination over and oppression of peoples, the plunder of their national resources, the outcome of unjust economic relations.'[2]

That is why, we believe, elimination of underdevelopment and establishment of a new international economic order are component parts of one and the same historical process, which, being of a profoundly class character, calls for joint action by all the progressive forces of the world against present-day imperialism. The immediate goals in this broad struggle, whose attainment socialist Rumania has constantly advocated, were formulated at the 11th congress of the RCP. These goals are:

— resolute elimination of the existing unjust relations, of the oppression of some peoples by others, elimination of the imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy;

— establishment of relations based on complete equality of all the nations of the world, respect for each nation's right to be master of its national resources and to decide the question of their use in a sovereign manner;

— respect for each people's right to choose, without any external interference, the social system it wants and, on the basis of full independence, to chart ways of its socio-economic development.

The nature of these problems is such that it rules out their solution by the former metropolitan countries. Nicolae Ceausescu has emphasized: 'The elimination of underdevelopment and the establishment of a new international economic order, and the development of economic relations based on complete equality and fair principles are essentially a direct continuation of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. That is why there is a need to link the revolutionary movement with the struggle to eliminate underdevelopment and establish a new international economic and political order.'[3] Because these processes are revolutionary, the socialist countries will have here the prime role to play, for by the very nature of their socio-political system they are capable of supporting the progressive forces and asserting the new economic relations in practice.

The accelerated economic growth of countries that are so far underdeveloped is the real way to make up the economic-potential gap. Rumania believes that internal factors, each people's own efforts, are crucial in building up their productive forces. The aim of these efforts in the concrete conditions of one's country is to make optimal use of the material and manpower resources so as to build up a modern industry, a highly productive agriculture, and bring about the proportional and dynamic development of the whole economy.

Industrialization is the key to ensuring high economic growth rates. Its importance is due not only to its role in developing the productive forces but to the need to consolidate the economic basis of state independence.

Of course, every country carries on its economic construction in the light of its national peculiarities. But a study of the experience of countries like Rumania, which have taken a resolute course toward building socialism and which have succeeded in eliminating their erstwhile underdevelopment, could prove useful to many other countries.

Our party has made industrialization the cornerstone of its economic policy, for it ensures all-round progress of the productive forces, maximum use of the material and manpower resources, and a steady rise in the living standard of the whole nation. Considering the potentialities of the economy and the magnitude of the task of building a fully developed socialist society, the RCP has written into its program the key principle of ensuring an optimal correlation between the accumulation and consumption funds, and the most effective use of all our resources. Our experience shows that maintenance of the accumulation norm at the level of 32-34 per cent of the national incomes has ensured

in Rumania high economic-development rates and a steady growth in the people's living standards. Thus, from 1971 to 1978, industrial growth averaged roughly 12 per cent a year, and the consumption fund, nearly 8 per cent. In the current five-year period alone, nearly 2,700 economic and social projects will be completed, and the working people's real incomes increased by over 30 per cent, which is well above the initial target, as a result of the planned investments (1,000 billion lei, which is equal to the total investments over the preceding three five-year periods).

Fulfillment, by the mid-1980s, of the directives mapped out by the 12th party congress, will turn Rumania, a developing country, into an economically middle-developed country with a per-head national income of $2,400-2,500.

That is why we believe that in order to eliminate underdevelopment and achieve complete economic sovereignty, it would be useful for each developing or underdeveloped country to explore its potentialities and set aside, regularly and over a long period, 25-30 per cent of its national income for economic development, consistent industrialization in the first place. We said as much, in particular, in our statement 'Rumania's Stand on the Question of Establishing a New International Economic Order', which was circulated at the UN Special General Assembly in 1975.

Rumania also believes that to eliminate the gaps in economic development and to overcome underdevelopment internal and external growth factors must be harmonized. The RCP program emphasizes the organic interdependence of each country's own efforts and interstate economic, scientific and technical cooperation, and says: 'For the purpose of eliminating backwardness, for independent socio-economic development, and for establishing a new social system, it is necessary to proceed both from the utmost use of one's own manpower and material resources, and from an extension of international cooperation and the use of assistance from other states made available without any strings.'[4]

In assessing the role of external factors one must reckon with the fact that the scientific and technical revolution deepens the international division of labor, and increases the states' economic interdependence. Moreover, the switch to industrialization by a large number of countries lends new features to international economic relations. For the time being, for these states the external market has a growing importance mainly as a supplier of the means of labor. But the need to maintain the economy in equilibrium requires that these countries should be more active not only as importers but also as exporters of manufactures.

The leading capitalist powers seek to increase their monopoly of the latest scientific and technological achievements, to maintain closed zones of world economic turnover, and make use of differentiated tariffs and diverse restrictions in international trade. All of this hinders the industrialization of economically backward countries.

Like other CMEA countries, Rumania consistently advocates broader cooperation with developing countries. Together with the development of trade relations, it has conducted a large-scale policy of understanding mutually advantageous production cooperation in the main sectors of the economy. Special attention is being given to the establishment of mixed companies with developing countries, and construction in these countries of enterprises, with the investments repaid by means of deliveries of finished products from the new enterprises. Besides, together with other socialist countries Rumania gives developing countries technical assistance and trains a large number of specialists for them. At present, over 14,000 young people from these countries are being trained in our education system.

An important condition for eliminating underdevelopment is further extension of just forms of international economic ties. The 12th Congress of the RCP pointed out that here considerable responsibility falls above all on the developed capitalist states, 'which, as everyone knows, ensured their own development also through the colonial exploitation of other peoples'.[5]

In order to accelerate the economic progress of lagging countries, Rumania has consistently advocated the adoption of effective measures on an international scale. We believe that the problem of fuel and raw materials can be tackled through diversified international cooperation aimed to extend to these countries modern methods in geological exploration, extraction and processing of valuable resources and also to increase their proved world reserves. Here there must, of course, be respect for the plenitude of each country's rights to its nature resources. It is highly important to do away everywhere with the wasteful use of fuel and raw materials, to secure just use of deposits on the seabed and ocean floor, and pool efforts to explore and use new sources of energy. To this should be added — on a broader plane — measures to combat inflation, to do away with the sharp and haphazard price fluctuations on the international markets, and to establish correct proportions between prices for fuel and energy commodities and other goods. This set of measures will provide all countries with fair access to raw materials and sources of energy.

There is a need for radical changes in world trade. In 1978,[6] world trade reached the record figure of $1,280 billion, or 14 per cent more than in 1977. The value of the capitalist countries' exports went up by 20 per cent, and the value of their imports by 15 per cent. Whereas in 1977 the industrialized capitalist countries had a deficit of $8 billion on their balance of payments, in 1978 they had a surplus of $25 billion. Meanwhile, underdeveloped countries without any oil of their own had a deficit which went up from $22 billion to $35 billion. This is due mainly to tariff and other kinds of barriers, restrictions and discriminations practised by the international monopolies.

That is why economic progress requires a liberalization of world trade and the adoption of incentive prices for developing countries. There is a

need to extend these countries' range of exports, establish fair terms of trade mainly for manufacturers and raw materials, etc. This definitely entails technical and financial assistance to developing countries, establishment of national export-import agencies, supply and marketing companies with their own network for selling goods on international markets. It is high time to do away with discriminatory practices of the transnationals in transport, banking and insurance. In view of the restrictions existing in international trade, it would be appropriate to prolong the General Preferential System beyond 1981, the year until which it was initially to be in effect.

Because in our day science has become an important productive force, Rumania believes that one of the chief conditions for any country's better use of its own resources, is broad access for all countries to the latest scientific and technological achievements. The facts show that the technological gap between countries is now much larger than the economic gap. In national income per head it is expressed as a ratio of 1 to 15, and in technological terms, as 1 to 50. That is why, the transfer of modern technology becomes a necessary condition for the developing countries' economic progress.

The rich imperialist powers have not only monopolized the fruits of scientific knowledge, but have also set up a whole institutional and legal system which favors them to the detriment of the poor countries. As a UN study of production methods at the transnationals' subsidiaries shows, only in 3 out of 100 cases is technology modified to suit local conditions. Most frequently, the transnationals' subsidiaries constitute an alien sector within the developing countries' economy, which is why the international forms of technology transfer need to be changed.

The acceleration of scientific and technological progress in developing countries, we think, implies the need for them to set up their own research, development and engineering establishments with material facilities and personnel meeting modern standards. We also believe that there is a need to have a broader international study of economic-growth problems in such countries and to improve the practice of international technology transfer.

The food problem is a very sharp one in the vast majority of economically backward countries. While carrying on industrialization, they have an interest in making the utmost use of the existing potentialities for developing agriculture. That is why one of the main tasks in their international relations is broader cooperation in crop-growing and stock-breeding on the basis of long-term programs, Many years ago, Rumania proposed the establishment of a world farm-produce reserve stock from contributions by countries with a developed agriculture, so as to prevent speculative trends on the world agricultural market.

Elimination of underdevelopment largely depends on joint action by developing countries. Rumania 'maintains that enormous importance would attach to the establishment of a permanent body by these countries — one that would, of course, not require special expenditures — so as to carry on negotiations with the developed countries in an organized manner, in complete equality and on the basis of a common platform'.[7]

The nations of the world have a vital stake in the earliest possible start on general disarmament, nuclear disarmament in the first place. This is one of the most urgent tasks of our day. Recent international developments have markedly increased tension. The attempts to revive the cold war and imperialism's threats of armed confrontation in various parts of the world are particularly dangerous to the policy of détente. That is why socialist Rumania believes that every effort should be made to relax this tension. Our country stands for concrete measures aimed to gradually reduce military budgets and national armed forces, to ban the use of thermonuclear and other mass destruction weapons, to stop the manufacture of these weapons, establish nuclear-free zones, dismantle foreign military bases, and withdraw troops from the territory of other states. The money so saved should go to the developing countries.

Constantly coming out for peace and international security, Rumania regards the switch to general disarmament as one of the chief conditions of socio-economic progress. Rumania's president has proposed the formation of a fund in aid of countries with a per-head national income of under $500-600 through a cutback by all states of military spending by 10-15 per cent. In the distribution of this fund, preference should be given to countries using at least 20 per cent of the national income to develop their economy, and less than 4-5 per cent on armaments.

In considering the problems of establishing a new economic order, we attach the utmost importance to effective activity by world bodies. Within the ramified system of international institutions, the United Nations undoubtedly has the most important role to play, because it provides the organizational framework for broad and democratic discussion of important political, social and economic questions, and for active participation by all states in their solution. In looking for ways to enable this world forum to play its role most effectively, Rumania has formulated a number of proposals aimed to strengthen the UN's role and authority and further to democratize it, so as to help it make a bigger contribution to consolidating the new international relations, fair cooperation and mutual understanding among nations. Specifically we have proposed the holding of a special session of the UN General Assembly to consider a new economic order. Much importance, we believe, is attached to the proposal on preliminary negotiations between socialist, developing and developed capitalist countries concerning the joint elaboration of a concrete program for eliminating underdevelopment and establishing a new world economic order.

In advocating such an approach, socialist Rumania believes that the solution of the intricate problems of international life requires active participation in it by all states, the small and middle states in the first place, because it is they, as a rule, who suffer most from the discriminatory policies pursued by the imperialist powers. At the same time, believing that the struggle to strengthen the economic independence of the young states is a continuation of the peoples' national-liberation struggle, our party holds that support for their just demands and the establishment of a new economic order are an international duty of the socialist countries, the communist and workers' parties, and the whole revolutionary movement of our day.

1. *Congresul al IX-lea al Partidului Comunist Roman.* Bucharest, 1965, p. 99.
2. *Programul P.C.R. de faurire a societatii socialiste multilateral dezvoltate si inaintare a Romaniei spre comunism.* Bucharest, 1975, p. 179.
3. Nicolae Ceausescu. *Expunere la Sedinta activului central de partid se de stat.* Bucharest, 1978, pp. 28-29.
4. *Programul P.C.R. de faurire a societatii socialiste multilateral dezoltate si inaintare a Romaniei spre comunism*, p. 181.
5. Nicolae Ceausescu, *Raport la cel de-al XII-lea Congres al Partidului Comunist Roman.* Bucharest, 1979, p. 111.
6. No detailed data for 1979 are yet available.
7. Nicolae Ceausescu. *Raport la cel de-al XII-lea Congres al Partidului Comunist Roman.* p. 112.

Technological progress and the crisis of capitalism

Ken Gill
General Secretary, Technical, Administrative and Supervisory Section of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (AUEW),
member, General Council, Trades Union Congress

The extension and deepening of our understanding of nature and the use of this knowledge to develop the productive forces and make them more efficient are a continuous, onward process accompanying and conditioning the development of civilization. At certain stages in history this process acquires the character of an explosion with breakthroughs in key sciences and, correspondingly fundamental changes in industrial and agricultural technology, communications, and so on. These breakthroughs inevitably have a far-reaching impact on society and on social relations as a whole.

In the past, a typical example of such a breakthrough and its effects was the first industrial revolution of the 18th century, which did much to establish capitalism as a world socio-economic system. During the past two or three decades we have been witnessing another of these breakthroughs.

The magnitude of the scientific breakthroughs in the latter half of the 20th century and their dissimilarity from the usual, gradual scientific and technological progress is so great that we have come to speak of this phenomenon as the scientific and technological revolution. This characteristic is justified not only by the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the scientific breakthrough and its impact on applied technology but also the influence of this process on society's overall economic and social structure and, in the final analysis, on the destinies of the human race.[1]

However, there is no substance in the superficial analogies drawn between the modern scientific and technological revolution and the first industrial revolution that are so typical of bourgeois thought and propaganda. By means of these analogies the high priests of the capitalist mode of production try to persuade the working people that, like the first industrial revolution, the present scientific and technological revolution will stabilize the capitalist socio-economic system and then assure its further upsurge. They aim to persuade blue- and white-collar workers that the scientific and technological revolution can create enormous social wealth, of which the working people would get their share. In many cases and for the same purpose efforts are made to break the causal link between the features of the scientific and technological revolution and the character and consequences of capitalist rationalization.

For that reason Marxist scholars accentuate not outward similarities but fundamental distinctions in the nature and specifics of the scientific and technological revolution and the first industrial revolution. Their analyses are based in particular on an assessment of the socio-economic changes that have taken place in the world during the two centuries separating the two revolutions in science and technology.

Similar criteria should be used for the study of the many problems of rationalization. I feel this would extend and deepen the discussion in *WMR*. Moreover, and most important, this is the only way a policy can be charted that would protect the working people of the capitalist countries from the severe effects of the scientific and technological revolution and, at the same time, facilitate their strug-

gle for socialism, which is the only socio-eocnomic system that can make full use of science's potentialities for the good of all society.

The foundations of the modern scientific and technological revolution are the breakthroughs in nuclear physics, chemistry (especially petrochemistry) and, lastly, electronics (chiefly microelectronics). The technologies developed on the basis of these breakthroughs have some distinctive features. I shall only name the most important.

—Previously, the development of technology did not affect the essential characteristics of the production process as such, bringing only a quantative replacement of manual labor by machines. Use of the achievements of the present scientific and technological revolution leads to robots taking over not only operational but also command, creative functions. One of the social effects of this is a qualitatively new proportion of the number of workers by hand and by brain, a tendency to turn the latter into the majority of the workforce.

— Whereas in the past, labor displaced by technological advances was absorbed in Department I, including industries manufacturing modern, advanced machinery, the scientific and technological revolution destroys more jobs than it creates in this department, and it is forecast that this tendency will continue.

— In the past the main innovations were in the manufacturing industries, hardly affecting the rest of the economy. For that reason displaced labor not absorbed in Department I could be absorbed in the rapidly growing services, finance, and distributive sectors. But the scientific and technological revolution reduces the absorption capacity of precisely these sectors.

—Machinery based on scientific and technological achievements of human supervision and services undermines the career prospects of the many of the most skilled workers.

But what is of much greater significance is the political, economic, ideological, and social state of the world, which differs fundamentally from what it was in the long gone days of the first industrial revolution and even in the intitial years following World War II.

The first industrial revolution ushered in the era of capitalism, creating the conditions for an enormous expansion of commodity production. Although the development of capitalism has never been free of crises, having its slumps and booms, its ups and downs, at its early stage it was nevertheless a young, vibrant and confidently developing social system.

By contrast, the scientific and technological revolution is unfolding during the general crisis of capitalism. Increasingly sharper and deeper crisis phenomena are to be observed simultaneously in all capitalist countries, and no serious bourgeois economist or politician ventures to predict an early end to them. On the contrary, all the economic forecasts are of a deepening of the crisis in the foreseeable future.

In this situation the struggle for markets induces the monopolies to use modern machinery and technology in industries where competition is particularly strong. But, on the other hand, finding difficulties in marketing the products of their present 'outdated' technology they are haunted by the fear that in view of the present surplus production capacities the full utilization of the potentialities of the scientific and technological revolution can only aggravate and deepen the crisis. Thus, unlike the period of the first industrial revolution, the capitalist relations of production are now becoming fetters on scientific and technological progress, a hindrance to the development of the productive forces.

Further, the alignment of class forces on a global scale and in each industrially advanced capitalist country must be taken into consideration. During the first industrial revolution the working class was not organized. Most of the workforce was drawn from the land to the factories. Trade unions had yet to emerge or were, as in Britain, just coming into existence and weak. The capitalists were free to exploit every innovation in the manner they saw fit without worrying about its effects on the workers.

That is not the case today. The days when the industrialists could ignore the impact of the rationalization of technology and the restructuring of production on the socio-economic condition of the working class are gone. Today in all the advanced capitalist countries the working class has developed powerful organizations of class struggle — the trade unions that have become in economic, if not everywhere in political, terms more mature and militant. Here at least two factors play an important role.

First, the new division of labor with the dispersal of production of any one commodity in a number of plants often located in different countries, which enables the workers of any one of them taking strike action with the minimum use of trade union resources to disrupt production in the entire network of plants and inflict great losses on the employers. This vastly strengthens the bargaining power of the workers and enhances the significance of their international solidarity.

Second, the above-mentioned rapid absolute and relative numerical growth of white-collar workers (technicians, engineers, and scientists) is radically changing their socio-political condition and outlook. The salaries of white-collar workers now consume a larger proportion of labor costs. But having been unorganized until recently, their pay growth rate has lagged behind that of many categories of skilled workers, who achieved an improvement of their condition by unremitting struggle. The class consciousness of the white-collar workers is awakening under the impact of growing capitalist exploitation. They are beginning to feel themselves part of the working class, refusing to obey their masters slavishly, and taking a more militant stand in the social struggles. A fact bearing this out is that during the past ten years the membership of the British trade unions has grown by 25 per cent,

largely through the unionizaiton of this category of workers.

Unlike the industrial revolution of the 18th century, whose accelerated development was fuelled by the pillaging of colonies and dependencies and the 'free trade doctrine' designed to give incipient capitalism a large world market, the modern scientific and technological revolution is unfoldng in a world which has put an end to capitalism's unchallenged supremacy. The revolution of October 1917 marked a watershed in world history: the socialist world system has emerged and is growing increasingly stronger, and the process of extirpating colonialism is nearing completion.

The capitalist barons have lost their erstwhile unchallenged domination of the world markets. Cheap raw materials no longer flow as freely as they did. Although the developing nations have not yet secured equitable terms of trade with the industrialized capitalist states, the posture of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries is evidence that former colonies are learning to protect their rights.

With the prospect of the capitalist market continuing to shrink, the giant capitalist monopolies are toughening the competitive struggle among themselves and resorting to protectionist practices. This is leading to distortions in the use of the potentialities being opened up for humanity by the scientific and technological revolution.

It is worth mentioning one other salient distinction. The innovations of the first industrial revolution were a response to the needs of the economy. It may be said they were tailor-made for industry.

Not so today. Most of the innovations being applied are spin-offs of imperialism's expenditures on the arms race, and may be described as its by-products. Had the resources allocated for the armaments industry been devoted to the needs of socially necessary and useful industries the character of the scientific and technological innovations and rationalizations might have been in keeping with society's socio-economic requirements and conducive to a rational and balanced development of the economy.

Science and technology are steadily becoming a major social factor determining the development of capitalist society. As Heinz Jung and Michael Graber rightly noted in their articles, this is most strikingly seen in the dislocations of the quantitative and qualitative structures of employment which are threatening the stability of the entire economy. The relevant facts are well known. Nonetheless, I should like to single out the field of telecommunications, in which electro-mechanical components are being replaced by electronic complements at a particularly rapid rate. K.G. Corfield, Managing Director of Standard Telephones & Cables (a subsidiary of ITT), estimates that by 1985 this will release as many as 96 per cent of the workforce now employed in the manufacture of long-distance communications systems.

This forecast is corroborated by the experience of another giant, American Telephone & Telegraph, which operates the majority of the telephone systems in North America. Its workforce plummeted from 39,200 in 1970 to 19,000 in 1976, and in 1980 is to be reduced again to approximately 17,000. The company estimates that as a result of developing electronic exchanges, instead of electro-mechanical exchanges, there will be a 75 per cent reduction in the need for labor in repairs and installation work.

Some quarters are inclined to reduce the effects of the application of scientific and technological innovations in industry to a threat of mass unemployment. It must be strongly emphasized that this is an extraordinary over-simplification of this key problem. Technological progress raises the most essential problem: Production for what? In the forefront here is the basic contradiction of capitalist relations of production, namely, the contradiction between private property in the means of production and the social character of production.

Over-production, low consumption, and high surplus value unredeemed by investment or demand remain critical to contemporary capitalism. These problems are intensified by the influence of the scientific and technological revolution because the latter develops under conditions of accelerating monopolization, the rising influence of the transnationals, and the growth of state-monopoly capitalism. the high rate of scientific and technological progress[2] brings capitalism face to face with new contradictions, whose complexity was brought to light in recent years by, among other things, the effects of the installation of silicon microsystems, whose invention caused a technological revolution in many industries.

I should like to draw attention to one more feature of the contemporary phase of technological innovation. It is linked with increased profitability, due to a drastic cut in the cost of equipment.[3] For instance, in the relatively recent past automation justified initial outlays of capital only if output reached 250,000 units annually. But with the increasing sophistication of robots aided by increasingly cheaper micro-processors, capital costs are diminishing significantly, making automation profitable at an output level of 5,000 units annually. This is particularly important for countries like the United Kingdom, where earlier forms of automation proved to be impracticable owing to small-batch production engineering.

Rapid technological development does not prove that capitalist entrepreneurs are out to increase the sum of human happiness. And not only because from the viewpoint of the monopolies the main purpose of the scientific and technological revolution is to maximize the profit rate. In most cases the use of technological innovations is dictated by the needs of military-industrial complexes of the imperialist states. Their decisive say in the distribution of resources continues to have a distorting effect on the economy of the developed nations.

In the United Kingdom, for example, the military-industrial complex wields considerable influence. A major reason for the decline of the manufacturing base in the British economy and for the

failure to maintain market shares has been and remains the inadequate investment in research and development and in capital equipment in non-military industries.

Here are some of the facts bearing out my analysis. In 1975 research and development in the British missile manufacturing industry amounted to 30 per cent of the total production costs. However, in the mechanical engineering industry both research and development manpower and the percentage of net output spent on research and development halved between 1967 and 1975. Between 1963 and 1973 research and development did not increase in the British industry. Of the total allocations for research and development 46.4 per cent go into R & D for military purposes compared, for example, to 11 per cent in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Of course, the outlays on research and development for military purposes can have a momentary positive effect by creating new jobs. However, the question that has to be answered is whether these outlays produce any long-term benefit to economic development, including the preservation of jobs. The experience of industrialized capitalist countries, including the United Kingdom, answers this question in the negative.

The scientific and technological revolution has produced conflicting tendencies in the capitalist world, particularly in the industrially advanced countries. It would be wrong, for example, to ignore the certain positive role played by it in the development of capitalist industry. One cannot deny that the structural changes in the capitalist system and, specifically, the dominant role of the transnationals in the capitalist world economy have created organizational forms objectively capable of speeding up the scientific and technological revolution and assuring the utilization of its achievements. Large financial, material and labor resources have begun to be allocated for the requirements of scientific and technological progress. Further, the possibility has arisen for using these resources to achieve a rational division of labor, producing some commodities or components of commodities where this is most economical and efficient, in relation to the location of material resources and the specifics of the infrastructure.

However, this is only one and by far the less important aspect of capitalism at its present stage of development. In the capitalist economic system there are powerful counter-trends inhibiting the rational utilization of the potentialities of the scientific and technological revolution. The crux of the matter is that science and technology can really flourish only in a society structured to the needs of the new, higher stage of the development of social production. But this is being vainly sought in a society in which the results of labor are appropriated by a small and steadily diminishing number of people.

There is yet another factor that, in addition to inhibiting the potentialities for scientific and technological progress under capitalism, aggravates the latter's contradictions. This is the widening gap between the potentially infinite growth of production and the vastly reduced labor force required in the production process. Technical advances are thus restricting the demand for a huge output, inevitably reducing the profitability of economic activity and undermining this key driving force of the capitalist mode of production.

One of the major effects of the mounting socio-economic contradictions, which will be exacerbated still further as time passes, is the growing resistance of the working class to the use of the potentialities of the scientific and technological revolution in ways which prevent the working people from sharing in the benefits of new technology, do not guarantee employment, and do not improve living standards. This resistance, as the experience of my own trade union shows, is being increasingly joined by white-collar workers.

Many examples could be given to show the ability of the working people, in defending their rights, to hold up the use of new technology that undermines their socio-economic condition. This has happened in the United Kingdom with, for instance, containerization in the docks, new steel processes, and rationalization of printing in *The Times*. These are but three examples.

The bourgeois mass media sometimes depict resistance to capitalist methods of rationalization as Luddism, as fanatical resistance to technological progress. This is totally false. Working people will not and do not object to new technology as such. What they want is to protect their interests, to guarantee that they benefit from the scientific and technological revolution now and in the future. It is the monopolists, not the working people, who raise barriers by refusing to satisfy the just demands of those whom they exploit.

Of course, we communists have no illusions. We are aware that the ultimate solution can only be a society in which new productive forces will be planned and used to secure the full satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of the people.

This reinforces the need for basic, socialist transformations, with all the resources owned and administered by the people. These transformations will allow for the development of new forms of organizing and managing production and distribution consonant with the new character of the productive forces, ensuring a high degree of self-management, and bringing planning and coordination on a nation-wide scale.

Moreover, in addition to providing new opportunities for advancing toward society's revolutionary socialist transformation, the strategy of the communists in a capitalist country like ours must envisage protecting the people from the immediate dangers linked to the installation of new technology. This means, for instance, the involvement of workers through their organizations at plant, district, and national level in decision-making on changes in the production process. And while these changes take place the crucial problem is security of

employment either in the particular plant or by the provision of alternative work at comparable earnings and working conditions in some other enterprise or industry, with a system of retraining in new skills.

Also, the working people must have the opportunity of benefiting from the immense growth of labor productivity and, hence, greater wealth production. This can be achieved, in particular, by shortening the working day and week, lengthening annual leaves, and lowering the pension age.

New technology should be used to improve the quality of life, eliminate hard, labor-consuming work, halt the waste of scarce resources, and provide better environmental protection. It should be used to solve the problems of homelessness and slums, and build hospitals and schools in keeping with modern requirements.

Since the capitalist class seeks to squeeze more and more profits out of scientific and technological innovations, something that is facilitated by domination on the part of the transnationals that do not recognize national frontiers, the significance of working-class international solidarity is growing. A powerful impetus to this could be given by ending the division in the world trade union movement, making it possible to respond quickly and effectively to the actions of one or another national contingent of the working class by organizing support for it at the international level.

Thus, the scientific and technological revolution and its practical form — rationalization of technological processes — is further aggravating and deepening the crisis of capitalism and setting before the working class and all the other working people, and their political organizations and trade unions, problems with new dimensions. The answer to these problems can be found only in joint action by all progressive forces united in a broad anti-monopoly, democratic alliance, whose main aim would be to harness the achievements of human genius to the service of the working people.

This contribution continues the discussion of the problems of capitalist rationalization. *See articles by Heinz Jung and Michael Graber, *WMR* January and March 1980.

1. This article considers the effects of scientific and technological progress only in capitalist society.

2. Researchers find that the sum of scientific knowledge in our day doubles every 10-15 years.

3. An integrated circuit today is only 1/1,000th of the price 15 years ago. The modern micro-computer is 20 times faster than the first-generation computer, consumes the power of a small light bulb, and costs 1/10,000th of what its predecessors cost.

---

viewpoints

Against repression and persecution

A tense situation arose in Bangladesh in the spring of this year. A tide of action by broad masses of working people demanding socio-economic changes swept across the country. Progressive and patriotic forces and opposition parties voiced their solidarity with the popular movement and supported it. And again — as on many other occasions over the past several years — the ruling circles responded with fierce repression to the acts of the indignant people.

The main blow was directed against the Communist Party of Bangladesh, which has been hounded for years. Communists were imprisoned and intimidated. Anti-communist religious and communal forces were incited against them, and repeated attempts have been made to wreck the party's building.

In March 1980, the tide of repression once again hit the CPB, when many party leaders were illegally arrested. On the night of March 31, Mohammad Farhad, the party's General Secretary, Mujahedul Islam Selim, CC member, Muhul Alam, leader of the CP organization in the Dakka rural region, Akram Hossian, Chairman of the Students' Union, Bela Nabi, a leader of the CP women's organization, and twelve activitists, members of the party CC apparatus, were arrested. Some leaders of the leading opposition party, the Awami League, were also detained. Since then, the repressions have continued.

Ever since reaction, with the support of imperialism, overthrew President Mujibur Rahman's patriotic regime, under which the country rose to independence, arbitrary acts and arrests have been broadly practised in Bangladesh, an ordeal for progressives and patriotic minded people. However, even after having shed rivers of blood, reaction has been unable to crush the popular movement, as will be seen from the fresh explosion of popular indignation in the form of powerful strikes and demon-

strations, and a boycott of parliamentary sessions last spring. There is a steady process of cohesion of the masses around democratic goals.

The authorities have failed — and will fail — to break the communists and the democratic movement. Despite the repression, the patriotic forces are carrying on the fight and looking to the future with hope. Their fight against arbitrary acts, and for the ideals of democracy and progress has always met with support from the world's progressive forces, which have indignantly condemned the campaign of persecution in Bangladesh and demanded the immediate release of all the arrested communists and other patriots.

Gulam Mahmud

The first Russian Revolution and the Paris Commune

Pierre Hentges
French journalist

A fitting way to mark the 75th anniversary of the Russian revolution of 1905-1907 is to recall the conclusions drawn from its experience by contemporaries, representing the proletariat's socialist movement, who understood its worldwide significance.

The revolutionary forces of France welcomed the 'revolution that would sweep away the tsar and the grand dukes,'[1] and saw it as a continuation of the historic endeavor started by the Paris Commune. A manifesto issued on January 27, 1905, by the Administrative Commission of the Seine Federation of the Socialist Party of France said: 'This is the most important historical event since the Commune of 1871. The Russian people are rising against tsarism; the Russian proletariat demands freedom and economic and social equality.'

Thus, the 1905 revolution, and subsequently also the October 1917 Revolution, was a reminder of the achievements of the Commune and helped to gain a clearer recognition that the Paris Commune, as Marx said, 'was a new point of departure of world-wide importance.'[2]

Characteristically, the ground for comparing the Russian revolution with the Commune was above all the leading role of the working class in those two historical events. The French socialist movement realized the role of the Russian proletariat in the revolution. Jean Jaures, the leader of the French Socialist Party, wrote: 'The Russian working class, the last to enter the battlefield, has assimilated the experience of earlier battles and the trials of the European proletariat. . . . The emancipation of the Russian people rid of the autocracy will be expressed not only in the establishment of legislative institutions but also in a social organization of labor which will undoubtedly place the Russian proletariat in the vanguard of the European peoletariat.'[3]

Of course, the 1905 revolution — the first popular revolution of the imperialist epoch — took place in different conditions and set itself different tasks than the Commune, but in the Russia of that period the industrial proletariat had taken shape as a class and the course of the revolution depended on the role which the working class would play in it, despite the fact that its scope was largely determined by a most acute agrarian crisis.

Various European socialist movements assessed the nature and character of the Russian revolution on the strength of their own experience. Thus, Rosa Luxemburg, a prominent leader of the German working-class movement, reproached Jaures for regarding the 1905 revolution above all as a movement whose main goal, like that of the revolutions of the 18th and 19th century in the West, with the exception of the Commune, was to overthrow the monarchy; she must have had in mind his articles on the fusillade in Petersburg.[4] Indeed, in the numerous articles which Jaures wrote about the events in Russia there is little mention about the Paris uprising. But he did say that 'in the Russian revolution there is a great deal of the French revolution.'[5] He held that the common feature of all the French 18th- and 19th-century revolutions, including the Commune, was that 'in 1792, and in 1830, and in 1848, and in 1871 it was the revolutionary people, the socialist proletariat which most strikingly displayed an understanding of the interests of France connected with the liberation of the peoples, with the inclusion of the working class in European democracy.'[6] It is true that far from all the socialist trends in Russia itself recognized the leadership of the working class in the first Russian revolution; in France many had no notion of the distinctions between these trends, and regarded the fight against tsarism and all the medieval survivals as the most striking manifestation of the Russian revolution.

Rosa Luxemburg's view was determined by the specific experience of Germany, where there already was a well-organized party and Marxism was wide-spread among the masses. That is what apparently prompted her to say that 'in the mutual influence of Europe and Russia' the main thing was the impact of the socialist movement of the working class on the bourgeois democratic revolution. She said that the 'Russian revolution, if viewed historically, is a reflection of the strength and maturity of the international, which means, above all, the German, working-class movement.'[7]

The continuity of experience between the Commune and the Russian revolution sprang from the similarity of their motive forces. The Russian revolutionaries made a profound study of the experience of the Commune. Thus, Lenin wrote: 'The Commune taught the European proletariat to pose concretely the tasks of the socialist revolution. The lesson learnt by the proletariat will not be forgotten. The working class will make use of it, as it has already done in Russia during the December Uprising' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 13, p. 477). Let us note that lessons were also drawn by the revolutionary proletariat from the 1905-1907 revolution.

A most important lesson both of the Commune and of the first Russian revolution was the understanding of the need to set up the working people's organs of revolutionary power. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies, which were set up in Russian in 1905 became the organs of the uprising and the embryos of the revolutionary power. It is this twofold function of the Soviets which gives ground for seeing a similarity between the 1905 revolution and the Commune. But only Lenin and the Bolsheviks saw the innovative character of the Soviets, the organs of revolutionary power set up by the masses. In this context, Lenin said that as early as 1905 the Russian 'socialists had realized that the organization of these Soviets was creating something great, something new and unprecedented in the history of world revolution' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 437). But this new and unprecedented development was also a continuation of the way along which the Commune had advanced. Pondering the importance of the Soviets in February 1917, Lenin wrote in his 'Letters from Afar': 'Guided by their class instinct, the workers have realized that in revolutionary times they need *not only* ordinary, but an entirely different organization. They have rightly taken the path indicated by the experience of our 1905 Revolution and of the 1871 Paris Commune; they have set up a *Soviet of Workers' Deputies*' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 324).

From the experience of the Commune, as from that of the Russian revolution, contemporaries drew the conclusion about the need to consolidate the working people's international solidarity. Representatives of the socialist movement (notably Jaures and *L'Humanité*) saw solidarity with the Russian revolution as a part of the historic battle carried on by the democratic forces of France. Jaures realized that the Russian revolution would invest the struggle for democracy in France with confidence, scope and strength. Was it possible to deny the need for international solidarity if, as Anatole France said, the proletariat even in a 'free Europe' was 'to no extent guaranteed against sorties by a wild and barbarous reaction'?

The Russian revolution of 1905-1907 opened up fresh prospects before the working-class movement in Western Europe. Anatole France said in December 1905: 'Whatever the outcome of this great and grim struggle, the Russian revolutionaries have exerted a decisive influence on the destiny of their country and on that of the whole world. It is on the banks of the Neva, Vistula and Volga that the destinies of the new Europe and the future of mankind are now being decided.' For the working people, the Russian revolution was an inspiring example.

The Russian revolution whose mighty liberating echo reverberated around the world, helped the German working people to defend universal suffrage, accelerated its introduction in Austria-Hungary and sparked off the first major national-liberation movement in India.

The movement of solidarity with the Russian revolution helped to unite the workers in France. The 1905 events in Russia helped to set up the United Socialist Party in France in much the same way as the subsequent October Revolution had the crucial role to play in the emergence of the French Communist Party. The unification commission of the socialist forces directed the French working people's campaign of solidarity with the 'heroic fighters for freedom in Russia'. Jaures told a congress of the French Socialist Party in Rouen which preceded the unification congress: 'Let our socialist unity inspire and strengthen those who are fighting for freedom in Russia!'

The solidarity movement became even stronger after the unification of the party under the impact of the broad strike movement in Russia in October 1905, which Lenin called the 'October revolution' (See *Coll. Works*, Vol. 10, p. 69). At its second congress in Chalon on October 31, 1905, the United Socialist Party, the French section of the Workers' International, urged 'all the other sections of the International to display vigilance and not to allow the governments of their countries to strangulate by means of armed intervention the revolutionary movement led by the Russian section of the International'. The depth and international character of the movement of solidarity with the Russian revolution were also vividly manifested on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, January 22, 1906. Everywhere — in France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland — the working people staged rallies in their thousands. Jean Longuet wrote: 'Never before . . . has the great character of our movement been expressed with such power and unanimity.'[8]

International solidarity with the Russian revolution was also expressed in the exposure of the attempts by international reaction to help the tsarist government to put down the Russian revolution. In October 1905, the German government kept its warships under steam so that they could be sent out at short notice allegedly to protect the royal family. Just then there was a discussion of the insistent proposals of Wilhelm II to suppress the revolution in Poland. 'In this way, the tsarist regime could be saved,' wrote the newspaper *Le Temps* on November 16 concerning these proposals. The following day, Longuet said in *L'Humanité* that that statement in *Le temps* was 'the most obvious and undisguised call on Wilhelm II, a sworn enemy of France, to put down the Russian revolution. . . . That is the outcome today of the ultra-patriotism of the French bourgeoisie, which is terrified by the

international consequences of the Russian proletariat's coming victory.'

This condemned not only the assistance given to the tsarist regime, that monstrous bulwark of reaction, but the whole foreign-policy conception of the French bourgeoisie, which believed that since the suppression of the Commune it was capable of returning to Europe 'a strong and wise France,'[9] As Thiers put it.

After 1871, the working class always mustered its forces and serried its ranks by proclaiming 'Long live the Commune!'. Whenever the bourgeoisie was gripped with fear, the specter of the Commune rose before it.

The celebration of May Day 1906 showed the growing strength of the working class. An address issued by the International Socialist Bureau on that occasion said that 'May Day epitomizes the fine year which abounds in results but which is even more generous in the hopes it produces . . . In Russia, the proletariat declared itself to be the crucial factor and the greatest hope of the revolution.' In Paris 200,000 workers went on strike. The government brought into the city over 60,000 soldiers from the various services, apart from the police and the Republican guard.[10] Many rich people left Paris, while others put in stocks of food and withdrew money from their bank accounts. Henri Houssaye, a member of the French Academy and a historian of the epoch of the Empire, compared the period with the darkest days of the Commune, as he put it.

Let me recall yet another conclusion which contemporaries drew from the 1905-1906 events.

Speaking in the Chamber of Deputies on December 15, 1905, Jaures said: 'When society carries within itself the seeds of internal conflicts, when there is a fierce struggle not only among the parties, but also among the classes, when a new world is taking shape in quest of light and equality, this maturing social conflict always and inevitably develops into a revolutionary explosion as soon as a war abounding in dramatic events breaks out in the world.'[11]

Without seeking in any way to lay down some historical rule, let alone elaborating some scheme that would necessarily apply in every case in the future, one could point to several examples in modern history when a European or world crisis acted as a signal for great social upheavals. That is what happened in 1871, 1905, 1917 and 1945 (the Franco-Prussian, the Russo-Japanese, and the First and Second World Wars). At the same time one has to note the diverse forms which the disintegration of imperialism tends to assume.

Lenin said that the Commune 'stirred the socialist movement throughout Europe' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 13, p. 477). Jaures wrote the following about the impact of the Russian revolution: 'A high social tide is rising in the East, and the victory of the revolution, in which the proletariat will play the crucial role, will inspire the working people to struggle for their demands.'[12]

'A high social tide is rising in the East.' For three quarters of a century this tide, first heralded by the Commune, has been growing and the world in which we live and struggle has been changing under its impact. In the current of history we are also influenced by the tide which pulls into the past, and the developing socialist civilization whose movement has been steadily accelerating in its advance; today it shows us the face of our future. The strength and sagacity of the working class and its allies enable them confidently to direct events and to assume a historical responsibility. Never before has it been as clear as it is today that socialism is the hope of humanity. The truth of socialism burns bright in the tragic but undying glory of the Commune, and the 1905 revolution has made its torch shine even more brightly.

1. Edith Thomas, *Louise Michel*, Paris, 1971, p. 439.
2. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works in Three Volumes*, Vol. 2, p. 422.
3. *L'Humanité*, March 4, 1905.
4. On January 23, Jaures wrote: 'Henceforth a river of blood flows between the tsar and the people. The tsar and tsarism are now banned from the community of nations'. Even more indicative is what he wrote on January 25: 'Victory awaits the Russian revolutionaries at the end of their trials; their victory will have unprecedented consequences throughout the world for the fight against what remains of despotism.'
5. *L'Humanité*, November 6, 1905.
6. *L'Humanité*, December 6, 1905.
7. Rosa Luxemburg, *Massenstreik, Partei und Gewerkschaften, im Aussgewahlte Reden und Schriften*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1951, p. 230. Written in Petersburg in September 1906.
8. *L'Humanité*, January 22, 1906.
9. Letter to the Princess E. Troubetskaia on July 29, 1872, quoted by Albert Manfred in his *Essays on the History of France, 18th-20th Centuries*, Moscow, 1961, p. 356.
10. *L'Humanité*, April 29, 1906.
11. When Jaures emphasized: 'We have had an example of this in Russia,' one reactionary deputy made the following rejoinder: 'And during the Commune', so emphasizing in his own way, in the light of his reactionary class consciousness, the similarity between the Paris Commune and the Russian revolution of 1905.
12. *L'Humanité*, December 4, 1905.

In the dead-end of capitalist orientation

Ahmed Salim
CC Economic Commission member, CP of the Sudan

The basic feature of the present situation in the Sudan is a most acute crisis which has hit every sphere of life: economic, political, social and spiritual.

The state of the economy is close to catastrophic. In a country with very rich natural and especially agricultural resources, the GNP per head falls short of $270 a year, which ranks the Sudan among the least developed countries of the continent. There is virtually no infrastructure which the country badly needs: there are only about 650 kilometres of hard-back roads, the railway network is going to pieces, while river transport functions worse than it did a few decades ago. Because of the energy and raw materials shortage, industrial facilities are loaded on average 20-40 per cent.

The area under crop is being reduced. At the end of the 1970s, the crop of cotton, the Sudan's chief export, was on the same level as at the beginning of the decade. The yields of other food and industrial crops have been declining. The state of crop growing and stock-breeding has been rapidly worsening and this is expressed in the rising cost of agricultural produce, the ever smaller earnings from it and the growing migration of the rural population to the towns.

These facts explode the official propaganda which claims that the country's economic development has performed some kind of 'leap'. Actually, not a single project that could bring economic returns and ensure a stable source of revenues for the state budget has been realized. To this day, 65-70 per cent of the budget revenues come from indirect taxes, a heavy burden on the working people.

In face of the looming economic collapse and under external pressure, the Nimeiri regime has accepted the terms and recommendations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund for 'saving' the economy. The Sudanese pound has been devalued, while the government's economic policy has been placed under the control of foreign financial circles.

Like Sadat's regime in Egypt, its neighbor in the north, the ruling Sudanese regime has announced an 'open-door' policy. But experience shows that such a policy tends sharply to increase the budget deficit, to worsen the trade and payments balances, further to depreciate the national currency and to intensify inflationary tendencies and the growth of prices. The Sudan's Minister of Finance and Economics has admitted that in fiscal 1979/1980 the country's balance of payments deficit will come to $675 million. Officially, inflation in the Sudan has been running at 25 per cent, but for some items, like foodstuffs, rents and services, it is as high as 80-100 per cent.

The result of all this is a steady worsening of the material condition of the masses. There is growing unemployment, a shortage of the prime necessities, including fuel and the stable foods: bread, meat and sugar. The hardship caused by the economic crisis is a burden not only on the workers and the toiling peasants. They are also felt by handicraftsmen, the urban and rural petty and middle bourgeoisie, and even some strata of the big national bourgeoisie not linked with foreign capital and the ruling elite.

In depth and scope, the present crisis is unprecedented in the history of independent Sudan. Our party has emphasized that it is a 'classical' specimen of the crisis of the capitalist way of development in a backward country. The development and assertion of capitalist relations throw the doors wide open to neo-colonial expansion and create the conditions for subordinating the country to domination by imperialism, which has naturally encouraged and supported this orientation in every way, including economic and financial aid to the ruling regime.

Inside the country, the chief advocates and conductors of the capitalist way of development are the 'new' strata of the bourgeoisie which have taken shape in a very short period on the basis of the administrative bureaucracy and the technocratic top section of the civil and military apparatus of power. They come mostly from the petty-bourgeois strata, who had earlier — especially before the May 1969 coup[1] — sided with the left forces. Some of them had even been members of our party. To this day they seek to justify their acts by resorting to pseudo-socialist and pseudo-revolutionary catchwords. They call the bloody repression against the progressive and patriotic forces 'the defense of the revolutionary power', the anti-popular regime, the 'new revolutionary democracy,' and the ruin of the economy and its subordination to neo-colonialist domination, 'radical transformations with a socialist perspective.'

Having seized state power and turned it into an instrument of personal enrichment, and also into a peculiar instrument of primitive capitalist accumulation, the 'new' bourgeois strata have put through a number of measures — like nationalization —

which hit at the 'old' bourgeoisie and which inflicted definite losses on it. But all these measures, including the expansion of the state sector of the economy, were ultimately used for the benefit of the capitalist class as a whole and helped to fortify the material basis of the policy aimed to develop the country along the capitalist way. Foreign companies and banks were paid generous compensation and given privileges for resuming activity on Sudanese territory. New and more profitable spheres of investment were opened up to the local bourgeoisie. This has made the 'new' bourgeois strata a force acting for the benefit of the bourgeoisie as a class, within which they now have leading positions because of their ties with neo-colonialism and the apparatus of power.

In the political sphere, the Nimeiri regime, which relies mainly on the administrative and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the army elite, has found itself in deep isolation. It mounted fierce repression against progressive democratic forces, while its acts alienated it from the conservative right-wing elements. This produced an acute crisis whose main feature just now is that something like a dead-end situation has arisen. The top sections are no longer capable of ruling in the old way, they have nothing like a consistent program for action, and are incapable of ensuring the functioning of political institutions and structures, notably the Sudanese Socialist Union, the only legal party. They are incapable of maintaining the old tough military-bureaucratic control over public and political life and of putting down the activities of the opposition. At the same time the lower orders, while refusing to live in the old way, are incapable of overthrowing the present regime for the time being. The reason is the fragmented state of the opposition which, overcoming considerable difficulties, both objective and subjective, is now rallying together its supporters in order to provide itself with an organizational basis in the masses and to set up a unified leadership, which is a necessary condition for fighting the dictatorship. The balance of forces that has taken shape tends to produce a situation of something like a temporary 'equilibrium', when each side, seeking to take the initiative and win in the forthcoming fight, is organizing and strengthening its ranks.

In these conditions, the ruling regime, trying to break out of its isolation and to avoid collapse, issued a call in the summer of 1977 for 'national reconciliation'. It wanted to extend its social basis by concluding an alliance between the 'new' bourgeois strata and the 'old' Sudanese bourgeoisie, which is represented by the leadership of officially banned but actually existing 'traditional' conservative parties. The idea was also to involve in the alliance semi-feudal and tribal groupings, which in the past few decades have used their wealth and influence to engage in private business operations. The leading role was naturally to go to the 'new' strata, while maintaining the country's capitalist orientation and leaving intact elements which are definitive to the present regime and its political line like the system of one-man rule, one-party politics, suppression of democratic rights and freedoms, repression against the revolutionary movement, and the use of religion for anti-communist purposes.

The authorities, aware that the Sudanese people were tired of the reign of terror and wanted to solve the political and socio-economic problems facing the country without any more bloody coups or civil war, expected their call for 'national reconciliation' to meet with mass support that would facilitate the attainment of their goal.

The Communist Party of the Sudan set forth its principled stand on 'national reconciliation' in a statement issued on August 31, 1977. Genuine national reconciliation, the communists said, entailed a transition period in the course of which the old forms of government which had produced the crisis would be finally eliminated and new, democratic institutions of power set up to enable the country to avoid the threat of sanguinary clashes and civil war. The first few steps along this way should be the removal from the responsible posts of all those guilty of having committed crimes against the people and the country, fundamental changes in the constitution and legislation, provision of broad and real democratic rights for the mass of people, political parties, trade unions and public organizations, release of political prisoners, re-establishment of the independence of the courts, a review of all treaties and agreements infringing on Sudan's national sovereignty, etc.

Accordingly, the CP Sudan did not flatly reject the idea of negotiations with the authorities, but formulated a number of preliminary conditions: the repeal of all emergency laws, above all the state security law; negotiations with full publicity, in full view of the people and with their participation, in order to prevent any unprincipled behind-the-scenes deal; the communists' participation in these negotiations as representatives of their party, acting on its behalf.

In putting forward these conditions, our party did not engage in any political bargaining and did not seek any advantages for itself. We have always insisted on these conditions, being certain that they open up a democratic way out of the crisis. But these conditions turned out to be unacceptable for the ruling regime, which had totally different goals.

In any case, the CPS had no illusions about the prospects for a 'national reconciliation' in the form in which it had been proposed by the authorities. Life proved us to be right. Just now this idea has been rejected even by those who had initially supported it, with the exception of the Moslem Brotherhood, an organization which takes an extreme right-wing anti-democratic and anti-communist stand. 'National reconciliation,' according to Nimeiri's recipe, turned out to be an expression of the crisis instead of a way out of it.

In any case, the CPS had no illusions about the prospects for a 'national reconciliation' in the form in which it had been proposed by the authorities. Life proved us to be right. Just now this idea has been rejected even by those who had initially sup-

ported it, with the exception of the Moslem Brotherhood, an organization which takes an extreme right-wing anti-democratic and anti-communist stand. 'National reconciliation,' according to Nimeiri's recipe, turned out to be an expression of the crisis instead of a way out of it.

From the outset, the 'reconciliation' policy came up against many difficulties and complications. The authorities failed to live up to their promise to the 'traditional' conservative opposition to find an appropriate formula for its participation in government. It is, in fact, very hard to find such a formula, because this would require radical changes in the system of military-bureaucratic dictatorship and one-man rule. But in practice such changes — whether from the standpoint of the decision-making procedures or a sharing of power — could help to invigorate the mass movement. And that is something both sides — the ruling regime and the right-wing opposition forces — would like to avoid.

'National reconciliation' also envisages that the political parties and groupings supporting it should join the SSU and disband their own organizations. However, the one-party system, in the form in which it has been imposed on the country by the Nimeiri regime, is now being resolutely rejected by the Sudanese people as having completely discredited itself. The SSU is the very substance of the regime, and not some true political organization like the parties which emerged in the country after the Second World War. It is no more than a mask covering the loathsome face of the anti-popular dictatorship. It is impossible to reform political life in the Sudan merely by changing something in the existing one-party system. No radical changes can be brought about in this pseudo-party either by elections from top to bottom, the elimination of the SSU's tutelage of the mass organizations, a rupture of its connections with the security service, an end to its financing by government agencies or any other measures.

The crisis of the Sudanese political system was compounded by the total failure of a similar experiment in Egypt over the past few years. What happened to the Arab Socialist Union in Egypt showed that there was no substance to Sadat's loudly advertised claims that the only party allowed in the country and used as an instrument for effecting the policy of the anti-popular regime could be reformed from inside through the establishment within it of various platforms in the guise of democratization.[2]

It is now perfectly obvious that any political force which agrees to join the SSU within the framework of 'national reconciliation' would lose its independence and would become an accomplice under the harsh historical indictment which the people will definitely present to this hated organization.

The actual and anti-popular substance of the Nimeiri dictatorship's schemes will also be seen from its attempts to join the Moslem Brotherhood and the extreme right-wing religious and political Al-Umma Party (although both are nominally banned) in using the Moslem religion to fight the upswing in the mass movement by directing the feelings of believers against the progressive and patriotic forces, the communists in the first place. At the same time, it aims to consolidate the regime of personal power by giving it a religious framework and formalizing the existing property relations by recording them in an 'Islamic Constitution'. The first step in this direction was the establishment of a commission for amending the existing laws in order to bring them into line with the Shariat.[3]

The calls for restructuring the whole of sociopolitical life merely on the basis of the teachings of Islam present a special danger in a country like the Sudan where different religions are practised. Such calls and corresponding actions threaten to aggravate and complicate existing conflicts on a national and religious basis and undermine national unity. Evidence of this comes from the public statements made by political leaders in the south of the Sudan who have flatly rejected the idea of an 'Islamic Constitution'. That is quite natural because the overwhelming majority of the population in the south is either Christian or pagan.

The CP Sudan has emphasized that the struggle now tends to go forward not over the 'Islam or atheism' issue, as the reactionary and right-wing forces claim. The contest is pivoted on the alternative of democracy or dictatorship, social justice or social oppression. The ideological and political struggle against the principles and provisions of an 'Islamic Constitution' is not a fight against the Moslem religion but against the very secular concepts of the ideologists, politicians and party leaders who seek to use Islam to safeguard the anti-popular interests of the exploiter classes, to suppress democracy and put down the popular movement. Our party believes that 'regardless of difference in or identity of religious beliefs, the classes determine their attitude to social revolution and their place in it in the light of their interests, in the light of whether they accord with the march of history or not'.[4]

We emphasize that the anti-communist campaign started by the ruling regime and the leadership of the Al-Umma Party and the Moslem Brotherhood has nothing in common with the defense of Islam. The CPS has never called for the elimination of religion. What is more, repudiation of religious beliefs has never been a condition for party membership. The Sudanese Communists do not oppose Islam. They are sure that observance of its historically-rooted moral, egalitarian features does not clash with the struggle for genuine independence and social progress and that the Sudanese people can carry out a national-democratic revolution and build socialism without entering into any conflict with the canons of the Moslem (or Christian) religion. By contrast, those who attack the communists most fiercely themselves constantly and grossly trample on Islam's socio-ethical prescriptions, which prohibit man's exploitation by man, usury and corruption.

The attempts to mount an anti-democratic, anti-communist campaign in the country under the banner of religion have lately been accompanied in the foreign-policy sphere by loud noises concerning the notorious 'Soviet communist threat' to the Moslem countries. This campaign became most hysterical in tone in connection with the dispatch to Afghanistan of a limited contingent of Soviet troops which, as the country's revolutionary leadership has emphasized, went there at the request of the legitimate government to help the Afghan people and their armed forces in warding off serious external aggression.[5] The Nimeiri regime is making all those noises after having subserviently supported the plans for a settlement of the Middle East crisis the American way in detriment to the legitimate interests of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine, after having closed its eyes to the menacing build-up of U.S. military strength in our region, and to the plans for setting up U.S. military bases in Egypt, Somalia, Kenya and Oman. The noises about the Soviet Union's 'unlawful' and 'aggressive' actions are being made by those who are completely silent over the military coup staged by French paratroopers in the Central African Republic, which borders on the Sudan. The military-bureaucratic dictatorship, which so assiduously 'cherishes' the freedom and independence of Moslem states, displays a readiness that is humiliating for the Sudanese national dignity to join the traitor Sadat in conducting his pro-Zionist line (despite the verbal attempts to distance itself from him which are being made with the knowledge and blessings of U.S. imperialism and Saudi reaction), and has generally stayed in power largely thanks to the bayonets of the 25,000-strong Egyptian expeditionary corps stationed in the Sudan.

The CPS is convinced that reaction and the rightists will ultimately fail to make the Moslem religion serve their narrow self-seeking interests so as to sidestep the mounting tide of social indignation. The democratic movement can join in open battle on this sector of the front, expose the unseemly plans of the dictatorship and its accomplices to the ordinary people who want actively to join in the struggle to restructure society without abandoning their religious beliefs.

In contrast to the idea of 'national reconciliation' between the 'new' and the 'old' bourgeoisie and the semi-feudal elements, which the ruling regime has been plugging, the CP Sudan has proposed the establishment of a National Democratic Front to unite the working class, the working peasantry, the small and middle bourgeoisie in industry, trade and the handicrafts, and the patriotic-minded intelligentsia. The front should be pivoted on an alliance of workers and peasants, whose sound and militant character will be a guarantee of successful solution of the tasks in a national democratic revolution. The front's program, we believe, should include the following main tasks: defense and strengthening of national independence and sovereignty; release of the Sudan's economy from the domination of foreign monopoly capital; a radical reorganization and democratization of the state apparatus; mobilization of all resources for the needs of a balanced economic upswing and development of the productive forces; a radical agrarian reform for the benefit of a majority of the rural population; the need to raise the working people's living standards, to give them broad democratic rights and freedoms, to overcome cultural backwardness and eliminate illiteracy, to strengthen and develop all-round ties and fruitful cooperation with the socialist-community countries and all the democratic forces of the world. The National Democratic Front, our party believes, should be based on respect for the ideological and organizational independence of its constituent political forces, their equality and mutual trust, strengthened in the course of joint action. Such is the CPS's strategic goal for the period until the establishment of a national democratic system in the country and its entrance upon the path of development with orientation upon socialism.

But at the present stage, the CPS believes that the chief and immediate task of the country's progressive and patriotic forces is to eliminate the regime of personal power, to overthrow the military dictatorship and to create an atmosphere of freedom and democracy in the Sudan. Without this it is impossible to go on to fulfilling the tasks of a national democratic revolution. Our party emphasizes that the question of overcoming the present crisis produced by the policy of the ruling elite is just as acute as was the question of the country's winning of national independence, the struggle for which involved the broadest strata of the Sudanese society. That is why the communists urge the creation of a Front of Struggle for Democracy and the Country's Salvation, within which they are prepared to cooperate with all those who oppose the present regime and are capable of actually fighting against it. This call is also addressed to those who, on many other issues, take an anti-communist stand, but who are, however, prepared to act together with the communists against the common enemy before them.

The alliance of forces which are so different in character and basic aspirations can, of course, rest only on the most general jointly formulated minimum program acceptable for everyone at the present stage of the struggle. Once the goal has been achieved, there will inevitably be a fresh regrouping as a result of which those who had earlier cooperated with each other could find themselves on different sides of the barricades. For all this our party does not want to lose any allies, but that does not depend on the communists alone. We make no secret of the fact that we shall not cease our efforts to increase the importance and influence of the working class in the country's political life, that we shall not abandon the struggle — within and outside the organs of power to be set up after the overthrow of the dictatorship — to attain our strategic goal.

In the recent period, there has been a definite change in the development of the working people's mass struggle. It has entered an upward phase. This will be seen from the scope of the strike movement

all over the country, the growing revolutionary activity of the working class, the increasing politicization of its mass action, the increasingly class character and radicalization of trade union demands, and a revival of the organized movement of the laboring peasantry.

This is largely the result of the dedicated and persevering work of the Communist Party of the Sudan, which it has to carry on in harsh underground conditions. The ongoing changes enable our party to broaden its activity and increasingly to assert the influence of the communists among the masses. Since the temporary retreat and the party's forced departure into the underground as a result of the bloodshed that led to the triumph of the counter-revolution in July 1971, the ties between the CPS, its organizations and broad sections of the working people have never been so strong and effective as they are today. There is every reason to say that real conditions are now taking shape for a re-establishment of the Communist Party's leading positions in the trade unions and democratic public organizations, in the mass movement as a whole.

This is naturally a source of alarm for the ruling regime. Once again it has inflicted savage blows at the working-class party. After the communists and democrats were released from prison and concentration camps in May 1978, under growing pressure from the popular movement the world-wide campaign of international solidarity, the authorities have once again resorted to mass arrests, among whose victims are about 500 members of our party.

But we are sure that whatever the repressions the dictatorship may stage, the change that has taken place is irreversible. The mounting tide of revolutionary struggle will radically transform the balance of forces in the Sudan's political arena, putting an end to the existing dead-end situation, and opening up the way for fulfilling the tasks of a national democratic revolution and advancing our country towards its socialist future.

1. The military coup which installed the present ruling regime. — *Ed.*

2. In 1976, three so-called platforms were set up in the Arab Socialist Union, Egypt's only mass political organization. Under a 1977 law, they were transformed into 'political parties', operating under the control of the ASU's Central Committee, although under the same law all the Union's organizations had been disbanded. In July 1978, the ASU was wound up for good. — *Ed.*

3. Shariat, an Islamic code of religious, ethical and legal prescriptions. — *Ed.*

4. Document 'On the Program', p. 41 (Arabic).

5. See interview by Babrak Karmal, General Secretary, CC, PDPA, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the DRA, to a *WMR* correspondent, *WMR*, April 1980.

Threat to Irish independence

Thomas O'Flaherty
Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Ireland,
CPI representative on *WMR*

Ireland is a semi-developed industrial-agrarian country. In 1973, for the first time ever, the number of people employed in industry exceeded the number employed in agriculture. The major problem of the Irish economy since the foundation of the state to the present day has been the problem of unemployment. In the past decade the unemployment rate has rarely fallen below 10 per cent. The large share of exports and imports in the gross domestic product (exports 41.2 per cent, imports 48.8 per cent) makes the country strongly dependent on fluctuations in prices and demand on the world capitalist market.

Ireland's economy is vulnerable and as a classical 'small open economy' easy prey for foreign investment. The past two decades have seen an unprecedented penetration of the economy by foreign-based companies. The purpose of this article is to examine the impact of these foreign firms on the Irish economy, the implications of the government strategy of luring foreign investors, and the problems posed for and alternatives open to the working class and progressive forces.

The policy of attracting foreign investment and loans was adopted in the late 1950s. The love affair of the dominant sections of the national bourgeoisie with imperialism began even earlier. From the foundation of the free-state their policy was one of concessions to the interests of British imperialism. The year 1958 marked a new departure for the Irish government. In that year it decided to abandon any attempts to establish a native industrial base, and any idea of pursuing an independent economic policy. Sean Lemass, then Prime Minister, decided that the best means of industrializing the country was to invite foreign investment. The vehicle for the attraction of this investment was to be the industrial Development Administration (IDA). The scheme was obviously a 'success,' for a directory published by the IDA early in 1979 listed as many as 656 foreign firms operating in Ireland. This 'success' has been in part due to actions of the IDA itself and of the government and in part to objective factors.

The government has, through the IDA, offered many incentives to the multinationals to invest in Ireland. Foremost among these have been grants

helping multinationals to set up subsidiaries in Ireland, and tax exemptions. Tax concessions, until recently, took the form of export tax relief for a number of years. Many of the firms set up under the policy adopted in the late 1950s are approaching the end of their tax-relief period. This would, of course, remove a major attraction of the investment in Ireland. However, a new 10 per cent corporation tax has been introduced. This tax, to be levied from 1981 on, will apply both to firms producing for export and for the home market. It should not affect the competitive capacity of corporations and should encourage the multinationals to remain in Ireland until the end of the century, when the term of the measure expires.

The IDA was also helped in its work by the post-war tendency of the multinationals to invest in developed capitalist countries. The Irish Republic is not on the level of the most developed capitalist countries of Western Europe, and is certainly underdeveloped relative to its partners in the EEC. However, its position on the periphery of this integrated area, and its decision to join the EEC, made it an attractive base for overseas investors, all the more since it has a cheap yet educated labor force. The interaction of these conditions with the above-mentioned incentives and the IDA's readiness to guarantee the competitive capacity of multinationals made Ireland an attractive area for them. In 1976 an economist with the Economic and Social Research Institute estimated that 38 per cent of private investment came from IDA-sponsored foreign firms.[1] A large percentage of these firms are subsidiaries of multinationals. But over a quarter of this investment was financed by the state through IDA grants.

To be sure, not all the foreign interests in the Republic of Ireland are sponsored by the IDA. Some needed no inducement to come. Foremost among these are mining and oil interests who hope to reap a rich harvest on the newly-discovered natural resources in Ireland. Substantial deposits of lead and zinc, for instance, were discovered at Navan, and recent explorations have shown that Ireland has rich offshore deposits of oil and gas. The exploitation of these resources is crucial to the future development of the Irish economy. They could also provide an industrial base. However, yet again it appears that the multinationals will assume control of these resources. By 1974, 64 oil companies had applied for exploitation rights and, of course, the seven major companies were foremost among these.

In 1978 IDA concluded negotiations for projects which committed an overall investment of £392 million; £150 million of this will come from new overseas investment and a very large percentage of the remainder will come from the multinationals already established in Ireland. Again, the state's commitment is high. Of the £392 million, approximately 38.6 per cent will come from IDA grants. These figures show that investment by the multinationals will be very expensive for the Irish taxpayer as in the past. In 1978 the IDA spent £55 million in grants and a further £8.9 million on promotion, etc., to attract multinationals.

Has the expense been justified? Those in favor of the policy of pandering to foreign monopolies have argued that Ireland's high growth rate and its high rate of exports have been due to investments from abroad. And indeed, Ireland has had one of the highest growth rates in Europe in the past two decades, averaging 4-4.5 per cent. Ireland's overseas trade has been increasing at a rate much higher than world trade as a whole. But these indices are deceptive, and are in fact indications of the inefficacy of the current policy, for in terms of strengthening the Irish economy or of providing employment they mean very little. As most of the resultant profits go to foreign-based monopolies there is not enough reinvestment in Ireland. Nor does the high growth rate generate further real industrial expansion. Monopoly penetration, rather than bringing long-term economic prosperity, has tended to make the Irish economy dependent.

It does so in a number of ways. The exports are dependent in the first place on the marketing and distribution links of the parent organization. The reason is that many of the industries in Ireland controlled by foreign capital import partly finished products and export them again in many cases still as partly finished products. This means that the multinationals can operate without regard to the Irish economy because they are not dependent on it for raw materials, parts, or markets. Nor do they promote the growth of related industries in Ireland. On the contrary, the economy ultimately becomes dependent on the multinationals, particularly in export-oriented industries. They control not only the marketing of the product but also the supply of raw materials. With such integrated international production processes, the multinational is always able to shut down its factories in Ireland when conditions are not satisfactory, or when more attractive conditions are to be found elsewhere. (In July 1979, the director of the Japanese-based Asahi Chemical International said that unless there was an end to industrial trouble the firm might withdraw from Ireland. Asahi has already received a £3 million grant from the Irish government.)

This dependence is central to the whole question of foreign investment in Ireland to date, and will be in the future. Already the monopolies are dictating the nature of investment in the Irish economy. Their emphasis is on extensive investment in capital-intensive industries, which will ensure profits, but provide little employment, although Ireland's main problem has always been, even in boom periods, that of providing employment. The penetration of the economy by the multinationals has done nothing to solve this problem. The exodus from the countryside and layoffs in traditional industries — sewing, shoe and textiles — due to cuts in production caused by worsening crisis phenomena and to the increased competition of imports following the abolition of customs duties are continuing. As a result, unemployment grows year after year (official statistics sets it at 110,000 today). The problem is made no easier by the fact that many foreign com-

panies use chiefly unskilled labor and bring skilled workers from their own countries.

The multinationals make the Irish economy dependent on imported capital goods. Those who favor capital-intensive industry say that the alternative is concentration in such labor-intensive industries as textiles and making Ireland a 'Taiwan of Europe'. This, however, misses the point. After all some of the industries created, although capital-intensive, have much in common with the industries of Taiwan. They create products or components which, although they up export figures, do nothing to create a healthy economic environment.

The real point is that Ireland needs and will need investment in industries that create capital goods. It will also need capital-intensive industries. What is needed at present is to ensure that resources are used in such a way as to tackle pressing economic problems or, in other words, that available capital is invested in industries capable of providing employment and a basis for future development. It is precisely such a utilization of resources that foreign monopoly penetration is blocking.

Now such facts show the concrete basis of demands for self-determination for the people of Ireland as a whole. Such demands are not merely pieces of emotional rhetoric but recognize that until the Irish people control the economy of the country, there can be no long-term positive development, economically or socially. Second, the facts show that foreign monopoly penetration of the Irish economy is a major barrier to growth and that these monopolies must therefore be viewed as an important enemy of the Irish working-class movement and its allies.

The situation is not changed by the fact that the thrust of the monopolies has brought in its wake some welcome side effects, culturally and economically. To be specific, obscurantist attitudes to women's place in society, to sexual morality, etc., are changing. Rapid industrial development has played a part in this. However, the monopolies have brought about no positive changes of a more serious nature. Rather, they have purveyed their own mass culture which has tended to undermine the Irish cultural and even natural identity. There is a danger that Ireland may become a desert, a market only for the cheapest products of America's culture industry.

Economically, too, the 'benefits' of foreign penetration have been of destructive nature, and also deceptive. The defenders of the monopolies have argued that, in eliminating the inefficient native capitalist class, the monopolies have created large-scale industries, a modern industrial network, and an industrial working class. As regards the native bourgeoisie, it is a potentially disastrous mistake to counterpose them to the monopolies, and then to choose the 'better alternative' on the basis of efficiency. Of course, the communists' aim is to provide a secure economic base, but, more important, their aim is to end the exploitation of man by man. And the monopolies are a greater obstacle in the struggle for both these aims than the native bourgeoisie. The house is still being plundered and it is of no more than academic interest to the victim that the latest burglar is doing a better job. Perhaps a deeper error is to assume that the multinationals have eliminated the native capitalists. Rather, they have taken the most important sections of that class and integrated them into their own system of exploitation. Of course, many smaller businessmen find the penetration of foreign monopolies is not in their interest and are forced into a position where they may become a part of the struggle against the monopolies.

The level of employment in industry has hovered around 1,060,000 for the past two decades. A study published in 1978 stated that overseas firms employed an average of 135 workers each in 1973, and that only two enterprises then employed over 1,000 workers. Other investments involving large-scale employment have since come to Ireland. This has also meant a numerical growth in the industrial working class. But this does not imply that the working-class movement should view the penetration of the economy by foreign firms as a positive development. The theory that simply because they have created a large working class the multinationals must be welcomed in Ireland, rests on the assumption that the existence of a working class ensures its victory. It ignores the conscious, subjective role of that class. The Irish working class must combine day-to-day struggle against their immediate employer with the struggle to end the dependent nature of the economy. If they do not carry out the latter task then ultimately they will be forced to defend the artificial industrial base to preserve their livelihoods.

Growing foreign monopoly penetration of the Irish economy in the past two decades has some new features. There are several reasons for this. The past twenty years have altered the position where British capital was the sole exploiter of the Irish economy. Of the new capital investment in Ireland in this period, 50 per cent has come from the USA. West European and Japanese capital has increasingly penetrated the Irish economy. Joining the EEC meant that Ireland's economy was no longer totally dependent on Britain's. This process was intensified last year when in joining the European Monetary System (EMS) the government broke the link with sterling.

Does this mean that British imperialism is no longer the main enemy of the Irish working-class movement and of its potential allies? No, it does not. Britain's position is weaker now but Britain still is the main imperialist force in Ireland, it is Britain which directly controls Northern Ireland and maintains a physical presence there. In the event of an extreme crisis Britain would be the most likely imperialist power to intervene politically or militarily in Ireland. In the key area of finance, it is British financial institutions which are the main force in Irish commerce.

The new economic developments underline Ireland's subjugation by imperialism. The American investment and the EEC ties intensify rather than

relieve all the old problems. Neither has allowed the country to pursue an independent economic course. The anti-imperialist struggle in Ireland has become more complex and there are now three main, inseparable arenas of struggle. It is a struggle to rid the country of British domination, to withdraw both parts of the country from the EEC, and to end foreign monopoly penetration and control of the economies. The struggle against British imperialism is crucial as it is an important feature in all the three arenas. At its 17th congress (Belfast, February 1979), the Communist Party of Ireland, while emphasizing the role of British imperialism as the major oppressor of the Irish people, stressed the need to avoid the political cul-de-sac of separating and contrasting individual aspects of imperialism's domination of our country, e.g., the physical British presence in the North versus U.S. monopoly penetration of that area. Both must be attacked by the progressive forces, which should draw support, in the first place, from the working-class movement, its trade union organizations and its political parties.

Inevitably, the trade union movement in Ireland has, on a number of occasions, come into conflict with the foreign monopolies. This is due not only to the blackmailing tactics of these companies during negotiations, but also to their hostility to any form of trade union organization. This is particularly true of American-based companies, which have attempted — some openly and others covertly — to stop their workers joining unions. Over the years, however, they have been forced to retreat from this policy. Last year, after a long strike, McDonalds, the giant hamburger chain, were forced to recognize trade unions.

Another outcome of the battle between unions and the multinationals has been a growing tendency for the firms to negotiate an agreement with one particular union before opening a factory at all. One union negotiating in a factory has advantages for workers in that it makes them a more homogeneous and more formidable force. This also has its faults, however. It cuts down the worker's freedom of choice. He may have to leave one union and join another in order to obtain employment. Skilled workers cannot join their traditional or craft unions. As it is with the biggest unions that the monopolies negotiate, the suspicions of the smaller unions that the former aim to swallow them up are increased. Of greater importance is the fact that workers on entering employment find themselves tied by agreements to which they were not a party.

The trade union movement has, in recent times, begun to look beyond the workplace towards the economy as a whole. At the Conference of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions in 1979 delegates adopted policies which called for the expansion of the public sector, greater public control of exploration and extraction of mineral deposits, public ownership of the entire industry. In addition, the conference called for the reinvestment at home of part of the profits of companies aided by public funds, and for an increase in corporation tax. There is still a long way to go; while these policies would seriously curb the power of the multinationals, the ICTU has not yet clearly identified the multinationals as a major enemy whose penetration into the country's economy must be ended.

The communists consider that the government must place conditions of operation on the foreign monopolies already active in Ireland. Such conditions would include the following:

'Areas of the economy should be protected from their (the multinationals'. — *T.O'F.*) intrusion. They should be compelled to reinvest profits in Ireland. They must contribute to infrastructural costs such as housing, schools, transport systems, urban development. They must contribute to the development of local resources and technology. They must not discriminate against local workers as regards pay, working conditions, training, promotion, access to technological know-how and managerial responsibility. They must redeploy workers displaced because of rationalization or transfer of activities. They must guarantee all trade union rights. Coercive measures against unions must be strictly prohibited. They must contribute to the development of scientific and technological research in Ireland. Workers must have free access to all information regarding all of the company's activities.'[2]

As regards alternatives to the present economic policies, the overall strategy should be to utilize our own natural resources in the best possible way. A main vehicle for this would be state-owned enterprises. A key demand concerns the nationalization of the banks and of all the mineral and oil and gas resources in Ireland. The former is urgent because of the growth of the banks' power in recent years, their role in dictating areas of investment and their links with multinationals. As for the latter, the exploitation and processing of our natural resources should not only supply sizable revenue but help create further industries, which the multinationals are not keen to develop in Ireland. The public sector will be the main vehicle in opposing foreign monopoly penetration. It is as well thought to be aware that under the present political system, with foreign capital assuming a more decisive role in the economy, there is the danger that the state sector will be used to service the monopolies. To strengthen its international positions, Ireland should fully development mutually beneficial relations with all countries, primarily the socialist countries.

Such are the main program provisions of the Left opposing the government's economic policy. This program, drafted under the leadership of the CPI, was amended and specified by the 17th congress of Ireland's communists. The political resolution of the congress contains the following passage: 'The policy of both British and Irish governments, of providing lucrative incentive grants to attract multinational companies to Ireland, is incorrect, as the experience of those affected by closures of branches of these companies proves. The main priority should be to change this policy in favor of

increased investment and expansion of locally based industry, especially publicly owned manufacturing industry. Complementary to this, it is essential that a proper relationship be established between both parts of Ireland and existing or proposed multinational companies. The main feature of this new relationship should be more control over all aspects of these companies.'[3]

1. A. Dale Tussing, "Investment and Its Control" in: *The Irish Economy. What Has to Be Done*, Dublin, 1976.
2. *For People's Unity*. CPI, Dublin, 1979, p. 31.
3. Ibid.

Why Soviet people do not want war

The very fact that this question is brought up at all evokes wonder and the counter-question: Why should they want war? But because bourgeois propaganda is stridently cultivating the 'Soviet military threat' myth, we deliberately raise it in the heading. To show what lies behind this monstrous invention, it would be useful to recall some of the facts of the past and present. This is exactly what the following letter does.

It was the early morning of Sunday, June 22, 1941, in a season when nature was bathed in warm summer silence, the soft tranquility of ripening grain, and the caressing freshness of the forests. It was on that morning of rest that war with all its horrors burst in on a nation which worked tirelessly all the other days of the week building a new society. It changed the lives of millions of people, bringing blood, devastation, and grief to our peaceful land.

We Soviet people will not forget that day of June 22. It left an unhealing wound. We frequently say 'before' and 'after' the war. Although the glory of victory over Hitlerite fascism, a victory to which the Soviet people made the largest contribution, muted the tragedy of that first day and the march of time is taking us father and farther away from it, the memory of it will not fade. The principal reason for this is that the pain of irredeemable loss continues to pierce the hearts of new generations.

Let us recall the facts, which speak for themselves — maybe in other countries not everybody knows or remembers them. An indication of this is that in the United States of America the television serial about the Great Patriotic War was called 'The Unknown War'.

More than 20 million Soviet people died in the war. Not a single family in the Soviet Union was spared the grief of personal loss. A toll of 20 million is, I am not afraid of the word, a terrible price: it adds up to 40 per cent of the number of people who died in the world during that war.

Let me give some other ineradicable statistics. On Soviet territory the nazi invaders shot or tortured to death more than 6 million civilians and nearly 4 million Soviet soldiers. There were huge civilian losses in the rear regions: the people were bombed and strafed, and besieged towns were starved. The invaders subjected more than four million to slave labor in Germany and in countries occupied by it. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens died in the nazi death camps of Buchenwald, Oswiecim, Dachau, Saksenhausen, Majdanek, and many others.

I should like to make special mention of the losses suffered by two of our republics — Byelorussia and the Ukraine — where I fought. During the occupation the nazis killed nearly five million civilians and prisoners of war in the Ukraine and over 2,200,000 in Byelorussia. The world knows what happened in the village of Khatyn, near Minsk: the nazis destroyed it entirely together with its inhabitants. In upwards of 60 major punitive operations against the republic's civilian population, the fate of Khatyn was shared by roughly 700 villages. The invaders set up 260 concentration camps, hundreds of prisons, and ghetto regions in occupied Byelorussia. Some 150,000 Soviet people died in Polotsk, roughly 100,000 in Gomel, over 90,000 in Vitebsk, and hundreds of thousands in other Byelorussian towns. In other words, Byelorussia lost one-fourth of its population in the war. I cannot tell how these unnerving statistics are seen abroad, but they continue to be chilling for Soviet people.

I should also like to recall that many of my countrymen gave their lives not only in defense of their own, socialist motherland, but also in order to deliver other nations from nazi slavery. Over three million Soviet soldiers fell in the battles for the liberation of European and Asian countries. This fact, too, cannot be forgotten or erased.

The loss of life is the most irreparable. In the war many died young, leaving no children or grandchildren to carry on their family name and their work. But one should also recall the enormous material losses. The destruction wrought by the nazi invaders on Soviet territory, the barbarism and inhumanity shown by them know no parallel in history. They reduced to ruin hundreds of towns, more than 70,000 townships, villages, and hamlets, and over six million buildings, leaving nearly 25 million people homeless. Some large cities — Stalingrad, Minsk, Sevastopol, Novorossiisk — were virtually wiped from the face of the earth.

It would be hard to calculate the loss inflicted by the war on our economy, which was built up by hard work. The invaders destroyed nearly 32,000 factories and looted 98,000 collective farms, 1,876 state farms, and 2,890 machine-and-tractor stations. Because of the hostilities the farming area diminished by one-fourth, land-cultivation deteriorated, and the crop yield declined. The nazis shipped to Germany a huge quantity of grain, seven

million horses, and 17 million head of cattle. The material damage suffered by the USSR amounted to 2,600,000 million roubles. Our national wealth was reduced by 30 per cent.

If these figures are translated into the language of memory, people of my generation can say from their own experience how long these appalling consequences of the war were felt. For many years our people suffered privation and incredible hardship. There was an acute shortage of prime necessities: food, clothes, footwear, and housing. Of course, we have now moved very far from those days. But it would be legitimate to ask: How much above our present level would our socialist country have risen had it not been for these colossal losses and enormous destruction.

Back in the 1920s, when he called for the exclusion of war from the life of nations, Lenin justifiably noted: 'We know, we know only too well, the incredible misfortunes that war brings to the workers and peasants' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 148).

We wholeheartedly support the cause of peace not only because of our experience, although that experience cannot be written off. The main thing is that the desire for peace is implicit in our socialist system, a system to which militarism and aggression are alien. The Decree on Peace was the first foreign-policy act of the October Revolution. For Soviet people the development and consolidation of socialism and the building of communism spell out the strengthening of world peace. Of course, we were forced to participate in the Second World War: we had to defend our native land, our socialist social system, and our very lives.

It would seem that this should be obvious to everybody. But there are perturbing signs. A few days ago I read that in its story about the Second World War a French textbook, entitled *The Modern World*, does not even mention the terrible losses of the Soviet people and says not a word about our policy of peace: this would evidently conflict with the 'Soviet military threat' myth that is daily drummed into people's heads by the bourgeois press. Also, I must mention that although I personally have not been abroad since the war; many of my friends have been in foreign countries and what they tell me corroborates newspaper reports that even some progressives in capitalist countries regard the Soviet Union as an 'aggressive state' or at least equate the aggressive actions of the imperialists, who do not stop at undermining world peace, with assistance to peoples defending their revolutionary gains.

As I see it, this is a result of uncritical acceptance of bourgeois propaganda, of its stereotypes. People must realize, as Leonid Brezhnev said in defining the mainsprings of Soviet peaceableness, that 'in the Soviet Union no class, social stratum, or professional group is interested in war or preparations for war, or can count on profiting from it.'

We ourselves, the entire people, are masters of the nation's factories and fields. We link an improvement of our welfare to our work and not to military conquest. We have neither exploiters nor monopolies, nor a military-industrial complex interested in an arms race and imperialist brigandage.

Any unbiased person can clearly see that none other than the Soviet Union has always pursued a policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The CPSU and the Soviet Union continue to act in the spirit of the Program of Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples adopted at the 24th congress of the CPSU. This program was amplified at the 25th congress. Its principal aims are to ensure peaceful conditions for the building of a communist society, strengthen the socialist world system, and deliver humankind from wars. The policy of peace is institutionalized in the constitution of the USSR.

One hardly needs to recite the long list of the Soviet Union's acts, initiatives, and proposals aimed at consolidating peace and promoting international cooperation. Without them there would have been no European conference in Helsinki, no special UN General Assembly on disarmament, no SALT-2, and none of the many other important events strengthening peace.

Those inclined to believe the clamor about the notorious 'Soviet military threat' or 'Soviet aggressiveness' should recall facts of the past and present. They should recall where the atom bomb was first developed and who dropped it on Japanese cities. They should recall who made a practice of nuclear blackmail in international relations; who set up the aggressive North Atlantic bloc four years after the Second World War and thereby divided the world into confronting military groups; who is now developing new types of weapons — neutron, laser, genetic, infrasound — deploying nuclear missiles in foreign countries, enlarging networks of military bases, landing troops on foreign territory, and brandishing swords.

Soviet people do not want war. But we are not pacifists and nobody should entertain the illusion that we will tremble in the face of imperialist threats. If they have to defend a just cause, the Soviet citizens know how to fight — this, too, is well known. We do not forget Lenin's behest that in order to safeguard the gains of the revolution the socialist motherland's defense capability must be maintained at the proper level. We remember this and draw the necessary conclusions.

As regards the question that sounds like the refrain of the popular song 'Do the Russians Want War,' on the eve of the anniversary that always makes me reflect, I should like to declare without equivocation:

'No, we do not and cannot want war.'

Ivan Pavlov
Veteran of the Great Patriotic War
Volgograd, USSR

the press

Through the prism of revolution

A REVIEW OF THREE BOOKS ON IRAN

For some years now world public opinion has been focussed on Iran. In February of last year the Iranian people, convinced of the righteousness of their cause, rose in anger against a tyrannical, despotic regime that was considered a reliable pillar of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East. A people's anti-monarchic, anti-imperialist revolution has been accomplished, but U.S. imperialism has not reconciled itself with it. When the USA failed to wreck the revolution from within, it came out with a direct threat of military intervention, an economic blockade, and severed diplomatic relations with Iran. The length to which the Carter administration can go in its dangerous gambles is evidenced by the abortive U.S. military operation against Iran at the close of April, which angered the whole of world opinion, while shocking and frustrating even the devoted NATO partners of the USA. The Islamic Republic of Iran declared in no uncertain terms that it would defend its revolution.

The swift succession of events in and around Iran has given much food for thought. The Iranian revolution has been discussed not only in the world press. The first books about it have now been published. I will dwell on three of them: *Iran in Revolt*, *Iran: The Weak Link* and *Iran: A Revolution in the Name of God*.[1]

All three were written with undisguised sympathy for the Iranian people. Their authors have tried to explain why a revolutionary explosion took place in a country that was looked upon as a dependable bulwark of imperialism. They take a close look at Iran's history, especially of the post-war period, and analyze, with differing degrees of competence, the social, economic, and political aspects of pre-revolutionary Iran. The authors of *Iran in Revolt* and *Revolution in the Name of God* witnessed the events they describe.

Of special interest, in my view, are the pages dealing with the causes of the revolution, its motive forces, character, and international significance.

Trying to unravel what lay behind the events in Iran, the authors of *Iran: The Weak Link* substantively researched the socio-economic contradictions that had accumulated in Iranian society under the shah. 'I was going to make a modern state out of my medieval country within a decade and I have almost succeeded,'[2] said the shah after his banishment. The book dispells this myth. The agrarian reform, one of the most essential elements of the so-called white revolution, designed to introduce a capitalist agro-structure into the feudal countryside, appeared to be anti-peasant rather than anti-feudal: it ruined huge numbers of peasants and brought the country to the verge of famine (about 60 per cent of the nation's food was imported, mainly from the USA). Driven from their land, the peasants went to the cities where, unable to find work and housing, they became lumpen-proletarians. The so-called industrialization placed Iran in a situation in which it was sold out to transnational corporations (mostly U.S.), its industry grew lop-sided, and 70 to 80 per cent of it was dependent on the imperialist monopolies.

Those who gauged Iran's economy only by the unprecedented growth of the national income (which was due to the high rate of oil production and the fast rise of oil prices) forgot that the people received practically nothing. Moreover, they were pressed still harder by exploitation and the high cost of living springing from unabating inflation. The gulf between the extravagant luxury of the shah's court and the elite and the grievous plight of the people widened steadily.

From 1970 to 1977 there were 124 strikes (*Iran: The Weak Link*, pp. 270-293). Progressive intellectuals and minor officials were outraged by the corruption in the government apparatus. The national bourgeoisie, pushed by foreign capital into the background, defended its interests, demanding the observance of the 1906 constitution, which said that the shah reigns but not rules. In other words, it demanded participation in running the country and a limitation of the shah's power. The social and economic contradictions were aggravated by the regime's policy of repression, which added to the people's dissatisfaction and was, in the opinion of all the authors, the main cause of the revolution.

The regime, of course, was aware of the growing discontent and took harsh measures to mute it. 'The shah,' we read in *Revolution in the Name of God*, 'was a despot. He behaved like an Oriental tyrant and brooked no authority; his court and family were up to their necks in corruption and crime; they eliminated anyone who opposed them' (p. 111). 'We had to deal not only with communists but also with students, the clergy, workers, and also foreign-educated Iranians,' admitted a senior SAVAK official. 'To keep the Pahlavi dynasty in power and protect the shah himself became far more important than to combat communism.' Created with the help of the CIA and of Mossad, the Israeli intelligence service, SAVAK dealt with the

people who did not suit the regime by methods so brutal that it made SAVAK perhaps the most horrible repressive machine that ever existed in the world.

The army, too, was used to suppress the opposition. 'Since 1974,' writes Behrang, 'Iran has been among the world's ten main military powers' (p. 96); it was the seventh on the list of the world's biggest military spenders and second to none in the Middle East as to the size of its armed forces — 423,000 (p. 89). Of the $100,000 million received in 1972-1977 from the sale of oil, almost $80,000 million were spent on armaments and the maintenance of the army. Imperialism supplied Iran with weapons not only to enable its army to police the country. Owing to the army, equipped mainly with U.S.-made hardware, consulted by U.S. advisers, and commanded by officers trained in the USA, Iran, a member of the aggressive CENTO bloc, became a policeman in the Persian Gulf area, helping other reactionary regimes to crush national liberation movements. Thus, we are reminded by the book *Iran: The Weak Link*, the anti-imperialist movement in the Dhofar Province of Oman was defeated in 1972 with the help of an Iranian punitive force.

During the shah's rule hundreds of thousands were sent to prison, thousands were executed without trial, murdered or tortured to death. During the year preceding the shah's fall some 60,000 were shot dead by the army and SAVAK; 'Iran was one of the most murderous dictatorships in the world' (*Iran: A Revolution in the Name of God*, p. 112).

However, as it has often happened in history, the regime achieved nothing by repression. Popular resistance mounted. The political struggle waged by the anti-imperialist forces, in which the People's Party of Iran played the biggest role, never stopped for a day. The pot was boiling. (Compare that situation with the mood of U.S. President Carter who said in a speech in Teheran on the eve of 1977: 'Iran, because of the great leadership of the shah, is an island of stability in one of the more troubled areas of the world.' Addressing the shah he said: 'This is a great tribute to you, Your Majesty, and to your leadership and to the respect and the admiration and love which your people give to you').[3]

But even general discontent could remain latent for long. Someone had to assume the leading role, inspire the movement, and raise the banner. The Tudeh Party is of the opinion that 'the subjective factor which made use of the objective situation in the country was, parallel with several parties, the nationalistic and left-wing groups, the force which fought the regime under the banner of new Islam, or young Islam, and could assume the leadership of our revolution. . . .'[4]

The authors of *Iran: The Weak Link* take a dialectical approach to the role of the Shiite clergy in the revolution, believing that religious views are, as Marx put it, at one and the same time an *expression* of the ugliness of the exploiting system and a *protest* against it. The broad and violent intrusion of bourgeois civilization into Iranian reality evoked, according to Behrang, its denunciation, and even revulsion, among religious people (see p. 58).

It is not without reason that ayatollah Khomeini sees one of the main problems facing the republic in educating young people and delivering them from cringing to the decaying West. Therefore the Iranian revolution is characterized (*Iran: The Weak Link*) not only as an anti-monarchic and anti-imperialist but also as a cultural revolution.

The ostensibly spontaneous popular movement, writes Behrang, was nevertheless well organized. Describing the strict discipline and self-restraint of the huge masses of people at meetings and demonstrations in the tense autumn of 1978, when a small disturbance would have been enough for the army, placed on stand-by alert, to start a carnage, the authors arrive at the conclusion that 'there should be no underestimating the role of the political organizations inspired either by Islamic or Marxist ideology' (p. 57). It is understandable that the political parties and groups, weakened by many years of repression and driven underground, built up their influence during the national movement.

The mosques, which the shah did not dare to touch, became uniting centers of the Iranian patriots. Early in 1979 there were 150,000 mullahs in the country, most of them having come from the midst of the people. In the mosques they harangued the urban and rural poor and organized groups of fighters for the sacred cause against tyranny and imperialism. In the mosques, says *Iran: The Weak Link*, 'they distributed leaflets and pamphlets. The people were called upon to adhere to the great ideals of Islam, they were reminded of martyrs; they burned with anger, and their resolve grew stronger . . . At first, freedom was only there (in the mosques), and from there it rushed out into the streets' (p. 59). It was in the mosques that people listened to the tape-recorded speeches of ayatollah Khomeini, who was in exile at the time.

While stating that the Shiite clergy was the organizing force of the revolution, the authors are not of the opinion that the revolution was carried out by some vanguard, or class, more dissatisfied with its position than others. It was a cause of the entire nation. The people's unity was, so to say, the unity of everything 'good and kind' that was determined to defeat all that was 'bad and evil' (*Iran in Revolt*, p. 259). At the same time the authors admit the great role of the industrial workers, especially the oilmen of Abadan: ' . . . the workers made the decisive move and checkmated the shah' (pp. 205-206), since the national strike which paralyzed the country's economy for nine months was the prelude to the revolution. They note also the massive participation of women in the struggle for the overthrow of the monarchic dictatorship (see p. 215).

The workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, the 'bazaar', the lumpen-proletarians, and the national bourgeoisie — all these social groups pursued their own goals in the revolution. But all had one common goal: to fight the shah and imperialist domination. 'Religion . . . What role did it play?' asks philosopher Michel Foucault, a witness of the

February events, in a talk with the authors of *Revolution in the Name of God*. 'Was it not the role of a unifying ideology which made it possible to conceal the contradictions and ensure the close unity of diverse interests?' (p. 230).

Realizing that, despite its religious coloring, the people's revolution was anti-monarchic and anti-imperialist, that is, democratic, the Tudeh Party supported and continues to support the course of ayatollah Khomeini, since from the outset the party's program — calling for a struggle against imperialism, the liquidation of the despotic regime, and the setting up of a people's republic, for socio-economic changes for the benefit of the people — coincided with the main provisions of the program of the Islamic revolution.

The authors of *Iran: The Weak Link* see the Islamic slogans of the revolution as a way of expressing the people's social demands, whereas the authors of the other two books regard the religious coloring of the revolution as something mysterious and incomprehensible. Khomeini 'amazed the world when he proved that religion can still move mountains', say the authors of *Iran in Revolt* (p. 287). The authors of *Revolution in the Name of God* see in the revolution a challenge to materialism. This idea has been repeatedly emphasized in statements by some of the present-day leaders of Iran.

However, there is nothing enigmatic or mystical about the Iranian revolution. No ideology, however sophisticated, can suppress the natural and ineradicable striving of the working people to assert their dignity, improve their living conditions, and defend their vital interests and rights. The struggle for socio-economic and democratic interests is so important to the masses that religious motives retreat into the background before them. This is the view of Marxists-Leninists.

In *Iran in Revolt* and *Revolution in the Name of God* the revolution of February 1979 is described as 'unprecedented'. If one has in mind the form of the anti-shah struggle chosen by the people (unending massive protest marches, disobedience to the authorities, mass participation of women and teenagers in demonstrations), then one would agree that 'unprecedented' is the proper world. But for all its specifics due to Iranian reality, this revolution is, above all, a logical expression of the anti-imperialist movement, which in our time has reached immense proportions. It may be likened to the victorious national liberation and democratic revolutions that swept across Africa, Asia, and Latin America in the 1970s. The Iranian revolution confirmed the general laws of the world revolutionary process. This is the conclusion prompted by the book *Iran: The Weak Link*.

The three books, naturally, analyze the international significance of the Iranian revolution. 'The uprising in Iran,' says *Iran in Revolt*, 'has set an example for the Arab and Muslim masses' (p. 287). 'This lesson must not be forgotten' (ibid.), they warn the West.

But first, one should not see the impact of the revolution as confined to Muslim countries, and second, this warning, of course, will not help imperialism. The peoples of the world use various forms of struggle for independence, against imperialism and neo-colonialism. What happened in Iran in February 1979 can hardly be repeated in the same form in any other country, Muslim or non-Muslim. But the people that are still oppressed will inevitably go over from resistance to a frontal assault against everything 'bad and evil' — this is the mainstream of history.

Hussein Bahrami

1. Paul Balta, Claudine Rulleau, *L'Iran Insurge*, Paris, Editions Sindbad, 1979, 310 pp.; Behrang, *Iran. Le Maillon Faible*, Paris, Maspero, 1979, 358 pp.; Claire Briere, Pierre Blanchet, *Iran: La Revolution au nom de Dieu*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1979, 248 pp. *Iran in Revolt* and *Iran: A Revolution in the Name of God* were written by journalists and *Iran: The Weak Link* by a group of Iranian and French researchers from a Paris centre for the study of anti-imperialist movements: they took the pen-name Behrang in honor of the outstanding Iranian writer Samad Behrangi known for his politically-edged tales. He was a village teacher in Iranian Azerbaijan and devoted all his life to the struggle against the shah's tyranny. In 1968 he was assassinated by SAVAK agents.
2. *Bild am Sonntag*, December 2, 1979.
3. *The New Republic*, January 13, 1979, p. 8.
4. *Donya*, Teheran, No. 1, July 1979, p. 11 (in Persian).

THE BATTLE OF IDEAS IN THE MODERN WORLD

V. Kortunov

Anti-communism from Marx and Engels' time, the Fifties Cold War, to today.

A masterful exposition of the relationship of ideological climate to the politics of the day.

Cloth 364 pp $6.50

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Ideas that have gathered strength

Herbert Mies, *Zur Politik der DKP. Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze.* Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Marxistische Blätter, 1979, 447 pp.

This collection of speeches and articles by Herbert Mies, Chairman of the German Communist Party spans the years 1968-1979, marked by important, often dramatic events in West Germany and the world. The reader will satisfy himself that the communists' class stand, their application of the principles of scientific socialism to present-day conditions, and their analysis of the main trends of social development and the prospects for the revolutionary process enable them to follow an unerring course in fighting for the working people's interests. 'Marxism,' Herbert Mies writes, 'owes its strength to its truth. Marxism is the theoretical basis for liberating the working class and establishing a new social system; hence it is a progressive and constructive theory not only criticizing society but transforming it' (p. 42).

This book gives insight into the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary party of the West German working class, into its ideological and theoretical activity. The communists operating in the homeland of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in difficult conditions, defend the interests of the working class and other working people and the country's national interests. Neither defamation, persecution, intimidation, nor the demand that the party be outlawed on the spurious charge of being 'unconstitutional' can divert it from its path.

West Germany's communists combine day-to-day work among the working people in factory and office with the struggle to bring about fundamental anti-monopoly changes and steer the country to the road to socialism. The numerous tasks tackled by the communists include defense of social and democratic rights, support of the demand of young people for putting education and occupational training on a democratic basis, struggle for a democratic way out of the capitalist crisis, measures to counter the danger of a radical shift to the right in national politics (this danger has increased significantly since CSU Chairman Franz Josef Strauss, spokesman of the extreme right-wing forces of big capital and the military-industrial complex, was nominated for the office of Federal Chancellor), and active participation in the movement against the arms race being escalated by NATO, for peace and security in Europe. But all these tasks are inseparable from the overall struggle for fundamental social changes, for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism.

In reading the book, one realizes that it is not a product of armchair theorizing but a reflection of the class struggle going on in West Germany. The author helps working people, above all young workers, get a clearer idea of the alignment of social forces and realize their own condition, the historical mission of the working class, and the place and role of its allies in the struggle to abolish capitalism and build the new, socialist society.

Excerpts from reports to GCP congresses in Hamburg, Bonn, and Mannheim, speeches to party board meetings, speeches on memorable occasions in the history of the working-class movement, analyses of strikes and democratic and social movements, speeches in defense of the constitution, against Berufsverbote and neonazism, for the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence, against the arms race and for disarmament add up to a vivid description of the situation in West Germany and the class forces active there, their political principles, and the objectives and intentions of West German imperialism.

The GCP Chairman considers these complex problems in detail and demonstrates the necessity for socialism in West Germany. He stresses that only a socialist society can meet the working people's vital demands and bring them social security, real democracy and freedom: 'our party program defines the need to head for democratic and social progress in the FRG as a political priority . . . The struggle for such a change spans a whole stage of the class struggle. Though connected with the present day, it is projected into the future and aimed at winning anti-monopoly democracy and paving the way for socialism . . .' (pp. 386-387). Speaking of socialist society, Herbert Mies says: 'If the working people wield decisive influence in the state and the economy, every prerequisite will be on hand for satisfying the people's growing material and cultural requirements to an ever larger extent, for life in peace, social security, well-being, freedom and justice. This is the meaning of socialism, and it is what we are fighting for' (p. 411).

The book deals primarily with the immediate interests of the West German working class and its allies and with the country's national interests. But it stresses that the workers of all countries have common interests and that proletarian internationalism, the anti-imperialist solidarity of the workers of every country, helps the international communist and working-class movement and the national liberation forces.

The communists of West Germany subscribe wholeheartedly to the principle of proletarian internationalism. While refuting the slander of the monopolized mass media and right-wing social-democratic leaders against existing socialism and exposing their lies about the 'threat from the East,' they tell the people of the achievements of the socialist-community countries and their unchanging policy of peace, international security and cooperation.

'In the socialist countries', Mies writes, 'nobody

waxes fat on armaments. The socialist countries have a strong stake in concentrating on socialist construction and allocating as little money as possible for defense. No propaganda, however subtle, can refute the fact that socialism needs peace and is the principal force of peace' (p. 394).

The communists want more and more people to realize that the gains of socialist countries also serve the interests of the working class of West Germany and every other capitalist country, for these gains inspire the working people to fight social injustice and compel the big bourgeoisie and its political spokesmen to make some concessions to labor.

'We emphasize again and again that our people, the working class of the Federal Republic, have a vital stake in good relations with the Soviet Union, the GDR, and other socialist countries. This is something more to us than just another foreign policy issue' (p. 230). With reference to Ernst Thälmann's internationalist attitude to the Soviet Union when it was the only socialist country, the GCP Chairman states: 'Existing socialism is an immense achievement of the international working-class movement ... The political guideline of the German Communist Party does not show today, nor will it show tomorrow, any distance in regard to existing socialism; on the contrary, it will always point to a solid alliance with the socialist world, primarily with the Soviet Union and the GDR' (ibid.).

Herbert Mies devotes much of his attention to the problem of unity of action by the working class, especially by communist, social-democratic and Christian workers. This unity, which materializes at factory and office level in the most diverse forms, stems logically from the common class interests of the workers and other working people and is the basic condition of their effective and successful activity for the good of labor. 'Our striving for unity of action is always aimed at using even the least coincidence of views with those of the social-democrats as a starting point for joint action while maintaining our fundamental communist position' (p. 307).

While vigorously advocating joint action by the communists and social-democrats and, on the whole, supporting the idea of a democratic alliance, Herbert Mies takes a principled stand against left sectarian, Maoist and Trotskyist views, and the views of right-wing social-democratic leaders. He shows that both 'left' and right-wing opportunism undermine the workers' struggle and injure the working-class and peace movements.

The GCP functions in a highly developed capitalist country, which is now the chief economic and military force of world imperialism along with the United States. In such a country, the revolutionary party of the working class must meet high requirements.

In 1968, when the GCP came into being after a 12-year ban on the Communist Party in the FRG, it did not have to begin from scratch. It continued the more than century-old revolutionary traditions of the German working-class movement. In many of his speeches and articles the GCP chairman looks at past lessons and experience to draw conclusions for the present. He also deals with current tasks of the communists at the factories and among young people. The GCP now has over 46,000 members. Its work centers on big factories and its main effort is geared to building its influence among the workers and young people and to winning new members and supporters primarily among the working people.

The peoples who became victims of nazi aggression during World War II rightly look with hope to the communists of the FRG. The German Communist Party strives to be equal to its internationalist duty and to fulfill its historic tasks in one of the key sectors of the international class struggle.

Eberhard Weber

For working-class unity

Rubens Iscaro, *Una linea consecuente de unidad sindical,* Buenos Aires, Editorial Fundamentos, 1979, 79 pp.

This small but meaningful, fact-studded book by Rubens Iscaro, CC Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Argentina, examines the problem of working-class unity, which is crucial to the nation's political life. Only united, Iscaro says, will the working class be able to act as a vanguard and then unite the other democratic forces around it to surmount the political, social and economic difficulties Argentina was plunged into by the military coup of 1976. He writes:

'If the working class pursues a line for unity, this will strongly encourage the unity of all democrats and progressives. And this depends chiefly on whether understanding is reached between the Peronists and communists, above all with respect to the trade unions' (p. 5). This is the main theme of this book.

Although many unionized workers are still influenced by Peronism and bourgeois nationalist ideology, the proletarian masses as a whole are characterized by democratic and anti-imperialist sentiment. Witness their attitude toward the revolutions in Cuba and Nicaragua. The influence of the organized working-class movement on the nation's political life is quite strong. Nothing has broken the militant spirit of the working class. As a matter of fact this is one of the causes of the instability in the reactionary camp. The right-wing forces are, therefore, eager to nourish the split in the trade union movement.

In referring to the problem of Peronist-communist unity Iscaro explains the essence of the polemic between the two parties. It differs widely from the Peronists' controversy with the other forces. The communists neither praise nor venomously attack Peronism. They will not be misguided by the fact that the Peronist movement still enjoys considerable support among the people. The very character of Peronism, which consists of various trends and political elments, requires a class, scientific approach. Iscaro gives a historical interpretation and objective assessment of Peronism in order to determine its place in the current political process and in the future. He believes that the place held by Peronists should be correctly determined not only by the communists, but also by the Peronists, because some of the latter are eager to use Peronism as an inhibitor in the struggle of the working people, as a barrier to communist ideas. Here they join hands with the *gorillas.*[1]

The political and ideological line of the Communist Party helps to give an objective, critical appraisal of Peronism. Iscaro states: 'We communists . . . distinguish between its democratic and progressive wing, on the one hand, and conservative, right wing, on the other. The former is still capable of acting as a powerful gravitational force in the national revolutionary process' (p. 7). Iscaro makes such an analysis, tying it to the problem of trade union unity.

He points to the anti-fascist, democratic class character of the General Confederation of Labor prior to the military coup in 1943.[2] The stand taken by Peron himself, who realized that without working-class support the movement headed by him would not succeed, was a positive element of the initial structure of the Peronist trade unions. Iscaro writes that the GCL was characterized by social-reformism, social-Christianity, and corporatism, which Peron used to advance his thesis about 'class conciliation'. In Argentina the situation during the Second World War compelled the bourgeoisie to make some concessions to the working class. Peron adroitly used this to win the support of a section of the working class.[3]

He believed that Argentina had a 'special road'. He named his policy a 'national doctrine', rejecting communism on, among other things, the argument that it was an international doctrine. This agreement is still used by enemies of the working class, who try to prevent Peronist-communist unity. Rejecting this false antinomy, Iscaro shows that Peron's 'national' concept of 'class conciliation' could never conceal the actual struggle between antagonistic classes. For the bourgeoisie, whose interests Peron represented and championed, the idea of class peace has always been a cover for exploitation, an ideological bridle on the class consciousness of the working people.[4]

Iscaro analyzes the Communist Party's work in the trade unions, starting with its 11th congress in 1946. In every concrete case he substantiates the position of the communists and their efforts to secure united action with the Peronists. This background clearly reveals the negative aspects of Peronist trade union leadership that lay behind the setbacks suffered by the workers: the preaching of 'class peace'; the direct political dependence of the GCL on the Peronist movement (as a result, the contradictions in the Peronist camp generated differences in the trade union movement); the high degree of subordination of the trade unions to the state; the monopolistic character of the trade union leadership with its inherent bureaucracy, gangster methods, and vertical structure and resultant paternalism and meekness.

United action by the Peronists and communists invariably led to advances by the trade-union and democratic movements; setbacks proved that success could not be achieved without unity. But, Iscaro points out, unity cannot be formal. For instance, in 1973 when Peron became president for the second time, the program of reforms promised by him could have been feasible were it not for his demand for unconditional support of the government, although with its heterogeneous class composition the government was not free of contradictions. It is worth noting that the Communist Party was not interested in its defeat. In the face of a mounting internal struggle unity among the working people, and between the Peronists and communists, was more essential than ever to block the road to the rightists. Iscaro makes it clear that the Peronist government suffered defeat precisely because its policy stemmed from a misinterpretation of the role of the working class, from the idea of splitting the working class.

What does Iscaro prescribe for Argentina's trade union movement so that it should it be equal to the requirements of historical necessity? He believes it should be a movement 'based on the class concept, independence of trade unions, and democracy' (p. 47). There is going to be an argument over this thesis, especially over the question of 'class conciliation' with the Peronists, the Social-Christians, and the ultra-leftists. Although they recognize class struggle, the latter hold an intermediate position between the extreme anarchists and neo-Peronist, conciliatory poles.

Immediately after the military coup of March 24, 1976, the Communist Party of Argentina advanced a platform of action of progressive forces with the purpose of setting up a transitional military-civilian coalition government democratically. This platform remains valid. The main task today is to achieve working-class unity.

In our opinion, Rubens Iscaro's meaningful and thorough work, in which he clearly enunciates his views, may be helpful in acquiring a more profound understanding of reality in Argentina.

Leonardo Paso

1. For instance, the view of General Tomas Sanchez de Bustamente, a *gorilla,* on Peronism is well known. When Juan Peron was in exile in 1970, he said: "Thank God we have Peronism. This is the only mass movement that has not joined the Left." — *Ed.*
2. The coup was staged by the United Officers' Group.

As one of its leaders, Juan Peron, a professional soldier, took over a number of ministerial posts. In 1946 he became President of Argentina. — *Ed.*

3. The Peronist Party was formed in 1947. Since 1955 it has been known as Partido Justicialista (Justice Party). — *Ed.*

4. Addressing a group of entrepreneurs, Peron said: "What I want is to organize the workers nation-wide so that the state would guide them and chart out the road for them. Thus, the ideological and revolutionary trends that might endanger our postwar capitalist society would be nipped in the bud. If you give the workers sops from time to time, it will be easy to control them." (Jorge Correa, *Los Jerarcas Sindicales*, Buenos Aires, 1972, p. 22). — *Ed.*

In memory of Josip Broz Tito

Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, a prominent leader of the international communist and working-class movement, an outstanding leader of the Yugoslav working people, has died after a long and grave illness.

Josip Broz Tito was born on May 25, 1892, in a peasant family in the village of Kumrovec in Croatia. As a youth, he left the countryside and joined the ranks of the urban proletariat. In 1910, he became an activist of the working-class and trade-union movement and joined the Social-Democratic Party of Croatia and Slovenia.

While doing military service in the Austro-Hungarian army, Josip Broz Tito was arrested at the outbreak of the First World War for anti-war propaganda and sent to the front. In 1915, he was wounded and taken prisoner; while in Russia, he joined in the liberation struggle of the country's working class. In July 1917, he was arrested for taking part in a demonstration in Petrograd against the Provisional Government and exiled to the Urals. In October of that year, he joined the Red Guard in Omsk and, together with the Bolsheviks, carried on revolutionary work among the peasants.

In 1920, Josip Broz Tito returned to his homeland, where he joined the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This marked a new stage in the struggle. In 1928, he was arrested and sentenced to a five-year term of imprisonment at hard labor. Released in 1934, he resumed his underground activity. His party comrades elected him a member of the territorial committee of the CP Yugoslavia in Croatia and then a member of the Central Committee of the CP Yugoslavia and the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP Yugoslavia.

From 1935 to 1936, Josip Broz Tito worked in the Comintern in Moscow. Following his clandestine return home, he became the leader of the Party of Yugoslav Communists in 1937.

During the People's Liberation War of 1941-1945, Josip Broz Tito was the organizer and leader of the heroic struggle of the peoples of Yugoslavia against the nazi invaders. Throughout the war, he was the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the People's Liberation Army and the country's partisan units. In 1943, he became the head of the National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia. Under his command, the fighting people stood with honor all the grave trials and made a worthy contribution to the rout of nazi Germany.

After the war, Josip Broz Tito was elected Chairman of the People's Front, and the head of the government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. From 1952, he was General Secretary, and from 1966, Chairman of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. In that capacity, and also as President of the Republic, he put in a great effort to organize socialist construction in the country.

Marshal Josip Broz Tito was thrice awarded the title of People's Hero of Yugoslavia, and received many other awards.

Josip Broz Tito played an important role in developing the non-aligned movement aimed against imperialism and for peace and the security of nations.

The communists of the world will always cherish the radiant memory of Josip Broz Tito.

Focus on industrial workers

Interview with *James West*
Political Bureau member,
CPUSA Central Committee

Q. How would you describe the main aspects of your party's activity among the workers? What tasks have you set yourselves and how do you go about accomplishing them?

A. Historically, the Communist Party of the United States was able to make the decisive contribution to the organization of the unorganized workers into industrial unions in the mass production industries (the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations — CIO) precisely because of its policy of industrial concentration. This policy meant focussing the party's attention on the workers in basic industries with the aim of helping them organize to win their demands and of building the party and its influence in the decisive sector of the population.

In a highly industrialized country like the USA, this would seem to be natural and self-evident. Yet, and because the ruling class itself is no less conscious of the far-reaching, fundamental significance of the role of the basic industrial working class, the pressures for becoming diverted from the concentration policy are ever-present.

Thus, when Browder[1] revisionism took the path of liquidating the party, the first step was abolition of the party's organizations in industry, the shop clubs.[2] They were restored only with the defeat of Browderism.

In the post-war period, pressures from the class enemy increased tremendously and took many forms. The monopoly bourgeoisie promoted every ideological current which would abort the accumulating impulses and trends in the working class toward class struggle and political independence for its class aims.

Experience has shown that the fight to implement the party's concentration policy is one that must be waged without let-up. The fight for its implementation is the litmus test of the Leninist qualities of communists and their collective bodies from top to bottom.

The CPUSA regards this struggle as one for the whole party, and not only for one or another department. Without such all-round and consistent attention, the policy cannot be fulfilled.

In his report to the 22nd National Convention, Gus Hall, General Secretary, attacking the many petty-bourgeois pressures, Marcusean and Maoist concepts which denigrate the role of the working class, said that the industrial workers' standing in the capitalist production process molds them into a class force that is bound to win political power.[3]

How, then, does the party implement its concentration policy? All departments of the party are directed to give priority attention to the primary party organizations in the shops and working-class communities and towns. The party's Labor and Farm Department guides the work of special industry commissions in steel, auto, electrical, transport, and coal mining. Special schools and classes are organized for workers in basic industries and comrades who are directly engaged in industrial concentration. The Department of Problems of Afro-American Liberation, Oppressed Minorities and Nationalities, and other Central Committee departments give prime attention to work among industrial workers, to molding the unity of white, Black and other minority workers and to building the party among them.

The National Convention instructed every district organization to place industrial concentration at the center of its work. In the party's structure, the shop and territorial clubs are the primary forms. A temporary, transitional form exists in many areas, such as industrial clubs and special committees, whose task it is to establish shop clubs. The industrial clubs usually consist of comrades in the same industry, but each working in a different plant. The objective is to establish a shop club around each comrade in his plant. Regional and national conferences of comrades in a given industry have proved productive in clarifying policy and direction, in exchanging experience, in coordinating local activities into national, concerted action, and in building the party and the press.

The promotion of the party press and literature in the shops and especially at factory gates and in working-class communities occupies a very high place in the party's concentration work. Special importance is attached to the issuing of party shop papers and leaflets. They are well received by the workers, as in longshore, electrical and steel. An example is the *Bull's Eye* issued at the Winchester plant in the state of Connecticut. Now in its eighth year of continuous publication, each issue is eagerly awaited by the workers. Together with the *Daily World* it has resulted in greatly increasing the party's influence and prestige. In the last elections for the U.S. Congress, the party's candidate, Joelle Fishman, the state leader of the party, who had become well-known and liked among the Winchester workers, received over 5 per cent of the total vote. The workers came to know her through her many appearances at the plant gates with the shop paper and other party press.

Fear of loss of job is a major factor in retarding

party growth in industry. While the party has a legal status in a quite restricted sense, it is illegal in industry, where the concept of democracy ends at the plant gate. The problem of security for class-conscious workers on the job is an ongoing one.

The solution to this problem lies in a Leninist style of mass work, especially the ability to give leadership by merging with the mass, by uniting communists and non-communists in struggle on urgent needs. The party attaches the highest importance to the initiative of communists in industry in establishing the united front of workers in the form of rank-and-file committees. These rank-and-file forms have been a decisive force in stimulating the re-emergence of a center trend in the trade unions. On the basis of building and strengthening rank-and-file committees in which communists and Left forces occupy leading positions, the process of molding Left-Center unity on issues is well under way. In this lies the path to transforming the unions into fighting instruments of class struggle, unity of the class, of Black, white and other monopoly-oppressed sectors for anti-monopoly political action led by a politically independent working class.

In its united front work, the party is guided by the principle: the united front from below, always; the united front from below and on top, whenever possible; the united front at the top alone, never. Working in this style and spirit, communists have been instrumental in the emergence of national rank-and-file movements in steel and auto and among teachers. In steel, especially, the influence of the rank and file has made its impact on the outcome of elections on the local and district level. The election of a Black steelworker as an international vice-president of the union is the result of a year-long struggle of the Left-led rank-and-file and Black caucus movements.

In the course of everyday rank-and-file work, many workers become radicalized and begin to move to the Left. Experience has shown that often another intermediate form between the rank and file and the party can serve as a bridge over which such workers can be brought to the party. Such forms are discussion groups, classes, meetings with party leaders, as well as individual discussions and other informal means, including social activities. It is in such forms especially that the struggle against the influences of anti-communism and racism, the twin divisive tools of the corporations, can have its most telling effects in addition to the mass education at the plant gates and in the communities.

1. Earl Browder, General Secretary of the CPUSA from 1930 to 1944, advocated the opportunist idea of class collaboration. He saw to it that the 12th Convention (1944) decided to dissolve the party. He was expelled from the party in 1946. — *Ed.*
2. Party branches.
3. Gus Hall, *Report to the 22nd Convention of the Communist Party USA*. New York, 1979, p. 98.

New books

Le Duan, *Ve xay dung dang* (On Party Building), Hanoi, Nha xuat ban Su that, 1979, 450 pp.

The speeches of Le Duan, CC General Secretary, CP Vietnam, in this collection trace how the Vietnamese communists built a new type of proletarian party in an economically underdeveloped country, where the working class was very small, and how the party led the masses in the struggle for national liberation, democratic transformations, for socialism, against aggression. The Communist Party of Vietnam has always proceeded from the Marxist-Leninist teaching, taking into account the extensive experience of the CPSU and other fraternal parties.

Rostoslav Ulyanovsky, *Politicheskiye portrety bortsov za natsionalnuya nezavisimost* (Political Portraits of National Independence Fighters), Moscow, Politizdat, 1980, 176 pp.

These are a publicist's notes about outstanding leaders of the national liberation movements in India and Africa: Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Kwame Nkrumah, Amilcar Cabral, and Franz Fanon. The author gives the social substance of their activity and describes their personal and political qualities. For all the difference of views, all were relentlessly opposed to colonialism and strived for social progress, peace, and friendship among nations.

Manuel Maldanado-Denis, *The Emigration Dialectic: Puerto Rico and the USA*, New York, International Publishers, 1980, 168 pp.

This Puerto Rican scholar has made a Marxist research into the problem of mass emigration from Puerto Rico to the USA. Drawing on numerous facts, he reveals the main causes and consequences of this phenomenon. The evolution of capitalist relations in the Puerto Rican countryside, he writes, compelled peasants to leave their land, which resulted in their pauperization. Having no opportunity to find a job at home, they went to the United States where they were subjected not only to ruthless exploitation as cheap labor, but also to racial discrimination. The book is a documented indictment of past and present U.S. policies in regard to the peoples of Central America.

Clara Zetkin, *Kunst und Proletariat* (The Arts and the Proletariat), Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1979, 340 pp.

The books by this eminent personality of the German and international working-class movement

hold a special place in Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. This one is, so far, the most complete collection of her articles and speeches on culture. Exposing and attacking decadent tendencies in bourgeois art, Clara Zetkin called for the shaping of a profound and serious proletarian culture that would enrich the working people spiritually and encourage their advancement. The ideas expressed by this revolutionary have not lost their significance. Today they warn workers in socialist culture against superficiality and oversimplification. No less topical is her criticism of bourgeois art, since in modern capitalist society so-called mass culture has become an instrument of the ruling classes to divert the working people from the struggle for their interests.

M. Szulczewski, *Informacja spoleczna* (Information in Society), Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1979, 182 pp.

The author, who has written several books on this subject, draws on Poland's experience to research the ways, forms, and methods of mass media in explaining world events and repelling imperialism's ideological attacks. The book contains interesting data on new phenomena in the sphere of information in the socialist community.

Camilla Ravera, *Lettere al partito e alla famiglia* (Letters to the Party and to the Family), Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1979, 267 pp.

Camilla Ravera took part in founding the Italian Communist Party, and was sentenced by a fascist tribunal to 15 years in prison. today she is a member of the ICP Central Control Commission and of the national leadership of the Italian Women's Union. In this book she describes the trials that fell to her lot. 'When you read these recollections,' she writes in the preface, 'you will live, together with me, through a past which affected not only myself, but many, very many women communists'.

Nicolas Buenaventura, *El programa de los comunistas, Texto de Estudio del Programa del Partido Comunista de Colombia* (The Program of the Communists. Text for Studying the Program of the Communist Party of Colombia), Bogota, Fondo Editorial Suramerica, 1979, 221 pp.

'This is what is needed to build socialism in our country: profound social changes and national liberation; an anti-imperialist, anti-latifundium, anti-oligarchic, and democratic revolution of the people as part of, and the first step towards, a socialist revolution,' writes Nicolas Buenaventura, CC member of the CP Colombia, a well-known social scientist, in the foreword to this book. He offers a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the socio-economic structure and political system in Colombia, the most outstanding features of the revolutionary process in that country, and the goals the Colombian communists have set the working people.

Diary

The working group of the *WMR* Commission on General Problems of Theory, consisting of Editorial Board members Girgin Girginov, CC member, Bulgarian Communist Party, and James West, CC Political Bureau member, Communist Party USA; Editorial Council members Clement Rohee, Central Executive Committee member, People's Progressive Party of Guyana, and Tommy O'Flaherty, Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Ireland; and the Commission's secretary Yevgeny Panfilov, visited Bratislava at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia to study the work of Slovak Communists in scientific and ideological fields. The group was told of the research that was being conducted at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CP Slovakia Central Committee, and the Slovak Academy of Sciences, and the ideological work of party organizations at several factories and other enterprises.

The *WMR* delegation was received by Jozef Lenart, CC Presidium member, CP Czechoslovakia, who spoke about the party's policy in science, the application of scientific achievements in the building of a developed socialist society, and related problems of the ideological and political work of party organizations. During the talk Jozef Lenart emphasized *WMR*'s role in the exchange of information among communist and workers' parties about their work. The delegation was received also by Ludovit Pezlar, Presidium member and Secretary of the Central Committee, CP Slovakia.

Polichronis Vais, *WMR* Editorial Council member (Communist Party of Greece), attended the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of Denmark at the invitation of its Central Committee.

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 Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada

Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon

New Horizon Publications,
14 Tamakloe/Kelani Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban

Al-Thakafah Al-Jadidah,
Al-Saadoon Street,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Baghdad, Iraq

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckách, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

FLEMISH EDITION: Inatituut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrief
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR

Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
Menandru 66, Athens, Greece

People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hirlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya,
Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

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

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia

Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR

Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador

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

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama

Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantaclaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlart, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp,
kháu sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng,
Há-Nôi, Vietnam