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

October 1980, Volume 23, Number 10 $1.00

El Salvador / 13

Trade unions in Japan / 55

Class alliances and political blocs / 35

Internationalism and CPSU — Kashtan / 3

Reformism in Britain / 48

Bolivia / 45

Workers of all countries, unite!

# WORLD
Problems of
# MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
# REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

October 1980, Vol. 23, No. 10

**Features**

3 The utmost possible
*W. Kashtan*

7 The CPSU's cadre work in the period of developed socialism
*I. Kapitonov*

13 We have no alternative to armed struggle
*S.J. Handal*

16 Politics and sport
*A. Leppänen*

**The party**

20 Sri Lanka:
rejecting social demagoguery
*K.P. Silva*

23 Costa Rica:
conditions for revolution
*E.M. Valverde*

25 New experience

**Exchange of views**

29 Creating a socialist entity of men

35 Class alliances and political blocs

**Viewpoints**

41 Searching for effective solutions
*W. Krolikowski*

45 Fascism — reaction's last hope
*F. Rodriguez*

48 Peculiarities of contemporary reformism
*A. Booth*

52 Our country's destiny is in our own hands
*Ios Por*

55 The class basis of unity
*H. Arabori*

59 Portugal:
destiny of the April Revolution
*Y. Potyomkin*

**Facts and figures**

64 Joint actions:
aims, lessons, difficulties

**The press**

69 Book reviews

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*

# The utmost possible

*William Kashtan*
General Secretary, CP Canada

## THE ROLE OF LENIN'S PARTY IN INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Lenin's party, is to be held in February 1981. Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has characterized his party's congresses, in the spirit of Leninist traditions, as reports not only to its own communists, but also to all the communist parties and to the world working-class movement. This is an expression of the CPSU's profound awareness of its responsibility to the international working class. We also regard it as an expression of the truly internationalist attitude to us, communists of other countries, on the part of the ruling party of the biggest socialist state.

This attitude induces us, for our part, to make preparations for the CPSU Congress, which will also be something like a report to the world communist and working-class movement. That is why the forthcoming congress of the Soviet communists induces the Communist Party of Canada, as it does the other fraternal parties, to turn to the key problems of present-day development. One of these problems is the role of the CPSU and the Soviet Union in the international solidarity with the revolutionary, progressive forces.

We assess the activity of each party and its contribution to the world revolutionary movement in the light of Lénin's view of internationalism. He wrote: 'There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is — working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) *this struggle*, this, *and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75).

Our party has always regarded and continues to regard revolutionary work in its own country as just such an inalienable part of international solidarity. The results of this work determine the objective arrangement of class forces in the world, the real potentialities for extending direct support to our brothers by class wherever that is necessary, and the overall success of our common cause.

Revolutionary work in one's own country does not at all rule out, but in fact implies concrete acts of proletarian solidarity. This approach springs from an understanding of the common vital interests of the international working class and the need for unity in the fight against imperialism, and for social progress. This stand serves as a guarantee of solid revolutionary successes.

That is why the role of the CPSU in international solidarity can be correctly understood in light, above all, of the results of its work in its own country with an eye to worldwide consequences of its activity. This approach was described by Lenin as follows: 'The utmost possible in one country *for* the development, support and awakening of the revolution *in all countries*' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 292).

A retrospect of the CPSU's way suggests the following obvious conclusion: it has always been true to this motto of Lenin's, working to achieve 'the utmost possible' at every historical stage, doing this first in history and setting an example to the revolutionary forces of all the countries of the world.

The construction of a developed socialist society in the USSR, the highest stage in our day of worldwide social progress, is an epoch-making achievement. It exerts a most profound influence on the world revolutionary process.

First, *developed socialism and the further strengthening of the Soviet Union's economic, scientific, technical and defense potential is the crucial material factor behind the positive changes in the arrangement and balance of class forces in the international arena.* This produces fresh favorable conditions and potentialities in the struggle for peace, democracy, the freedom of the nations and socialism.

The experience of the past decade has borne out the conclusion of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that 'the main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces.'[1] In the 1970s, important changes took place on the political map of the world: after a protracted and persevering struggle the people of Vietnam triumphed over U.S. imperialism; a revolution took place in Portugal and former Portuguese colonies rose to freedom; revolutionary transformations were carried out by the people of Ethiopia, who chose the socialist orientation; a national democratic revolution won out in Afghanistan; the people of Iran overthrew the pro-American regime of the shah; the Sandinista revolution triumphed in Nicaragua and put an end to Somoza's bloody dictatorship; progressive changes have taken place in Grenada. Even this cursory and incomplete list gives an idea of the proportions of the mounting revolutionary struggle at the new historical stage connected with the emergence of developed socialism.

There is no doubt that we have entered a period of a fresh offensive by the revolutionary forces on the positions of world imperialism.

Second, *the example of socialist construction in the Soviet Union exerts a tremendous mobilizing effect on the revolutionary struggle.* The USSR's successes have been and continue to be for the CP Canada, as for the Marxist-Leninist parties of other countries, an indispensable support in our mass work, winning people's minds for socialism. The power of the example set by existing socialism is multiplied over and over again in view of the deepening crisis of capitalism and the sharpening of the social problems engendered by that system on the one hand, and the ever fuller and more comprehensive manifestation of the advantages of the mature socialist society, on the other. The substance of the two opposite social principles, which are of paramount importance in politics, is becoming ever clearer and more obvious to the peoples: the capitalist principle of 'everything for the sake of profit' is contrasted with the socialist principle of 'everything for the sake of man, everything for the benefit of man.'

Of course, difficulties do arise in the building of the new society, and this cannot be otherwise. But these are the problems of a growing society. Indeed, the analysis of these difficulties by the communists of the Soviet Union and the methods used in overcoming them tend to enhance the international prestige of the CPSU and the attractive power of socialism.

Third, *the CPSU's political activity has an important role to play as a specimen of honest and dedicated fulfillment of international duty.* The Soviet people had to put in a tremendous effort to transform a country with a relatively weak economy, left in ruins by the first imperialist and civil wars, into a highly developed modern state, with a gigantic economic, scientific, technical and defense potential. We also know that the defense of socialism required equal efforts and sacrifices. In the Second World War, the Soviet Union bore the brunt of the fight against fascism. Mankind highly appreciates these efforts and sacrifices, which enabled more and more peoples to take the road to socialism.

The building of the socialist society in the USSR demonstrated for the first time that the ideals of socialism could be translated into practice. This experience, whose essential features are of international importance, is open for all the communist parties. Its truth and significance have been confirmed by the practice of socialist construction and the communists' struggle in other countries.

The actions of the CPSU on the international scene are an important factor of its growing role in international solidarity. In these actions one sees the indissoluble link with its domestic policy. We see that the CPSU's international policy expresses the peaceful aspirations of the Soviet people and ensures the international conditions most congenial to the building of communism.

Moreover, in the foreign policy actions of the CPSU one sees the embodiment of the Leninist principle of solidarity, in other words, to secure the utmost possible in support of and for the promotion of the world revolutionary process. We know the difficulties and responsibility involved in fighting in the sphere of world politics with all resources, constantly and always, which is typical of the CPSU, working for the utmost possible in carrying out this task.

We are far from failing to see the certain contradictions between the overall international task — the transition to socialism on a global scale — and national interests in specific situations. This contradiction may require, as already has been the case in history, not only the subordination of the national to the international but also the preparedness to make national sacrifices for the sake of carrying out the global revolutionary task. Inability to assess such situations from class, internationalist positions has time and again pushed individual personalities and even entire parties into nationalism, caused deformations of the revolutionary line with the ultimate result that serious harm was inflicted on both national interests and the common revolutionary cause.

In concrete terms what does it mean today to fight with all resources for the utmost possible on the international scene in the interests of promoting the world revolutionary process?

It means, above all, *to fight for a fundamental restructuring of the entire system of international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, non-interference in the internal affairs of nations, equality, and mutually beneficial cooperation.* I am speaking of the creation of such international relations, which to quote Lenin, 'make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 107).

Imperialism is erecting serious obstacles to the creation of a world without wars and without armaments, to humankind's social progress and to revolutionary changes. Does this mean that one should confine oneself to what is achievable within the framework of the status quo? It does not. This approach would spell out accommodation, an underrating of the potentialities of the revolutionary struggle and of the strength of international solidarity.

The sources of the line toward creating a new system of international relations, a system that would guarantee the peoples of the world liberation from imperialist oppression spring from Lenin's Decree on Peace. This course, which organically links the problem of world peace with the struggle for the freedom of peoples, has been amplified in the Peace Program worked out at the 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU. The consistent efforts that were made throughout the 1970s to implement this program led to visible changes in the world and, more importantly, throughout these years they made it possible to prevent war, this being a paramount contribution to the cause of international solidarity. Thanks to the implementation of the

Peace Program, which is supported by revolutionary and progressive forces, there has been considerable progress along the line of détente and in the struggle for the freedom of the peoples.

Lately, the reactionary forces of imperialism have stepped up their attacks on détente. Some have even hastened to bury it. For instance, *Time* magazine has recently written that after détente 'a new cold war became a reality.'[2] It is symbolic that the keynote of conclusions of this kind consists of attempts to portray détente as a state of international relations that allegedly benefits only one side, that it does not improve the entire international atmosphere. It is interpreted as a course toward an intensification of 'Soviet influence.'[3] In other words, imperialist propaganda is brandishing the bogey of anti-Sovietism, seeing the aggravation of the class struggle in the capitalist countries as the 'handiwork of Moscow.'

In this situation the cardinal task is to *defend détente, to repulse the present anti-Soviet campaign* unleashed by U.S. President Carter and spreading, as a malignant tumor, to other capitalist nations, including Canada. The attempts to turn the world back to the cold war are a symptom that imperialism is preparing for a new assault in order to retrieve the positions it has lost. The possibilities for successfully repulsing these assaults are on hand — they are linked mainly to a further strengthening of world socialism, to a militant struggle of the peoples for freedom and a peaceful future, for social progress.

In many countries the revolutionary forces have been able to use the favorable climate created by détente to forge ahead. This is true to some degree in Canada also, evidenced in modest electoral advances in the municipal field by the Communist Party, in the increased influence of communists in the organized working-class movement and in the broad democratic movement.

Further, it must be taken into account that détente has deep roots in international life, that it rests on objective, long-term factors of world development. For that reason even in the ruling circles of the capitalist states there is disagreement over the line toward renunciation of détente. An indication of this is that last July the Canadian government called off the embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union, imposed by the Conservatives on instructions from Washington.

Another orientation of the utmost possible in world politics for the development of the revolutionary process is direct assistance to peoples in their struggle against external and internal enemies and in building a new life. The Canadian communists cannot but clearly and bluntly state their stand on this fundamental issue.

As we see it, international solidarity would remain an empty phrase if it were not reinforced by concrete actions in the struggle against a specific adversary. We subscribe to our movement's stand that the rendering of assistance can have nothing in common with 'forcing blessings'[4] on anyone, as Engels said, and also with the 'export of revolution.' Needless to say, to accept or reject anybody's assistance is purely the internal, voluntary business of one people or another. Support for the revolutionary struggle in this context does not in any way conflict with the principles of non-interference in internal affairs. On the contrary, *it is one of the major guarantees ensuring freedom of social choice and the right of nations to shake off regimes they do not want.*

It would be hard to overestimate the significance of the internationalist assistance of the Soviet Union and the CPSU to fighters for freedom, independence and social progress. As a matter of fact, effective international solidarity was one of the factors that made it possible to form the world socialist system. Soviet economic assistance (given, it must be noted, at a difficult time when the USSR was itself abolishing the ruinous consequences of the nazi invasion) played a huge role in helping to restore and reconstruct the economies of socialist countries, while its defense capability ensured the security of the entire world socialist system. After the Cuban revolution triumphed, the USSR used its political prestige and economic and military might to support the first socialist republic in the Americas, and this allowed frustrating the interventionist plans of U.S. imperialism. Soviet assistance was an important factor ensuring the transition to socialism in the countries of Indochina.

The same principled policy is pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet Union relative to the parties, countries and peoples fighting for independence and national liberation.

Today, in their efforts to separate the national liberation movement from the Soviet Union, from world socialism, the reactionary circles are spreading the invention that Soviet support is only a means of strengthening military-strategic positions, that it is 'payment' for providing military bases and so forth. But the long history of Soviet foreign policy is evidence of something entirely different: this assistance has never been tied to political strings or military interests. Such was the case in the 1920s, when the USSR stretched out its hand in fraternal friendship to the Middle East states and the Chinese people, during the anti-fascist struggle of the Spanish working people, and after the war when revolutionary-liberation movements unfolded on the African continent and in the Arab world. Such is also the case today.

Further, we regard the assistance of the socialist community for the economic development of liberated nations as a major component of international solidarity. This assistance is making it possible to lay the foundations of modern industries, the development of which leads to genuine independence and strengthens the foundations of the public sector. Considerable significance is also attached to assistance, chiefly Soviet assistance, for the development of agriculture, science, education and culture.

A special and exceedingly important aspect of the internationalist role of the CPSU is its links with fraternal parties. The Communist Party of Canada,

whose 60th anniversary we shall mark next year, can from its own experience, assess the beneficial significance of such links, which are equitable and creative. The theme of the independence and identity of the communists is a favorite gambit of our adversaries. The Communist Party of Canada has known difficult years when it had to repulse the onslaught of various forces that sought, from without and from within, to subordinate the party to alien, hostile influences. The truth however, is that thanks to support from the CPSU, our party has been able to assert its independence in working out strategy and tactics with account of the specific conditions in our country.

Science is always internationalist as to substance, development methods and spheres of application. This is also true of our Marxist-Leninist doctrine, scientific socialism. Its internationalist character necessitates cooperation in the ideological, theoretical field and exchange of experience involving not merely scholars concerned with this or that set of problems, but all communist parties.

The object of Marxism-Leninism is not only to explain the world but, more important still, to change it. This axiomatic postulate of our world-view formulated by Marx, implies going over from scientific elucidation to practice, translating scientific into existing socialism by the working class accomplishing its revolutionary mission. None but a communist party is equal to combining scientific knowledge with revolutionary practice. Therefore, cooperation among fraternal parties assuring the unity of theory and practice is as indispensable a form of international solidarity as joint efforts in political struggle by the international working class.

The communist and workers' parties have devised effective forms of joint work on current problems and comparing notes, for example, world and regional meetings of communists, bilateral and multilateral consultations and international conferences and discussions. It is essential to continue the search for forms of collective ideological and theoretical work particularly helpful in creatively carrying forward revolutionary theory with due regard to the diversity and community of the tasks of our movement in order to strengthen its ideological and political unity. This unity can be made closer by solving new problems in time, approaching new tasks in a principled fashion and combating opportunist, reformist and revisionist standpoints.

What makes collective theoretical, ideological work by fraternal parties valuable is that it enables them to treat this or that social problem in all its diverse manifestations determined by the peculiarities of various countries and assess the experience gained. The latter circumstance is all the more important because even before revolutionary practice proves theoretical guidelines correct or rejects them, they are verified in every way and in advance through discussion and by comparing points of view.

*The role of the CPSU in the fraternal parties' cooperation in the sphere of theory and ideology reflects, first of all, the objective fact that this is a party which has given the world Lenin and Leninism, a party having vast and varied experience of revolutionary transformation, socialist and communist construction, and international activity.* By virtue of the objective situation, the Soviet Union is the decisive factor in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism. This accounts for the immense — we might say all-embracing — scope of theoretical research into the contemporary revolutionary process being carried on by the CPSU. It is also highly important that in the years of Soviet rule an elaborate system of social sciences has been brought into being on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. No other country has so numerous and competent social scientists or such opportunities for social, economic, philosophical and historical research as the Soviet Union.

Naturally, no one in our movement has or can have a monopoly on creative theoretical effort and development of the revolutionary doctrine. Each fraternal party now has substantial national and international experience. And it is both a right and duty of each party to assimilate this collective experience critically and creatively. We are convinced that this work can be fruitful only if carried on in the spirit and on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and methodology. Needless to say, the very attitude to Marxism-Leninism, a steadily developing doctrine open to new problems of contemporary social evolution, should likewise be creative. This makes the Marxist-Leninist education of party cadres and their concentration on urgent tasks a matter of the first importance to our party. *We see in orientation on Marxism-Leninism and in its application to our national conditions an assurance of evolving the right strategy and tactics for our party.*

Hence the fact that work on new problems of public life is central to the theoretical effort of the CPSU is particularly important. In the past 15 years, the CPSU has contributed to the common theoretical treasury of the international communist movement a number of very important theses proved correct by practice. This applies, first and foremost, to the substantiation of the program of international détente and struggle for peace. Furthermore, the CPSU has revealed the dialectical interconnection of peaceful coexistence and the revolutionary process at this stage. A major contribution to Marxism-Leninism is its investigation of a wide range of problems of developed socialism and ways of building communism. The CPSU has worked out a program for methodically implementing the scientific and technological revolution under socialism, combining its achievements with the advantages of the socialist economic system. While the new Soviet Constitution was being drafted, the doctrine of the state of the whole people, its political structure and the role of the communist party in it was further elaborated.

Among the theoretical problems which the world communist movement has lately been working on, special mention should be made of proletarian solidarity. The fact that attention focusses on this prob-

lem is not accidental but is due to the requirements and progress of our movement.

The approach to proletarian internationalism today is distinctive to a considerable degree. On the one hand, the specific tasks of the various parties differ notably, while the ultimate goals of the movement are common. Some parties are concerned primarily with leading the construction of the new society, while others are effecting revolutionary changes or searching for possibilities of embarking on them in specific situations. It should also be borne in mind that the world revolutionary process involves new social and political forces which are particularly active and show initiative in the struggle against imperialism. On the other hand, all-out resistance to imperialism's global policy in every sphere is of paramount importance for the advance of this process. It implies both joint action by communists and international solidarity with various political and social movements championing peace, national independence and social progress.

The Canadian communists, like the communists of other Marxist-Leninist parties, think highly of the contribution of the Soviet Union and the CPSU to the working people's international solidarity. At the 24th congress of our party last January, we stressed the international significance of the example of the CPSU and the need to stay loyal to the principles of international solidarity of the working class in the struggle against imperialism.

We regard solidarity of the communists of the world with the Soviet Union as a most important aspect of their internationalist duty. It means, first of all, support for the policy of the CPSU and Soviet Union, which serves the cause of peace and the interests of all revolutionary forces and the whole of progressive mankind. For Canadian communists, this is a fundamental and invariable line, a norm of life and work and a tribute of gratitude to Lenin's party for its contribution to the revolutionary transformation of the world.

1. See, *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, Moscow, 1969, p. 13.
2. *Time*, June 23, 1980, p. 6.
3. For instance, see *The Communist State in the Era of Détente, 1971-1977*, Ed. by A. Bromke and D. Novak, Oakville, Ontario, 1979.
4. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, 1965, p. 351.

---

# The CPSU's cadre work in the period of developed socialism

*Ivan Kapitonov*
CC Secretary, CPSU

A cadre policy based on Marxist-Leninist principles is a key factor in the exercise of the leading role by the communist party in a socialist society. On how skillfully and flexibly this policy is pursued, crucially depend successes in economic, state and cultural development, the growth of the working people's well-being and the strengthening of the party's ties with the masses. It is natural therefore, that our party, and its Central Committee headed by General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev attach primary importance to the selection, appointment and education of cadres and the development of the cadre policy as a whole. The USSR's entry into the period of developed socialism has confronted the party with new tasks in this sphere and has required a further improvement of the whole system of work with cadres.

## I

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is advancing toward its 26th Congress united and well-knit, still stronger ideologically and organizationally. It now has over 17 million members. The party's authority and influence in our society and its leading and guiding role in communist construction have been steadily growing. In his report at the June 1980 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev emphasized that the correctness of the CPSU line has been tested in practice and has yielded positive results in home and foreign policy.

The Soviet people are successfully completing the fulfillment of the plan of the 10th five-year period, which marks a new and important step in the development of the economy, science and culture, and the raising of the living standards of the masses. In the past four years, as compared with the first four years of the ninth five-year period, the national income has increased by 323 billion roubles, and industrial output by 600 billion roubles. Nearly 1,000 industrial enterprises have been started, and over 500 billion roubles' worth of capital investments effectively applied. Gross farm output has markedly increased. The real incomes of the population have increased by over 13 per cent. The USSR's steady economic and social advance would have been impossible if our country did not have skilled and experienced cadres at every level of direction of society and in every sphere of labor activity.

One of the most important gains of socialism is the successful solution of cadre problems. In the socialist society, the approach to these problems is fundamentally different from that in capitalist soci-

ety. Under capitalism, their solution depends on the haphazard changes in the market outlook, but socialism tackles them purposefully and in a balanced manner, in accordance with the requirements of social progress. Under capitalism, management personnel, especially of the higher echelons, are recruited above all from the exploiter, propertied strata of society and caters to their self-seeking class interests, whereas under socialism the affairs of state and society are managed by representatives of the working people, who are accountable to them and do their will. In capitalist society, cadre problems are subject to the arbitrary acts of the powers that be, but in our society these problems are solved on a democratic basis: in the selection and appointment of cadres, the party relies on the masses and on their opinion of leading personnel.

From the very early years of Soviet power, when our party took the responsibility for running the country, it has constantly shown concern for selecting, appointing and educating leading cadres from among the people, from among communists and non-party men and women, workers in the first place. The CPSU's cadre policy has consistently ensured the conditions for enabling the working class constantly to advance 'its *own* organizers,' and to do everything 'to find them, encourage them, put them on their feet, promote them' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 262).

The CPSU has always acted on the premise that cadres are the key element in the direction of society. Emphasizing this, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'The party's *cadre policy* is a powerful instrument by means of which it exerts an influence on the course of social development.' The substance of the CPSU's cadre policy and its role as an important means of the party's influence on social processes have not changed throughout the history of the Soviet state, but at various stages of socialist construction it has had its specific features determined both by the objective circumstances — the level of economic and cultural development, the nature of society's social structure, the international situation, etc. — and by subjective factors, above all the party's program directives at the given moment. Depending on this, the CPSU has worked out the forms and means for conducting its cadre policy and laid down its basic, leading lines.

Thus, in the period when the party was organizing the socialist reconstruction of the economy and launching upon the country's industrialization, the task of providing every sector of the rapidly growing industry with cadres was brought to the fore. In that period, the training of cadres for socialist industry, the commanders of production, mainly from the ranks of the working class, was conducted on an extensive scale. During the collectivization of agriculture, the party sent tens of thousands of communists, industrial workers into the countryside, and put in a great effort to select and appoint representatives of the toiling peasantry to leading posts in the collective-farm movement. The industrialization and collectivization brought out a host of remarkable organizers of socialist construction, prominent economic, party and state leaders.

From the ranks of the workers and peasants, the party also painstakingly trained new, Soviet cadres for education, public health, science, defense and diplomatic work. The CPSU's purposeful cadre policy was an effective instrument for ensuring the steady rise of the country's economy and the people's well-being, in carrying out the cultural revolution, and broadly involving the masses in government, all of which, for its part, created favorable conditions for the further quantitative and qualitative growth of cadres.

Our cadres were formed, tempered and molded into a powerful organizational force in the struggle to implement the party's general line and fulfill the tasks of its domestic and foreign policy. They acquired experience in political, economic and administrative leadership, experience which has been handed down from generation to generation, being constantly enriched with the whole of our social practice. That is one of the key prerequisites which enabled the Soviet people, under the party's leadership, to build socialism in a short historical period, to win in the life-and-death struggle against fascism, and which now enables it to successfully fulfill the great tasks in communist construction.

At the stage of mature socialism, the CPSU's cadre activity tends to acquire a number of new features reflecting the profound qualitative changes in the development of Soviet society, which are connected with the transition to the full-scale construction of communism. What are these features?

First, in accordance with the growth of the party's leading role under mature socialism, there is a marked invigoration of the communists' work with cadres and improvement of its forms.

Second, this work is being democratized to a greater extent which is mainly due to the fact that the CPSU has become a party of the whole people, and the proletarian-dictatorship state — a state of the whole people.

Third, under the scientific and technological revolution, and the struggle for enhancing the efficiency of production and the utmost use of the advantages of socialism, there is a growing demand on the political, business and moral qualities of leading workers; accordingly the party has been working to develop most fully the creative initiative of cadres, to enhance their responsibility for assignments, and to help them to master the Leninist style of leadership, the science of management, the art of organization.

Fourth, the principles of socialist internationalism tend to acquire ever greater importance in the CPSU's cadre policy; this is connected not only with the further integration of our country's nations and nationalities but also with the strengthening of the socialist community and the development of all-round ties between the fraternal parties and states.

The CPSU seeks to make its cadre policy most fully accord with the conditions of developed socialism and promote fulfillment of the tasks

of communist construction in the best possible way. Its main lines are determined by CPSU congresses and are expressed in concrete terms in the decisions of the CC plenary meetings and resolutions. Leonid Brezhnev has had a tremendous role to play in elaborating the party's cadre policy and consistently implementing it in the spirit of Lenin's traditions. For all our cadres he is a model of the Leninist type of leader, setting an example of dedicated service to the people, to the cause of communism. Under his direct influence, a truly creative atmosphere has been established in the party and the country in which trust in our functionaries goes hand-in-hand with a principled exactingness. This is having a beneficial effect on the activity of our cadres and on all our undertakings. Leonid Brezhnev's works and speeches and party documents display profound theoretical comprehension and give all-round substantiation of meaningful cadre policy problems. This provides an even more solid scientific basis for the whole of our work with cadres.

The Central Committee of the CPSU, the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the Central Committee constantly analyze in concrete terms the selection, appointment and education of cadre in party and government organizations and in the various sectors of the economy and culture. Thus, in the recent period, the CPSU Central Committee analyzed the work of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia with leading cadres; the work of the party's Volgograd Regional Committee in selecting, appointing and educating leading cadres in industry; the work of the Ministry of Construction of the USSR with executives, engineers and technicians; and the work of the party's Altai Territorial Committee in raising the role of specialists in the development of collective-farm and state-farm production. In the course of these discussions, experience in the work with cadres is summed up, its positive aspects brought out, shortcomings identified and as a result, measures determined for its improvement.

The party has devoted much attention to middle-echelon cadres. This is the most numerous category of leading functionaries. They are closest to production, being engaged in the direct organization of our people's work and exerting a day-to-day influence on their education. In this connection the CPSU Central Committee examined, for instance, the enhancement of the role of foremen at the enterprises of the Ministry of Chemical and Oil Engineering, and the provision of middle-echelon cadres for collective and state farms in the Rostov Region.

The party seeks in every way to invigorate and constantly improve the activity of our ideological cadres. That is the purpose of the CPSU Central Committee's resolution 'On Work in the Selection and Education of Ideological Cadres in the Party Organization of Byelorussia' and 'On the Further Improvement of Ideological and Political-Education Work.'

In short, the CPSU Central Committee constantly has the work with cadres under its unflagging control, seeking to have party, Soviet-government and economic agencies and social organizations steadily pursue the single party line in the matter of cadres, naturally with an eye to local conditions.

## II

The chief (one could say, strategic) purpose of the CPSU's cadre policy at the present stage is to have every sector of party, government, economic, cultural and education work headed by ideologically seasoned and well-trained organizers, capable of acting with initiative and with the broad sweep and acumen which is inherent in our system, especially in the period of its maturity. All the opportunities for doing so have been created by the whole of our preceding development and the CPSU's correct policy. Especially much in this respect has been done since the October 1964 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee which was of great importance in asserting the Leninist norms of party life and the principle of collective leadership.

Considering the principles of cadre policy, the most important and definitive of these is the selection and appointment of cadres in accordance with their political, business and moral qualities. When a person is appointed to a leading post, the first thing that is taken into account is the extent to which he is devoted to the cause of socialism, how well he is trained politically, and how capable he is of implementing the party's line and loyally serving the people. The party constantly sees to it that everyone promoted to leadership should be capable of organizing in practice and arranging harmonious work in the collective. Much importance is also attached to the moral qualities of the appointee and this is quite natural, because one cannot lead men and head a labor collective under socialism without having a moral right to do so.

At the very beginning of socialist construction, Lenin said that 'management necessarily implies conpetency, that a knowledge of all the conditions of production down to the last detail and of the latest technology of your branch of production is required; you must have had a certain scientific training' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 428). Lenin's requirement is of special significance in our day under the scientific and technological revolution, which markedly makes production, the economy and the whole of social life more complicated.

Thanks to the realization of these Leninist principles we now have in the sphere of leadership politically mature and active specialists in the economy experienced in working with people. Suffice it to say that in our economy we now have over 26 million specialists with a higher and secondary special education, or 20 per cent of the work force. Our higher schools alone graduate nearly 800,000 certified specialists annually. Almost 9 million specialists are members of the CPSU. One in four engineers, technicians and agronomists, one in three teachers, and one in six doctors is a communist.

Specialists in the leading sectors constitute the backbone of the party and state cadres. Virtually all the CC secretaries of the communist parties of union

republics, territorial committees and regional committees of the party have a higher education. Nearly three-quarters of them are specialists in industry and agriculture; 99.7 per cent of the secretaries of district and city party committees have a higher education, and 64 per cent are specialists. Almost 80 per cent of the chairmen of the councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, the executive committees, territorial, regional, city and district soviets of people's deputies are specialists in industry or agriculture. A sizable part of them are engineers specializing in various lines of production, economists and agronomists.

Our cadres in industry have a high professional standard and well-grounded competence. This applies especially to those who head large production and scientific-production associations and combines, which have the crucial role to play in developing the economy under the growing concentration of production. All general directors of associations have a higher special education, and many have scientific degrees and much experience in organizational and economic work. The heads of the most important production associations are simultaneously deputy ministers.

There is a steady rise in the level of professional training of those who organize agricultural production. Compared with 1965, the number of specialists of a higher and secondary qualification among collective-farm chairmen went up from 52 per cent to 86 per cent and among state-farm directors, from 79 per cent to 94 per cent.

While constantly replenishing the ranks of our leading cadres from among specialists, the party has continued to consistently pursue its line of promoting workers and collective farmers for managerial posts. Under developed socialism, these two main lines of cadre policy are interconnected and closely concerted with each other, merging into a single process of improvement of the qualitative make-up of our cadres. The working class and the collective-farm peasantry are the source from which every sector of communist construction is provided with cadres. Indeed, many specialists promoted to executive posts started out as workers and peasants. They constitute nearly three-quarters of all the CC secretaries of the communist parties of the union republics, territorial and regional committees, chairmen of the councils of ministers of the union and autonomous republics, and the executive committees of territories and regions.

The CPSU's concern for the optimal social make-up of leading cadres is also expressed in the fact that more and more women are being involved in the management of the economy, and the affairs of state and society. For this socialism provides the broadest opportunities. In our country 60 per cent of all specialists with a higher and secondary education are women. Millions of women have proved themselves in work and in socio-political activity, and they are being ever more actively promoted to leading posts. Thus, 21 per cent of the secretaries of district and city party committees are now women.

In tackling cadre problems, the party believes that it is of fundamental importance to ensure continuity between the generations. While cherishing the old cadres and making the utmost use of their knowledge and experience, young and promising comrades who have shown themselves to be capable organizers are being promoted to leading posts.

In this way, the party's cadre policy fully accords with its social policy and takes into account the interests of every section of society.

The CPSU formulates this policy in light of the fact that the Soviet Union is a multinational state. Much importance is attached to the effort to foster the growth of executive cadres, skilled workers, engineers, technicians, scientists and workers in the arts from among the native population. At the same time, we reckon with the fact that people of various nationalities live and work in each republic and autonomous region. This is also concretely expressed in the make-up of the body of executive workers. Our cadre policy actively promotes the pursuit of Lenin's nationalities policy. The democratic procedures that have taken shape in our country for promoting and appointing cadres — procedures which are in principle inherent in socialism — help us to objectively evaluate and to correctly select our cadres. Practice makes nonsense of bourgeois propaganda assertions that in the USSR cadre problems are solved exclusively by fiat. In the party and in the soviets, as in all social and cooperative organizations, executive posts are elective from top to bottom. In scientific establishments, the competitive system for filling posts is prevalent. In state administration and material production, appointments are made by the organs concerned in collegial procedures, in which account is taken of the opinion of party organizations and the public at large. This helps to avoid subjectivism and mistakes.

The mass involvement of the working people in the management of the affairs of state and society testifies to the profoundly democratic way in which decisions on appointments are made in our country. There are something like 27 million men and women in executive posts in party, soviet, trade union and young communist league organs. Of them, 10 million are communists. These elective activists can be regarded as the flower of our society. These are men and women who dedicate their efforts and knowledge to the cause of communism and who devote a large part of their leisure to socio-political activity. They all have close bonds with work collectives and they bring to the activity of the governing bodies the collective thinking, experience and creative energy of the masses. Work in the elective organs enriches their lives, enlarges their horizon and helps them to express themselves in the best way. Here millions of activists acquire the necessary experience and management skills, which helps them to develop into leaders of the masses. It is quite natural therefore, that the body of elective activists constitute the section of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and the Soviet intelligentsia from which the party draws new cadres. For all practical purposes, all our executive

workers have gone through this school in one way or another.

The CPSU Central Committee constantly induces all governing organs to make skillful use of cadre reserves for the successful fulfillment of the tasks of communist construction, without engaging in a 'cadres quadrille,' as Leonid Brezhnev put it, in which people are ceaselessly moved from one post to another. Transfers are made when that is required by the business at hand. As a result, party and soviet cadres have a largely stabilized make-up. Annual replacements of the CC secretaries of the communist parties, territorial and regional committees come to 11 per cent, and of city and district secretaries, to about 15 per cent. This makes it possible to ensure a constant influx of fresh forces, while maintaining stability.

The CPSU regards the consistent application of Lenin's principles of selection and appointment of cadres and their improvement in close connection with the concrete conditions of the dynamically developing socialist society as the prerequisite for successfully fulfilling both the most urgent and long-term tasks.

III

The CPSU acts on the assumption that with the growth of the scale of communist construction and the rising level of political culture and creative activity of the masses, our cadres have a growing responsibility for implementing the party's economic strategy and social policy, developing socialist democracy and shaping the new man. The demands on executive workers tend to grow and in consequence, greater importance is attached to the education of cadres by party organizations.

Educating cadres means above all teaching them. Our party displays unflagging concern for the training and upgrading of executive workers of every echelon, inducing them to raise their theoretical level and deepen their knowledge to become highly qualified leaders meeting present-day requirements. Much importance is attached to the establishment in 1978 of a totally new academic institution — the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee — as the leading academic, scientific and methodological center for the whole system of training of party, soviet and ideological cadres. In this Academy and in the 15 higher party schools in the localities, leading workers obtain a sound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, economics and party and state construction. The further training of cadres is actively effected at the Institute for the Further Training of Leading Party and Soviet Cadres in Moscow and also at inter-regional, republican and inter-republican refresher courses. In the past three years alone, 187,000 men and women have gone through these courses. This year, over 50,000 persons are to raise their qualifications.

The further training of economic executives and specialists is being carried on in our country on a large scale. Higher echelon executives are trained at the Academy of the Economy of the USSR, set up under the USSR Council of Ministers. In Moscow and in the localities, something like 2 million men and women take refresher courses every year. The Higher School of the Trade-Union Movement, the Higher Young Communist School, the Diplomatic Academy and the Academy of Foreign Trade are important elements in the overall system of training and retraining of leading cadres.

Consequently, our party and state have been doing their utmost to constantly improve the qualitative make-up of their cadres, to keep them growing professionally, improving their knowledge, gaining a deeper grasp of the art of leadership and the modern science of management. That is an important assurance of our successes, because our party believes that in every sector of communist construction success essentially springs from the science of management.

In view of the sharpening ideological struggle in the international arena, the ideological seasoning of our cadres tends to acquire ever greater importance. Their duty is to display a high level of political vigilance and an ability to resolutely rebuff any ideological subversions on the part of the class antagonist. We have all the conditions necessary for raising our people's ideological level. A ramified network of political education has been set up. Over 20 million men and women are enrolled just in the system of party studies. Leading cadres constitute the bulk of our lecturers, speakers and propagandists.

The party requires that all leading workers should closely tie in organization and education of people, taking into account the socio-political education aspects and consequences of the decisions being adopted in every sector. Executives are fully responsible for the moral and psychological climate in work collectives. This is all the more important in view of the fact that the role of work collectives tends to grow in the life of society and the Soviet political system, while the USSR Constitution invests them with broad powers.

The party values our cadres and has trust in their creative potentialities, while making great demands on them. The well-established care and concern for our cadres has nothing in common with being indulgent with respect to their negligence or mistakes, or with pandering to careless workers. In Leninist terms, concern for and education of cadres means painstaking work with them and help in overcoming the difficulties that arise, together with warnings against incorrect acts and deeds. Leonid Brezhnev says: 'If a man knows his business, is dedicated to the cause, works for the common good, he has to be supported. Here, there is only one purpose: to adjust, to correct, to educate the worker, instead of breaking him. The main thing is to bring out and use his good qualities for the cause.'

Principled criticism and self-criticism are an indispensable means of education. We seek to have every aspect of the activity of each organization and worker objectively assessed and the shortcomings fully analyzed for the purpose of their elimination. Life has repeatedly confirmed that to safeguard the

leader from just criticism is to ruin him. At the same time, the party does not want criticism to amount to a smashing attack; it should be very comradely and should induce the worker to display more vigor and initiative. The CPSU Central Committee Plenary Meeting in November 1979 clearly showed how we should approach our shortcomings in a principled and firm party spirit. At the Plenary Meeting Leonid Brezhnev levelled some personal criticism at a number of heads of ministries and departments. That was friendly criticism, which gave those who were criticized a sense of confidence in their abilities and determination to obtain the best results.

The party constantly gives leading workers reminders about their duty to the people and about the need to back up their good reputation by all their acts throughout the whole of their life. It is incompatible with the Leninist style of leadership to display the narrowly departmental approach, to give preference to local interests, to cheat the state, to neglect the needs of the working people and allow immoral behavior in everyday life. The party requires that such phenomena should always be given a sharp assessment and that those who make a mess of things and compromise themselves in the eyes of the working people should be strictly called to account, regardless of their post and past services.

It is well known that the level of responsibility and discipline displayed by workers largely depends on the state of control and verification of performance. That is one of the most effective means of educating our cadres. The party wants the verification of performance to be well organized at every echelon from top to bottom, being conducted systematically and helping not only to bring out shortcomings and mistakes but also to eliminate them in good time, to anticipate them and to find the most correct approaches to the tasks that have been set.

Here, a great deal is being done. In the recent period, the organization of control of execution of party decisions has been improved. The CC Secretariat, the USSR Council of Ministers, the ministries and departments and local party committees now more frequently hear reports from comrades responsible for this or that sector of our work. Conversations with leading workers in party committees are also a form of work that is highly beneficial.

Our party seeks to enhance the role of people's control and to invigorate the work of all its organs and the millions of people's controllers. The party regards intensification of control from below as an important means of influencing the work of our cadres and their education.

We recently adopted the Law on People's Control in the USSR. Its entry into force also made it necessary to raise to a higher level party direction of the people's control organs, in connection with which the CPSU Central Committee adopted a special resolution. Other laws adopted in accordance with the new Constitution of the USSR — the Law on the Supreme Court of the USSR, on the Procurators' Office of the USSR, on State Arbitration, etc. — also help to strengthen socialist legality and intensify control over the activity of state organs and all cadres. The party and its Central Committee work consistently to make control an instrument of management in fact, an important means for tightening up state and planning discipline and enhancing the personal responsibility of cadres for the sectors of work assigned to them.

The certification of leading personnel and specialists, which is regularly carried out in every sector of the economy, is an effective means for educating our cadres and testing their ability to engage in practical activity. This is done with the participation of the public; here we make extensive use of the experience of the fraternal countries.

In all its activity, our party is invariably guided by the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism, teaching our cadres to take an irreconcilable attitude to any expression of national narrow-mindedness. The internationalist education of our cadres is especially important today, when socialist integration is being steadily deepened and cooperation among the CMEA countries is being extended in the implementation of long-term programs covering the key spheres of material production. The CPSU Central Committee insists on our cadres displaying a greater responsibility for developing all-round ties with the fraternal countries, and for studying and making creative use of their experience in socialist construction.

Cooperation and mutual assistance in the training of cadres are of great importance in strengthening friendly international ties among the fraternal parties and countries. Many leading personnel from the socialist countries are trained at party schools in the USSR; over the past 10 years, more than 2,000 persons have completed the full course of education, with 460 defending their theses; over 5,000 leading party and government workers have completed short-term courses. For their part, Soviet personnel study at the party schools of some fraternal parties.

Multilateral and bilateral meetings at which problems of party organizational work are discussed help to further develop cooperation among the parties of the socialist-community countries. These problems were discussed, for instance, at the meeting of Central Committee secretaries of fraternal parties held in Berlin in June 1980, where they had an extensive exchange of opinion and experience in the selection, appointment, training and education of cadres and problems in the creative application of the principles of scientific socialism in the sphere of cadre policy.

The way traveled by the socialist-community countries shows very well that concern for cadres is of exceptional importance in realizing the tasks of socialist and communist construction. We now have cadres of the new formation capable of tackling the most complex problems of economic and social progress. By developing these successes, we shall promote the steady advance of socialism and the triumph of Marxist-Leninist ideals.

# We have no alternative to armed struggle

*Shafik Jorge Handal*
CC General Secretary,
Communist Party of El Salvador

A revolutionary situation exists in El Salvador. More, and this is most important, the revolution is gathering momentum. The people's organizations have a ramified mass political structure and have been able to form their own armed units.

The subjective factors of revolution did not surface at once and for a long time the revolutionary forces could not agree on unity. The Communist Party of El Salvador was founded in 1930, while other democratic organizations began to appear only in the early 1970s, and to win influence among the people they conducted an acrimonious polemic with our party and among themselves.

The banner of left unity was raised by the Communist Party. We sought to give the polemic the maximum theoretical depth and place it on a principled footing. To avoid sticking labels, our party gave prominence to the common tasks of struggle. As a first step, a coordinating center consisting of the Farabundo Marti People's Forces of Liberation, the Armed Forces of National Resistance and the Communist Party was set up last December. This proved feasible although no agreement was reached on such fundamental issues as the general line of action, the definition of the character of the maturing revolution, the policy of alliances, the significance of armed struggle and its combination with other forms of class actions.

The main purpose of the coordinating center is to ensure unity of action by our three organizations, each of which remains independent, pursues its own line and adopts its own political and military decisions.

This first step toward unity fired the masses with enthusiasm. Indeed, at the present stage of the confrontation between revolution and counter-revolution in El Salvador, following the developments in Nicaragua, there is no longer any point to a split or polemic. Further steps were taken to cement the movement's unity. In early January 1980 the coordinating center was joined by a fourth mass organization: the Revolutionary Party of El Salvador-Revolutionary People's Army. This led to the formation of the Coordinating Agency of revolutionary mass organizations: it soon became a major political force. Later its members adopted a platform for the future revolutionary-democratic government. This ended the polemic over the character of the El Salvadoran revolution, which has now been defined as democratic and anti-imperialist. The formation of a broad democratic front was started on the basis of that platform: the front was formalized in March and April of this year as the Revolutionary Democratic Front. For all practical purposes it embraces all of the nation's political forces, regardless of their political and ideological views, with the exception of small ultra-reactionary groups.

It should be noted that for a long time the El Salvadoran bourgeoisie had no parties of its own. In December 1931 reaction installed a military dictatorship that ruled the country for the next 49 years. The governing classes were so frightened by the people's rising of 1932,[1] a rising that was headed by the Communist Party, that they preferred to disband even their own parties in order to deprive the masses of any possibility of conducting a political struggle. The powers that be gave all their support to the army, which has been their 'party'[2] ever since.

In the 1970s the ruling classes tried to set up their own political parties to counter the spread of the democratic and revolutionary movement, but it was too late. Despite enormous financial outlays, these parties hardly managed to win 15,000 votes at the 1972 presidential elections and somewhat above 6,000 votes at the parliamentary and municipal elections two years later. In our country the governing classes do not have a mass base. Hence their efforts to turn the employers' association into a political instrument and their haste to form extreme, reactionary, typically fascist groups, which are nothing less than gangs of assassins. Some capitalists emigrated to the USA taking with them hundreds of millions of dollars ($1.5 billion in 1979). From time to time they visit El Salvador to see how their enterprises are run and to establish contact with the fascist ringleaders. However, many capitalists and wealthy people of the middle strata are still in the country. They station guards at night and have large caches of modern weapons. All this is evidence that the struggle for the freedom of El Salvador will not be easy.

Whereas in 1976 the masses were still looking to elections with hope, a year later it became clear that the presidential elections would change nothing. It was not difficult to foresee that the people would find themselves faced with the need to fight for their rights in a different way. That is exactly what happened. The 1977 elections were an undisguised farce. In most regions citizens were not even admitted to the polling stations: the police and fascist bandits filled in the voting ballots themselves. This triggered indignation and clashes. Within a week the masses were in open rebellion, but were forced

out of the Libertad Square and the central district of San Salvador by the dictatorship's troops, who drowned the rising in blood. The people rose in an armed struggle. Military organizations, the first of which were formed in 1970, rapidly reinforced their ranks and won growing prestige. That was when progressive Catholic circles headed by the courageous Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero began to play a bigger role.

During election campaigns the Communist Party has always made the point that the people should not depend on elections alone. We have never encouraged the people to pin their hopes on a way that was clearly unrealistic in our country. But when legal possibilities were exhausted it did not prove easy to follow Lenin's wise advice: to be ready to employ the most diverse forms of struggle, to go over from one form to another in accordance with the political situation. During these two years other revolutionary organizations, despite propounding some concepts which we felt were ill-advised, acquired considerable influence and the armed struggle assumed a mass character.

The people are learning to fight in different ways. I'll give an example. Formerly in almost all the industrial strikes the workers failed to secure the satisfaction of economic demands. The strikers were harassed, large numbers were arrested, while many of their leaders and militants were killed. In 1978 the workers of a factory decided to stage a sit-in strike, take hostages from among the owners and management, and conduct talks on an agreement. For the first time in many years the talks were successful. This lesson was quickly learned at other factories.

Or take another example. Many U.S., Japanese, and West European transnationals have agencies in El Salvador. When the political situation in the country deteriorated, the personnel of these agencies fled. The workers had nobody on whom to press their right to work or compensation, because in many cases there was not a single foreign representative authorized to take decisions. The workers then began to take responsible staff members of these agencies hostage and, with arms in hand, guard the enterprises day and night against the National Guard.

Lastly, it may be mentioned that in the countryside the struggle for the economic and political demands of the masses has fused with the armed struggle. This, I repeat, has become a mass struggle in the true sense of the word. There are now thousands of self-defense units and a well-organized people's militia. The guerrillas have a broad base and dependable sources of food. Regular insurgent combat units have been formed.

The viability of the nation's revolutionary forces proves that reaction is in fact unable to strike at them politically or militarily. Reports are now frequently received of assassinations in El Salvador. They may give the impression that the junta is dessimating our organizations, that clashes are taking place between government troops and revolutionary combat units. Actually, these are punitive operations involving 3,000-4,000 infantrymen and helicopter gunships. The infantry employs tactics developed by the USA in South Vietnam: troops surround a district where the revolution has a strong base and begin the wholesale extermination of the population, utilizing napalm.

It must be brought home to world opinion that almost none of the people being killed belong to any combat organizations or to guerrilla units. The purpose of these savage tactics, known by the North American doctrine of 'depriving fish of water,' is to intimidate the population, break its militancy.

Nevertheless, the process of uniting the revolutionary forces continues. Last May a new important agreement was reached. The unanimity of the revolutionaries on all basic political, military, national and international issues made it possible to go over to a new level of cooperation, to the creation of a United Revolutionary Leadership. There is now a single political leadership and a single military command; a united headquarters has been set up; the supreme organ of the United Revolutionary Leadership consists of the first secretaries of the four parties that signed the agreement.

The experience of every country has its own features and, possibly, in other Latin American nations the problem of the unity of the revolutionary forces will be resolved differently. But our experience shows that the external aspect of the polemic of the communists with other revolutionary organizations of El Salvador should not be taken too seriously. Of far greater significance is the place these forces hold in the nation's socio-political life, their revolutionary character and their practical action. We were confident that we could achieve unity despite the heated debates which preceded the agreement because we had earlier arrived at common conclusions. These conclusions emanate from an analysis of society's class structure under the conditions of dependent capitalist development and backwardness.

There was a time when other left forces contended that the Communist Party was an organization monopolizing the entire field of revolutionary activity in the nation, but that at the close of the 1960s it had committed errors and ceased to be a revolutionary organization, that it became a reformist party and that therefore it was possible and necessary to form other revolutionary organizations. We analyzed these arguments to see if there was any truth in them. Why had no other revolutionary organization appeared in the course of a period of more than 40 years?

The contention that the communists monopolized the revolutionary movement had absolutely no leg to stand on. After the defeat of the 1932 rising the Communist Party was weak for many years. In that period it made many mistakes, most of which were reformist, but there were also leftist errors. Anti-communism became widespread and there even was a time when, working in an atmosphere of hostility, the party began to argue that it did not exist. This was a mistake, of course. But our miscalculation is an indication of how grave the situation

was. A small group of communists took part in the class battles and clashes. The party survived and was then able to augment its strength, but in order to clear the path for itself it had to fight unremittingly. You will agree that this hardly dovetails with the contention that we were a party 'monopolizing the entire field of left activity.' The opposite was the case. In the face of harassment and anti-communism our party bent every effort to give scope for the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism and left ideas generally.

We believe that new left organizations appeared in the 1970s chiefly because that society's class structure underwent a change at the new stage of development of dependent capitalism. This stage began immediately after the Second World War and reached its high point in the 1960s, when industrialization made rapid headway as a result of the activities of the imperialist monopolies and the possibilities opened up by the Central American Common Market. Albeit to a lesser extent, this was also a process of the spread of capitalist relations in agriculture. A relatively large industrial proletariat came into being, and it was reinforced by people from rural communities and small provincial towns. There appeared new middle urban strata and large fringe groups that were virtually excluded from social life.

The emergent working class had by no means broken its strong and complex links to the other classes and social groups from which it had come. The numerical strength of the fringe groups and the intelligentsia grew faster than that of the industrial workers (there were less than 3,000 students at the nation's institutions of higher learning in 1960, and over 35,000 in 1980). But the bulk of the young people are denied the possibility of getting a higher education, while those who do get such an education cannot find employment. As a result, the rapidly growing intelligentsia is also a fringe group. Generally spreaking, the limited growth rate of production and the dependent capitalist economy cannot provide jobs for all intellectuals and all the rural inhabitants who have migrated to the towns.

These are the social factors that led to the appearance of various leftist organizations. On the whole, in Latin America the 1960s were a period of major politico-ideological convulsions and produced an abundant harvest of 'new lefts' opposed to the communist parties.

There were other factors that influenced the socio-economic situation in El Salvador. Its war with Honduras in 1969 hit the Central American Common Market that was set up under the aegis and in the interests of U.S. monopolies. This spelled out the collapse of the pro-imperialist model of industrialization, which had generated many new problems, led to glaring imbalances in development and intensified the contradictions between the five nations of the isthmus. The 100-hour 'small war' was in fact an explosion of the accumulated dissatisfaction of the two nations, the commencement of the structural crisis that mirrors the present revolutionary situation in Central America.

In El Salvador the crisis coincided with attempts to consolidate the right-wing military dictatorship, which growing increasingly senile, feverishly sought ways for its salvation. All this fostered the politization of the masses and weakened the regime.

These are, in our view, the deep-seated conditions under which other left organizations emerged in El Salvador.

Frankly, we did not expect the unification of the revolutionary forces so soon. The speed of this process is extraordinary. It proved sufficient to achieve agreement for fraternal relations to take shape between our organizations. This is, of course, not an idyll: there are survivals of sectarianism (a result of decades-long bitter polemics) and prejudices. But this is now of minor importance and cannot inhibit the successful development of the unitary process, whose purpose is to create a united Marxist-Leninist party, although nobody can say exactly when this will happen.

Last March the junta that came to power following the overthrow of the reactionary dictatorship in October 1979, decreed that there would be socio-economic reforms. Considered in the light of existing legislation, these are radical reforms. But they will not eliminate the structural and political crisis in El Salvador. Nor are they finding support in the United States, in whose foreign policy there has been a turn toward a cold war. Moreover, the USA has now begun to place the accent on military solutions in its relations with Central American nations. The U.S. political line harbors the threat of export of counter-revolution.

The revolutionaries of El Salvador are courageously fighting the forces of imperialism and reaction. The revolutionary movement in the region, the victories of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and the developments in El Salvador have thrown the Central American dictatorships into panic. The reactionaries are well aware that the victory of our people will be inevitably followed by further revolutionary successes in the region. Feeling the approaching end of their rule, they are having recourse to extreme measures and preaching bellicose nationalism. Today this is a distinctive feature of fascism in Central America.

Simmering with counter-revolutionary fury, the reactionary forces are speaking of invading Nicaragua and showing even more zeal than the U.S. imperialists in their efforts to turn the isthmus into a zone of war and fire. In Guatemala there are military camps with thousands of mercenaries (mostly former Somoza guardsmen) who can be thrown against the insurgent people of El Salvador. Washington is pleased with these plans of the counter-revolution since they meet its own interests of fighting the liberation movement in El Salvador and Guatemala. It counts on using these feelings to justify intervention by its own or, better still, 'inter-American' troops in El Salvador.

In September 1979 Carter decided to form a

'mobile force' at Key West, Florida, in order, as was cynically announced, to 'protect U.S. interests' in the Caribbean and Central America. This was followed by 'exercises' — the landing of U.S. troops at Guantanamo, the naval exercises off Vieques Island, Puerto Rico, the unsuccessful provocation against Cuba and other military gambles, and the conspiracies agianst the Manley government in Jamaica and the Bishop government in Grenada. Intervention in El Salvador is being stepped up with the sending of military advisers and hardware to the junta.

Washington's decision to modernize the Honduran armed forces in order to turn them into a counter-revolutionary policeman in the region is part of its military escalation. Already there are U.S. experts in Honduras and aid is being rendered to the military forces at three strategic bases: in Fonseca Bay, and along the Caribbean coast — in Trujillo and Puerto-Cortes near the frontier of Nicaragua and Guatemala. The reactionary military élite in Honduras has received helicopters from the Pentagon in order to patrol the air frontier with El Salvador. It is taking part in the criminal operation against 'insurgents' conducted by the El Salvadoran armed forces in border areas.

In face of the danger threatening our revolution the United Revolutionary Leadership is conducting propaganda work among the masses, explaining why it is imperative to prepare for armed resistance to any foreign intervention, including intervention by the USA. We are strengthening our organization and the political and armed forces of the people, bending every effort to expand cooperation and interaction with the revolutionary and democratic movement in fraternal countries.

The United Revolutionary Leadership is highly appreciative of the international solidarity fettering the aggressive actions of U.S. imperialism. In this connection the main task of the day is to expose the U.S. policy of genocide relative to the peoples of El Salvador and Guatemala, where thousands upon thousands of families have lost relatives and homes or found themselves in the bloodstained hands of butchers directed by U.S. military advisers. World opinion must know that two wars are now raging in El Salvador: a war of extermination, an unjust war conducted by Yankee imperialism and local reaction against our people, and a just war conducted by the people of El Salvador for liberation from the brutal reactionary dictatorship that has been oppressing them for almost half a century, a war for democratic freedoms, independence, and social justice.

The El Salvadoran revolution has no alternative to armed struggle. The communists are convinced that the revolution will triumph despite all obstacles. Our revolution rests on the strength, will, and heroism of the people, and its vanguard consists of left forces that are united and have extensive experience of struggle. It has the support of the peoples of Central America and the whole world. Victory will come.

1. One of the most significant revolutionary actions in the history of Central America. — *Ed.*

2. The Christian-Democratic Party, until recently an important force at elections, did not become a party of the bourgeoisie: it found it had to pursue a populist policy, proclaim the slogan of a 'revolution of the poor,' look for support among the working masses and form an alliance with the CPS.

---

# Politics and sport

*Aulis Leppänen*
*WMR* Editorial Council Member,
representative of the Communist Party of Finland

*O sport, you are peace!*
*You bring good relations*
*Between all the nations,*
*Drawing them ever closer together.*

The world was reminded of these words, written by Pierre de Coubertin at the dawn of the Modern Olympic movement, by the staggeringly colorful opening of the Olympiad in Moscow, the hospitable host of the 22nd Games.

Sport is magnificent as the highest expression of human physical potentialities, as the arena of wide and honest competition in the most diverse merits and talents — courage, perseverance, daring and ability to achieve a set aim — and as the way not only to physical but also to moral perfection.

However, the subject of these meditations is not the world of sport. It is the place sport holds in the world, in our uneasy and dynamic world.

The beginning of the Olympic year was disturbing. *Time* magazine wrote: 'Whatever the outcome of various 1980 Olympic events, one contest is likely to be remembered for a long time: the tug of war over the American-made Olympic boycott.'[1]

As everybody knows, the tug of war was excluded from the world Games a long time ago, and the American weekly had something else in mind of course: the unparalleled and unseemly political campaign aimed at wrecking the Olympiad; the boycott into which the Carter Administration sought to draw the world. This action mirrored the White House's imperialist stand, the attitude of the biggest capitalist power to peace and its foreign policy. The boycott wanted by the U.S. President

was in the same bracket as the decision to postpone ratification of SALT II and the embargo on the sale of grain to the Soviet Union.

Of course, sport differs from political and commercial relations, but in the case of the Olympic Games Carter used means typical of the aggressive policy of the present U.S. administration: imperialist calculation on strength and undisguised hegemonism — as much as to say that the USA could make everybody dance to its tune. Hence the total refusal to reckon with the opinion even of allies, and the scorn for the interests of its own people, in this case the American athletes.

Clearly, political dividends were the objective of the U.S. government's efforts to wreck the Games. White House Presidential Counsel Lloyd Cutler made no secret of this, saying that if the athletes of many countries stayed away from the Olympiad 'there is no way the Soviets can portray . . . that the whole world is coming to Moscow and supports the Soviet position . . .'[2] But who interpreted the decision of any National Olympic Committee to take part in the Games as buttressing 'Moscow's position,' as support for the Soviet Union? Before writing this comment, I paged my way through Soviet publications and in not a single one did I come across the thought which the U.S. Administration sought to attribute to the hosts of the Olympiad. On the other hand, I read numerous pronouncements to the contrary, for instance the words of the French gymnast Boerio: 'I have never concealed by opposition to communist regimes but I have never refused to meet Soviet athletes, even in their country.'[3]

The events in Afghanistan were chosen as the pretext for the boycott campaign, but as was repeatedly underscored by the media, the choice of Moscow as the venue for the summer Games awakened the rhetoric of the cold war demagogues long before most of them learned to pronounce the word *Kabul*.

The sum and substance of all the arguments, comments, essays and reports filling the world press this summer was that politics and sport are different aspects and tiers of this problem. Are politics and sport linked? Of course. But what is this link in concrete terms and how is it expressed? Is it permissible to use sport for political purposes?

Let us first consider what lies on the surface. It is said that the Olympiad gives the host country a rare opportunity to show the world its political and ideological system in the best light. This is indisputable. But has Moscow gone further in this than any of its predecessors? Just before the Games were opened, Lord Michael Killanin, then the IOC President, cautioned: 'I should like to say a few words about the use of the term "propaganda" in sport. I must make the reminder that every Olympic city tries to show the best it has. That was the case in Munich, and also in Montreal. Moscow, quite naturally, wants to demonstrate all the wealth of its sport, all the richness of its art and culture, in other words, all that an Olympiad host has every right to be proud of. I should like to remind you again that we named Moscow, as in the case of other cities, the venue of the Games not for political reasons but because of its outstanding services to the promotion of the sport movement. In 1974 all the IOC members (most of them do not hold so-called left positions) welcomed the choice of Moscow and knew that the USSR would open its door wide to everybody.'[4]

It is unquestionable that sport is prestigious. This is a reality recognized worldwide. When Robert Kennedy was U.S. Attorney-General he noted that some national prestige is won at Olympic Games. I was not surprised when I learned that on the eve of the contests in Moscow the Austrian athletes took an oath to the Federal President, that the President of Mexico presented to Carlos Giron, a diver who competed at the Games in Munich and Montreal, the national banner under which Mexican athletes competed in the 1980 Olympic capital, and that with similar ceremony the President of Venezuela presented the national flag to the athletes of his country. More, I was not even surprised by Margaret Thatcher's decision (true, taken under pressure from public opinion and the Labour Opposition in parliament) to congratulate British athletes who won awards in Moscow: the 'iron lady', who had done all she could to wreck the Games, to prevent British athletes from competing in them, knew that she could not counterpose herself to millions of Britons to whom interest in sport and a sense of national pride are by no means alien.

Sport is prestigious. Near the Olympic Stadium in Helsinki stands a statue to Paavo Nurmi, the famous long-distance runner: it was unveiled in his lifetime. Also, the significance of sport is underscored by the fact that famous athletes have become outstanding figures in various spheres of public life, including parliaments. I'll give only one example. Kelpo Gröndahl, a worker who won a gold medal in wrestling at the London Olympiad, was a member of the Finnish parliament. There are similar examples in many other countries.

The theme of sport is on the lips not only of youth but also of workers, gray-haired scientists, businessmen, doctors, farmers, artists. And also of politicians. Tributes to sport are paid by political publications. The Games were given wide coverage by the Finnish *Kansan Uutiset*, which devoted two to three and sometimes as many as six pages to reports from Moscow; Czechoslovakia's *Rude Pravo* allotted a page and half to highlight the Olympics, and there was similar coverage and even more in *The International Herald Tribune*, published in Western Europe.

Sport is, naturally, linked to politics if only because it is quite rightly called the greatest of diplomats. True, diplomacy comes in different colors: from honest, open, with lofty aims, to 'ping-pong' that screens sinister political designs and paves the way for hegemonistic policies. In the given case, the point is clear: the Olympic Charter names among other aims of the Olympic movement, the education of young people in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendship that helps to create a better and more peaceful world; the utmost dissemination of Olympic principles for the creation of international

confidence and good will among nations. In keeping with these aims the Olympic movement denounces racial discrimination and apartheid.

The communists are of the view that the assertion of these principles strengthens détente, gives it a definite material content and facilitates the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe adopted in the Finnish capital. In an address to all those who had prepared and were participating in the 22nd Olympic Games Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said that the Games 'have become a festival of youth and sport and helped to strengthen friendship, understanding and peace among nations. They have united the international Olympic movement and given a fresh impetus to the further development of the noble ideals of that movement.'[5]

These words of the leader of the Soviet communists had points in common with what Georges Marchais, General Secretary of the French Communist Party said during a visit to Olympic Moscow: 'The French bourgeoisie likes to see young people fight in conflicts and wars in defense of bourgeois class privileges. For my part I like to see young people study, learn a profession, have a job and engage in sport. I am at one with such young people.'[6]

The spirit of chivalry, humanism and brotherhood determines the optimistic spirit of sport. Through the ages and millenia a special form of political concord — ekichyria — meaning a general sacred armistice during the preparation and holding of the Olympic Games, has come down to us. But even this is resented by some. A French periodical wrote: 'The boycott is due to the fact that the Olympic Games hamper U.S. policy. By the fact that they are its exact opposite in meaning. After all, they orient one upon cooperation, détente and coexistence.'[7]

We in Finland unanimously condemned the boycott of the Olympic Games. Not only athletic organizations but political parties and the country's official circles came out against the boycott. In connection with President Carter's letter to President Urho Kekkonen, the Foreign Ministry issued a communiqué stating: 'The Finnish Olympic Committee has already announced that it wants the Olympic Games to proceed in accordance with the original plans. The Finnish government takes the same view.'[8]

The boycott has proved to be a fiasco. Athletes from over 80 countries took part in the main sporting events of the four-year period. I will not enumerate all those who gathered for the Olympiad in Moscow — that is well known. Let me merely recall that never before had various countries such numerous teams, like Poland, Sweden or Brazil. Here is a curious fact: 77 memebers of the IOC arrived in the Soviet capital for the session of the International Olympic Committee, among them those who had not attended its meetings for four or five years.

The idea of the boycott was roundly condemned by political leaders, public figures and athletes. Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky declared: 'Demonstrations should be staged on the political level, instead of getting the athletes to shoulder such a responsibility. Acts like refusal to hoist the national flag or refusal by an ambassador to attend the Games — all of this, I think, amounts to no more than a show, which will have no results.'[9]

Lasse Viren, our famous long-distance runner who won four Olympic gold medals, says: 'The boycott of the Olympic Games is an unsuitable means for solving international problems. Every athlete dreams of winning at the Olympic Games. And I think that for most of those who were deprived of the right to go to Moscow it will remain an unfulfilled dream. I cannot even imagine what would have happened to me if I had been in their shoes.'[10]

Today, weeks after the Games, it is not very hard to picture the mood of an athlete in whose life politicians meddled. Members of the U.S. Olympic team declared that they were simply betrayed. On this side of the Atlantic, athletes also have a sense of the most profound disappointment. A West German magazine writes: 'It is said that nearly 250 of the roughly 350 FRG athletes who would have gone to Moscow but for the boycott, have lost their only chance of ever taking part in an Olympiad.'[11]

'The grand scale of the Olympiad, the impressive number of athletes, and the athletic results show that, despite the boycott, the Moscow Games are superior to all the earlier ones.'[12] Of course, the absence of a number of teams did reduce the number of athletes, but that is only an external feature. It is generally believed that the Olympic Games in Moscow were a grand festival of world sport. The results achieved in Moscow are highly impressive: 10 world, 22 Olympic and 238 national records were broken in swimming alone; 21 world records were broken in cycling; there was a good crop of records with 16 Olympic and 5 world records — in one weight category (up to 75 kg) in weight-lifting only. And what about the amazing achievements of the high-jumpers, long-jumpers, runners and throwers! Altogether 36 world and 74 Olympic records were established in Moscow, which is more than the number at Montreal.

The Games, held in a socialist country for the first time, were a fresh triumph of the Olympic idea and another demonstration of the boundless potentialities of socialism (it was rightly being said that the Organizing Committee of the 1980 Olympics consisted not only of Muscovites, but of the whole Soviet people), and also an impressive act of Olympic solidarity. For the first time ever, the participants included athletes from many developing countries, and it was in Moscow that the idea was first forcefully brought out that the Games are not an exclusive 'club' for the elect, but an important part of the social life of all countries.

Athletes from 36 countries carried home from the

22nd Olympic Games valuable prizes. Most of the medals went to athletes from the socialist community and that is not at all surprising. Communists believe that sport and physical training should not be the lot of individuals, but of masses, and that sport is important not only as a spectacle (and it is, undoubtedly, fascinating!) but above all as a way to health and the harmonious development of millions. Under socialism, physical training and sport are an organic part of the system of education and upbringing of men and women, part and parcel of their daily life, of the scientific organization of labor, and the structure of the whole way of life.

The winners of the Games were ceremonially honored and were the center of attraction of the press and public, but one could say that the Moscow Olympiad once again confirmed the profound meaning of Coubertin's noble formula: the main thing is not to win, but to take part in the Games. However sharp the competition, whatever the results at the end of the contests, even for those who did not succeed in mounting the winners' rostrum they were a first-class school of athletic skill and human relations, and a happy festival of youth and friendship.

The political consequences of the unsuccessful boycott of the Olympiad, it now becomes especially clear, have turned out to be lamentable for its organizers; the U.S. President clearly failed to score any of the 'political points' he had expected to win in this election year. The boycott boomeranged and hit at the architects of the provocative scheme, Carter in the first place. The reactionary politicians lost out, as did also the U.S., West German and Japanese athletes, and the athletes of other countries whose governments succumbed to the pressure from the White House. U.S. business lost out. Losses were incurred by the companies catering for tourists, companies that were to supply Olympic equipment and goods. This 'defeat' can also be expressed in real terms; dismissal of thousands of more workers and losses running to a total of $10 million.

There is certainly good reason why right after the Olympiad a large part of the reactionary press deemed it better to abandon the subject: it shut up like a trap! Nor was it accidental that many bourgeois periodicals tried to play down the importance of the Games even as they were in progress, not stopping short of inventions and exaggerations. Attempts were made to black out news of the Games (U.S. television, for instance, succumbed to pressure from the Carter administration and screened only a few episodes running to not more than 90 seconds, and even these were mainly irrelevant to the contests), or to smear them. But while it is virtually impossible to twist the arithmetic of the Games, many bourgeois mass media presented distorted — and even provocative — pictures of events before the start and finish, and at the opening and closing ceremonies. The reporter of a London Sunday paper wrote: 'Many British sports reporters in Moscow moaned long and bitterly last week that their London offices were requiring them to doctor copy to suit the needs of pro-boycott editorial lines. Take out reference to gorgeous gymnasts, insert descriptions of troops in serried ranks.'[13]

These ranks of troops haunted the ill-wishers everywhere. But something of a record in anti-Sovietism was set by *The New York Times*, which reported that 'an estimated half million soldiers, police and secret police' were mobilized 'to keep everyone in line.'[14] The paper said nothing about who made the estimate and how. I think that the fitting response to these inventions came from the Moscow correspondent of the U.S. ABC television company, who said that guards there of course were, as there had been in Munich and Montreal, but shots are fired here only in the shooting galleries. Alas, the Munich tragedy has not yet been forgotten. And the main thing is that it is the athletes themselves who need elementary order. Jussi Pelli, our Finnish athlete who goes in for the pentathlon, explained that 'good order creates a tranquil atmosphere in the bustle that is inevitable at the Olympic Games. Courtesy, politeness and readiness to help — that is what I felt when dealing with members of the Olympic guard service. All of that is to my liking.'

The festival of the 22nd Games has done down in history, a bright page in the annals of mankind. This festival could not be upset by the enemies of peace and progress who hate the Olympic flame and who wanted to impose their will on the nations. Nor was it darkened by its ill-wishers, who vainly tried to set the athletes of the world at odds with each other. Summing up the results of the youth meeting in Moscow and looking to the future, the newly elected IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch said: 'The Games in Moscow strengthened the Olympic movement. The IOC can continue its work for unity, peace and friendship.'

Sport — the most popular diplomatist of our age — continues to be at its noble post. The latest Olympiad gives us yet another reminder that it is the duty of communists to add to their broad range of concerns for the interests of the working class and all the other working people greater attention to sport, which helps to build a better, more tranquil and fairer world.

1. *Time*, June 8, 1980, p. 46.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Revolution*, July 11-17, 1980, p. 23.
4. *Sovetsky sport*, July 19, 1980.
5. *Pravda*, August 17, 1980.
6. *L'Humanité*, July 29, 1980.
7. *Revolution*, July 11-17, 1980.
8. *Kansan Uutiset*, January 22, 1980.
9. *Salzburger Nachrichten*, July 13, 1980.
10. *Turun Sanomat*, July 23, 1980.
11. *Der Spiegel*, July 14, 1980, p. 135.
12. *Kansan Uutiset*, August 4, 1980.
13. *The Sunday Times*, July 27, 1980.
14. *International Herald Tribune*, July 23, 1980.

the Party

# Sri Lanka: rejecting social demagoguery

*Kattorge P. Silva*
General Secretary, CC CPSL

The 11th Congress of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka was convened two years after the previous congress. The Central Committee found it advisable to hold the congress ahead of term in order to examine new developments on the domestic and international scene, draw proper conclusions and, if necessary, reconsider the relevant estimates and the party's tasks.

The report on the international situation submitted to the congress and approved by the delegates analyzes new factors that have come to the fore in the world in recent years. They are, on the one hand the further changes that have taken place in the alignment of international forces in favor of peace, national liberation and social progress, and on the other, the attempts of the imperialists to stop and then 'roll back' the building up of international relations on the basis of mutual trust.

With reference to the so-called leading role claimed by President Carter in resuming the cold war, the congress noted the despicable role of China's leaders. The Peking hegemonists are in collusion with the U.S. imperialists, particularly in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf, as well as in South and Southeast Asia. In pursuance of their expansionist policy they regard our continent as a vital primary base for their advance toward world domination. Peking openly calls for a united front against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. While China has become an ally of imperialism, Maoism is a species of anti-communism.

Intimidation, pressure and interference by imperialism and the Chinese hegemonists are invariably accompanied with cries about the 'hand of Moscow' and the 'Soviet military threat.' This multipurpose propaganda weapon is designed to divide the revolutionary liberation forces and to cover imperialist interference in the affairs of other countries and justify its escalation.

On the strength of its analysis of the international situation, our party's 11th Congress, while reiterating the importance of holding a regional conference of Asian communists, stressed the need to make preparations for a new international meeting of fraternal parties.

In considering the domestic situation, the congress concentrated on devising measures to resist the United National Party government's continuing attacks on the living standards and democratic rights of the people. To defend capitalist interests, the government comes up almost daily with schemes with essentially one and the same purpose, namely, to shift every possible burden to the people and make Sri Lanka a paradise for local and foreign capital. However, with each passing day the people are becoming increasingly conscious of the ruinous effects of the government's economic policies and social demagoguery. The government has been compelled more and more to shed its mask of righteousness and democracy. It is getting ready for increasingly sharp clashes with the masses, which it considers inevitable.

In light of new developments and the experience of the last two years, the 11th Congress was able to further concretize the line adopted by the 10th Congress in March 1978 in the new situation, which arose with the collapse of the United Front[1] and the subsequent UNP sweeping victory at the 1977 general elections.[2]

The Congress pointed out that the economic policies of the United Front government were determined primarily by the dominant party of the coalition, the SLFP. The balance of forces within and outside the government was such that the left partners were not strong enough to secure a radical shift to the left in economic policy. On the other hand, neither did the SLFP succeed entirely in its attempts to go far enough to the right to satisfy the new desires of the industrial bourgeoisie, which expected to attract foreign capital, win greater tax concessions, and bring about the lifting of economic controls. There was little response to the UF government's invitation to foreign capitalists to invest in Sri Lanka. They demanded exorbitant concessions and political guarantees. By guarantees they meant not only the relevant legislation but also restriction of the trade union and democratic rights of the working class. The left parties firmly opposed such concessions. This impasse resulted in economic stagnation, more unemployment, consumer shortages, inflation and a deterioration of the people's living standards. The progressive measures carried out by the government, such as the land reform which nationalized all the foreign estates, could not prevent the disillusionment of the working people with the government. The UF cracked up when the SLFP decided to get rid of the left parties in the government and thereby have its hands free.

The UNP came to power with a mission to resuscitate and develop capitalist relations in the economy. The first steps taken by the Jayawardene government were, therefore, to liberalize trade by

relaxing import and exchange controls, unify the exchange rates at a depreciated level, abolish domestic price controls and drastically reduce consumer subsidies. The UNP reduced the company tax and the maximum tax payable by individuals, and increased tax holdings. Foreign investors were offered an attractive package of incentives, in particular in the so-called Free Trade Zone. To carry out these policies, the UNP obtained generous bilateral and multilateral aid from imperialist countries. During the last three years the UNP was able to get $150 million more in aid than the SLFP obtained during its seven-year tenure.

These policies have certainly resuscitated the capitalist economy and contributed to economic growth and additional jobs. While the new job opportunities could only touch the tip of a massive problem (there were nearly a million unemployed in 1977, who are joined annually by as many as 125,000 new entrants to the labor force), economic growth has neither solved the problem of rising living costs, nor the much needed restructuring of the economy. Sri Lanka's position as an appendage of the world capitalist economy has gone from bad to worse. The balance of trade deficit, which was Rs.106 million in 1976, shot up to Rs.2,173 million in 1978. The foreign debt tripled during the first two years of the UNP government and stood at Rs.14,582 million, which was nearly equal to the total export earnings of that year. Due to the high rate of inflation, budget deficits swelled to enormous proportions, swallowing up most of the foreign aid. This year the UNP leaders will have to cut back original plans of development expenditure.

Official statistics show that the GNP growth rates were 8.3 and 6.2 per cent respectively in 1978 and 1979. Contributions to this growth came mainly from the construction, commercial and services sectors, particularly tourism, while the material production sectors, such as industry and agriculture, lagged behind. Import-related trade recorded a phenomenal growth of 23 per cent in 1979 as against 2 per cent in agriculture and 5 per cent in industry. Businessmen who had taken to import substitution industries in the early 1960s have reverted to the more lucrative import trade. Similarly, many small industrialists producing mainly for the domestic market have been forced to close down due to liberalized imports. Export as well as tourist earnings have increased, but so have import expenditures, giving the balance of payments a further deficit.

To please imperialism and thereby obtain aid, the government is yielding to continuous scrutiny and discipline by financial agencies, such as the IMF and the World Bank. It stops at nothing in seeking the meek submission of the working class and has been able so far to hoodwink the workers, largely due to the failure of the SLFP and the association of the left parties with that failure. But the continuous rise in living costs is opening the eyes of the working class and making it difficult to carry on this deception much longer. The UNP is therefore preparing for a confrontation, and for this purpose it has armed itself well with a helpful constitution and repressive legislation.

The new constitution reduces the sovereignty and powers of the National State Assembly and concentrates executive power in the President. The new electoral system of proportional representation has been so designed as to perpetuate bourgeois rule. The high percentage of votes necessary to qualify for representation and the prevention of the possibility of forming electoral united fronts aim to ensure that left parties do not receive anything more than purely token representation.

In 1979 the government adopted two draconian bills aimed at the working class and the left movement. Taking advantage of the terrorist activities of an extremist separatist group of the Tamil ethnic minority, the government adopted the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which gives enormous powers to stifle any political opposition. Under cover of the ban on strikes by doctors, the government adopted the Essential Public Services Act, which enables it to declare practically any strike illegal, and to mete out heavy punishment to those who defy the law, including confiscation of property.

Outlining the tasks in the new situation that arose after the UNP came to power, the 10th Congress drew attention to the immediate task of developing mass struggles to safeguard living standards, democratic rights and other vital gains achieved by the people through decades of struggle. However, mass struggles could not be developed as rapidly as we expected at the time of the 10th Congress. The party had overestimated the rate at which contradictions would grow between the government and the people. The UNP was able to combine a show of economic activity with social demagoguery to retain most of its electoral support during the last three years. It won two by-elections, one in December 1979 and another last May.

For the development of mass struggles in conditions of demoralization among progressive forces and of ruthless victimization, our party relied first and foremost upon the trade unions opposed to the government. The CPSL played the major role in setting up, and in the activities of the Joint Trade Union Action Committee which also included the trade unions associated with the SLFP. In launching actions, this committee had to contend not only with ruthless regulations imposed by the government but also with the aggressive trade unions centers of the UNP. The UNP unions succeeded in cajoling many state sector employees into joining them under threat of victimization and discrimination.

The JTUAC launched several protest campaigns against cuts in consumer subsidies and real wages and against attacks on democratic and trade union rights. With demonstrations banned (except on May Day), the display of placards carrying slogans in front of work places during the lunch hour soon became the most popular form of protest. In the early campaigns, only the communists were prepared to face police intimidation and the organized

thuggery of the ruling party. But with each campaign the turnout improved.

Protest campaigns during the last two years have largely helped to get over much of the demoralization among the left and expose the social demagoguery and democratic pretensions of the government. The continuing attacks on the living standards of the working people while affluent classes thrive are opening the eyes of more and more people. This was evident in the much wider participation in the Day of Protest called for by the JTUAC on June 5 of this year. That day saw a token strike by private sector unions affiliated to the JTUAC and a joint lunch hour placard display campaign by both private and state sector employees. Both actions drew a significantly larger turnout than usual. An attack on protesting workers by UNP-sponsored thugs led to the death of one trade union branch leader belonging to a CPSL-led union, leaving many more seriously injured. General indignation against the government over this incident ran so high that the funeral procession became a mass demonstration led by the JTUAC.[3]

On the Day of Protest the UNP unions organized, with the public blessing of the President and leader of the UNP, J.R. Jayawardene, a counter-campaign in support of the government. However, the turnout was quite poor, showing that the majority who had been coerced into joining UNP unions no longer supported the government's policies.

Our party's line of promoting and strengthening joint action by trade unions irrespective of the political affiliation of leaders has made steady progress despite the government's intimidatory policies and internal obstacles coming from left sectarian and rightist trends. The existence of the most diverse political trends (bourgeois, Trotskyite, Maoist) within the JTUAC demanded of the party flexible tactics of unity and struggle to preserve its militant unity. Left sectarianism, which aspires to be more revolutionary than others, is being compelled to retreat as more and more workers gain political experience. The right-wing trend manifests itself today as an attempt to subordinate the JTUAC to an anti-government alliance of political parties. However, the role played by CPSL-led unions is increasingly appreciated by the movement.

The second main political task decided upon by the 10th Congress was to expand and strengthen the United Left Front of the LSSP/CPSL which existed at that time. The party's aim was to bring in other left parties and groups and strengthen the Front so that it could provide a left alternative to the policies of both the UNP and the SLFP. However, this goal was premature. Rather than being able to widen left unity, even the existing LSSP/CPSL United Front broke up toward the end of 1979. The two parties diverged more than before. The LSSP moved toward a political alliance with the SLFP.

The SLFP bourgeoisie have not changed their policies despite the demagoguery of the leadership of that party. Therefore, we reject the idea of a political alliance with the SLFP, since no bourgeois party can offer constructive solutions to the present problems of rising prices, unemployment and restrictions of working-class rights. However, our party has reiterated that it is willing to cooperate with any political party or group to defend the interests of the working class and other oppressed sections. It was on this basis that the CPSL invited all opposition parties, including the SLFP, at the end of May to discuss ways and means of supporting the Day of Protest.

The 11th Congress specified the tasks before us. It stressed the importance of achieving working-class and left unity as the mainstay, both in developing mass struggles and in building up a broad alliance of anti-imperialist and democratic forces. The congress noted that neither working-class nor left unity could be achieved solely through joint actions against a common enemy. United action has to be combined with the ideological struggle against trends hostile to Marxism-Leninism and with the building of the party among the working class and other revolutionary strata. It depends primarily on the strength and influence of the Communist Party whether these goals are attained. The congress directed the party to overcome in the shortest possible time the weaknesses in our style of work.

The congress, going deep into the question of a left-led anti-imperialist alliance proposed by the 10th Congress, concluded that the task of achieving economic independence from imperialism through socialist-oriented development requires such a front to be led by the working class. Considering the nature of both the socio-economic tasks to be accomplished and the role the working class is called upon to play, the congress stated that such a united front could arise only when objective and subjective conditions matured. More specifically, the birth of a left united front capable of following a socialist orientation in Sri Lanka depends on the advance of the crisis of neo-colonialist capitalist development that the country is going through, on the development of the class consciousness of the working class and on the strength of its vanguard, the Communist Party.

The above conclusions of the 11th Congress concerning both the short-term tactical line and the long-term goal have brought greater consistency to the party's application of Marxist-Leninist theory in Sri Lanka. They will serve to enhance the militancy and purposeful activity of cadre and rank-and-file members. They will help the party in its struggle against both right and left opportunist tendencies and promote greater ideological cohesion within the party. They will also serve to rally round the party the militant sections of the working class, the peasantry, radical youth and the intelligentsia.

1. Formed in 1968, it comprised the CPSL, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party, and the Socialist Party (Lanka Sama Samaja Party). — *Ed.*

2. See Pieter Keuneman, 'Unity of the Fighting Masses,' *WMR*, August 1978. — *Ed.*

3. The JTUAC set a general strike for July 21. The government retaliated by declaring a state of emergency. Subsequently, it decreed a heightened alert in the army and imposed press censorship. — *Ed.*

# Costa Rica: conditions for revolution

*Eduardo Mora Valverde*
CC Deputy General Secretary,
People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica

Costa Rica is in the throes of a debilitating socio-economic crisis. Inflation is running at a rate of 30-40 per cent. One-third of the national income is used for the gradual settlement of the foreign debt, which amounts to two annual budgets. Half of the hard-currency revenue has to be spent on covering the inexorably growing balance of payments deficit. Housing, wages, food, social security, education are all acute problems. Unemployment is growing (the rate has now reached 10-12 per cent) and prices are sky-rocketing. Small and medium enterprises are being forced into bankruptcy by the concentration and centralization of capital. The condition of the peasantry is going from bad to worse.[1]

It would be a mistake to put today's social and economic calamities down to the government's policy alone. They were engendered by the long domination of the oligarchy, which takes its orders from U.S. imperialism, the transnationals and the International Monetary Fund. Neither of the two reformist parties, alternating at the helm, is capable of solving, if only in part, the nation's burning problems. The reasons are obvious. First, the local bourgeoisie is closely linked to imperialism and second, a radical solution would inevitably hit the oligarchy-imperialist bloc.

The socio-economic crisis is leading to a political crisis, which may erupt into a revolution. Frightened by the advances of the revolutionary movement in Central America, the government is intensifying repressions against the people's, primarily the workers' organizations and encouraging the paramilitary fascist gangs.

The People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica held its 13th Congress[2] in this situation. It reviewed the party's work in the preceding four years, adopted a number of important documents concerning the international and the domestic situation, debated the drafts of the new Program and the Party Rules, and approved the Political Theses.

It reaffirmed that the strategy of the Costa Rican communists was aimed at accomplishing an anti-imperialist, agrarian, democratic, people's revolution in order to pave the way for socialism. Here the point of departure was that the main contradiction in the country is between the people and imperialism. Without a doubt, today's Costa Rica is one of those 'dependent countries which, politically, are formally independent, but in fact are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 263). For that reason the democratic revolution in Costa Rica has got to be anti-imperialist in content. And even though at the present stage our revolution is not aimed directly at the overthrow of the capitalist system, it does undermine its foundations.

What then are the classes and social groups interested in the revolution? The congress gave a clear-cut answer to this question: the proletariat, poor and middle peasants, white-collar workers, students, the middle strata. Needless to say, the congress also took into consideration the role that under certain circumstances may be played by the segment of the bourgeoisie opposed to imperialist domination. However, its participation, whatever form this takes, should not be overrated because by its very nature the bourgeoisie cannot be a consistent motive force of revolution. In this sense, Lenin's warning remains as valid as ever. He said: 'In using the word "people" Marx did not thereby gloss over class distinctions, but united definite elements capable of bringing the revolution to completion' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 9, p. 133). We regard the people as an evolving historical category with a constant tendency to expand its framework and at the same time, dismiss from its composition those political and social forces which, at the different stages of the revolutionary process come into conflict with and impede social development.

In the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism the proletariat is society's main motive force. The new program adopted by the congress states in no uncertain terms that although the working class does not comprise the majority of the population it should head any revolutionary alliance. Its qualifications for guiding revolutionary processes are: the place it occupies in capitalist production; exploitation by the bourgeois regime, which prompts it to set up its own organizations; its experience of class struggle; its total disinterestedness in the preservation of private ownership; and last, the fact that it is the only class equipped with a scientific vision of the world — the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

In Costa Rica the working class is growing rapidly, becoming better organized and more class conscious. While cementing its alliance with the peasantry, it will continue to be the leading force in the revolutionary struggle.

Ever since it was founded 49 years ago, the party of Costa Rica's communists has held that the revolution could triumph without recourse to violence. The 13th Congress reaffirmed this historical projection, which besides reflecting the profoundly humanitarian character of our teaching, stems from objective factors: the nation's socio-economic de-

velopment, the existence of deep-rooted bourgeois-democratic traditions and the absence of a brutal repressive apparatus (such as function in other Central American countries).

Having analyzed the struggle of the peoples in the isthmus, the congress stressed that imperialism and local reaction had to be prevented from blocking the peaceful development of revolution — regarded by the classics of Marxism-Leninism as a rare but very important possibility of the people assuming power. It called upon the people of Costa Rica to make every effort to use the conditions still available for this non-violent course. The best can be made of these conditions if the alignment of forces in each sector of the revolutionary struggle changes in favor of the people. The vanguard's skillful use of favorable internal factors, among them the contradictions in the enemy camp, would reduce the latter's capability to resort to armed violence. But today, with the reactionary stand of the class enemy hardening, the working class and all other working people must be prepared to repulse any onslaught from the right.

As they define their tactics and action program the communists of Costa Rica realize that the battle against imperialism must be won before the revolution can triumph. Here reliance must be placed on their own forces but also on the forces of world revolution. This was why the congress re-stated the determination of the communists to bend every effort to rouse the masses to action for the satisfaction of their economic, political and social demands, draw all strata of working people into the struggle and form representative alliances of the popular forces. Special attention was given to strengthening unity with other parties which have adopted Marxism-Leninism as their doctrine. This will allow forming the foundation for a democratic, anti-imperialist front with the people's liberation from foreign oppression and the implementation of fundamental democratic reforms as its aim.

The party understands that the struggle against imperialism and social inequities merges with the worldwide struggle for socialism and that it is, therefore, essential to strengthen its ties with the international working class and with the socialist countries, first and foremost with the Soviet Union and the great Party of Lenin.

As throughout the 10 months we prepared for the congress we always bore in mind the complex problem of the correlation of objective and subjective factors in a revolutionary situation, a problem that is especially important and vital for a country in an explosive zone like Central America. Do we have the objective and subjective conditions for a revolution in Costa Rica?

They are unquestionably maturing and a detailed analysis was presented at the congress. Consideration was also given to yet another factor, which must be reckoned with even though, in itself, it does not further the maturing of a revolutionary situation. I am speaking of the international situation. 'International problems,' the CC report said, 'variously influence the political development of different countries, depending on the place and time. It is imperative to stress that today the course of history is determined by the forces of socialism, peace, democracy and national liberation.'

In this context the foreign policy resolution passed by the congress noted the danger harbored by the USA's policy of reviving the cold war and the arms race, and particularly by the NATO decision taken under pressure from Washington, to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe with socialist countries as their target. The United States, the resolution says, is whipping up anti-Communist, anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria.

The congress condemned Peking's sinister alliance with imperialist circles in the United States and Japan. The Peking clique is jumping out of its skin to secure the trust of its new allies; suffice it to mention its criminal attack on heroic Vietnam, or its support for the counter-revolutionary gangs in Afghanistan.

The Iranian revolution was a heavy blow to U.S. imperialism. The United States refuses to reconcile itself to the changes in Iran and spares no effort to destabilize the new regime in that country.

The People's Vanguard Party unreservedly supports the USSR's policy of peace and thinks highly of its assistance to the national-liberation movements.

One of the congress' main slogans called for solidarity among the Central American states. This is an indication of the importance we attach to the struggle of the fraternal peoples in our region. 'Nicaragua has trimphed. . . . And El Salvador shall triumph too!' These words were pronounced by the thousands of participants and guests. The communists of Costa Rica are in solidarity with all the peoples of Central America and are prepared to give them the same fraternal assistance they had extended to the people of Nicaragua against the Somoza dictatorship.

As the vanguard of the Costa Rican people the party bears a special responsibility. It must assimilate the Marxist-Leninist teaching, use the experience of the world revolutionary movement and strengthen its links with socialist countries.

It realizes that in the immediate future the communists will have to show staunchness, tactical flexibility, courage, perspicacity and unshakable fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The 13th Congress was an important milestone in the party's four-year plan which will end in 1982, when the presidential, vice-presidential, parliamentary and municipal elections are to be held. Our party, a member of the United People Coalition along with other left parties, expects the movement for the creation of a democratic and anti-imperialist bloc to be substantially strengthened by that time.

The success of the 13th Congress, which had considerable support from the working people during the preparations and while it was in session, is evidence that the plan is making good headway.

We have now entered the 1980s, which will doubtlessly be a difficult decade. Our Marxist-Leninist party — vanguard of the working class and all other working people of Costa Rica — has accumulated extensive experience in the course of almost half a century of continuous struggle; strong and inspired by revolutionary enthusiasm, it is working to cement its ties with the masses and consolidate its ideological and organizational unity.

1. Whereas landowner domination had not been a distinctive feature of the nation's agriculture, today 65 per cent of the arable land is held by a handful of big landowners, who comprise 4 per cent of the rural population; 40 per cent of the peasants have only 6 per cent of the farmland.

2. This congress (June 13-16, 1980) was attended by 289 delegates. Of these 33 per cent were workers, 17 per cent peasants, 20 per cent diploma'd specialists, 6 per cent white-collar workers and 24 per cent were people from other sections of the population.

# New experience

## OUR INTERVIEWS

### CONCERN FOR SPECIALISTS

*Dang Huu Khiem*
CC member, Communist Party of Vietnam

*Today, with the nation building socialism, it would be interesting to know more about your party's work among intellectuals and how specialists are trained.*

At the initial stage of socialist construction our intelligentsia was small numerically. The party made considered use of these people's knowledge and experience and at the same time, enlarged the facilities for training a new intelligentsia, chiefly from among the military, workers and cooperated peasants. One-third of this intelligentsia has shown its mettle in battle and in work. We are trying to ensure the maximum coupling of theoretical study with practical work, upbringing with work in production and schooling with public life. Training covers a wide field — theory, thorough study of Marxism-Leninism and the party's policies, the development of practical skills, and political and moral education.

It may be said that today we have an intelligentsia that has come from the working class and is devoted to the motherland and socialism.

Despite the fact that our economy is still undeveloped and despite the effects of the long war, we have rapidly trained a body of scientific and technical intellectuals with assistance from fraternal socialist countries, especially from the Soviet Union. We now have 260,000 specialists with a higher education, 4,000,000 candidates and doctors of sciences, and more than 400 professors and senior lecturers. Some two-thirds of them are party members. Ten per cent of the specialists with a higher education and almost all the doctors and most of the candidates of sciences received their training in fraternal socialist countries — half of them in the USSR.

With its eye on present-day requirements, the party gives much of its attention to improving the skills of specialists and training a new generation of cadres capable of directing economic development and tackling scientific and technical problems.

We have 79 institutions of higher learning and 290 specialized secondary schools training economic and technical personnel. As many as 80 per cent of the party members receiving training at special courses (with a short or non-interruption of their work) have completed their study of fundamental questions of political economy, economic management and party building; 40 per cent of the members of district committees have completed a secondary school program, and 66 per cent have completed the party school program. This has enabled the CPV to carry out important tasks, for instance tasks linked to socialist transformations in the south of Vietnam and the strengthening of frontier districts in the southwest and north.

We are giving increasing attention to training cadres and improving their skills at educational institutions opened for ethnic minorities. It is of paramount importance to enlarge the education system in highland regions not only to wipe out illiteracy in these regions but also to train more local cadres. Each large region, that includes several highland provinces, has a higher teachers' training facility, an engineering school, and medical and agricultural colleges training people of ethnic minorities and the Kinh* living there. As regards political education and the study of Marxism-Leninism at the central level we have two schools for the ethnic minorities.

In its concern for the placing and promotion of cadres the party gives much attention to their links with the local population. In education, medical care and the judicial system, priority is given to specialists belonging to ethnic minorities. The number of such cadres is growing. In 1960 the ethnic minorities hardly had a hundred scientific and technical specialists with a higher education, but today there are nearly 6,000. Moreover, the party pays the most serious attention to people's skills, chiefly of ranking officials of economic agencies. It is our policy that the national specific should not lead to the promotion of cadres whose training level does not conform to present-day requirements.

In recent years many scientific and technical

* Or Viets — the basic population of Vietnam. — *Ed.*

specialists, who have proved themselves in production and in battle, are closely linked to the masses, have outstanding abilities and are morally staunch, have been appointed to executive posts.

Speaking of political cadres, 22 per cent of the members of district committees, 32 per cent of the members of provincial committees, half of the leading cadres of government departments and 37 per cent of the ministers and deputy ministers have a higher education.

After the liberation of the South we won over between 75 and 85 per cent of the scientists and technologists who had worked under the former regime (the exceptions are those who were hostile to socialism or lost their capacity for work). Specialists were admitted to the corresponding mass organizations. Attention was given to providing them with ideological and political training in the spirit of national traditions. We thereby fostered their patriotism and gave each of them a clear understanding of the situation and the nation's tasks. Every opportunity was given for the effective, professional activity of specialists and surmounting the opinion that they were 'puppet intellectuals.'

Progressive intellectuals contributing to the development of science enjoy all rights and powers at factories, hospitals, schools and research institutes. Missions to study the achievements of fraternal socialist countries give them the possibility of broadening their knowledge.

The party sees one of its central tasks in working among intellectuals, reinforcing the ranks of scientific and technical specialists and improving their training.

## PARTY BUDGET

*Edmund Larsson*
Head of the Finance Department,
Board of the Left Party — Communists
(Sweden)

*Many of our readers are asking for information about the financial aspect of a party's life. You head the department forming your party's budget. Would you tell us what the budget consists of?*

Our party's budget consists of two basic parts: primary and district organizations have their own funds, which they dispose of independently, but a certain portion comes under the jurisdiction of the central leadership.

Let me say a few words about where these funds come from. First, I shall note that since the party is represented in parliament it receives a state subsidy, whose amount depends largely on our parliamentary group's numerical strength. We got the use of this money not very long ago, and it serves as a good prop. But the party cannot, of course, count only on that source. Our main problem is to extend the party's financial self-sufficiency.

We formed a competent commission headed by one of the party's secretaries, which in addition to studying some questions of organization, analyzed the budget and the ways and means of increasing it. In particular, it considered the new, differential system of party dues. The survey has revealed that this source can yield considerably more money than we are now getting.

We attach importance to economic campaigns. Each district organization works out the best way of conducting them. On the local level they organize fairs, festivals and so forth. The districts deduct part of the revenues to the central fund and use the rest as an addition to their own budgets. Last year we received 1,600,000 kronors from this source.

The voluntary donations to the party support fund show that people have faith in the party. For example, when recently we were short of half a million kronors for urgent requirements, this money was collected by party members and sympathizers. We often get donations from individual citizens: 100,000 kronors were received from an anonymous lady; a farmstead and plots of land were donated by private individuals. The list of such examples is long.

Some forms of commercial activity have been tried to add to the budget. This did not bring much, and we are now discussing whether it is expedient to continue this activity.

The party runs its own publishing house and printing facilities equipped with fairly modern machinery, but this does not bring any revenue. We are developing ways of increasing revenues from the sale of publications. For instance, it is suggested that district organizations should pay for part of the printed output. But this is only at the discussion stage.

The party thus tried to expand all the sources of revenue.

*How and on what are party funds spent?*

The budget of the central apparatus today amounts to roughly 7,000,000 kronors. About 20 per cent of this money is allocated to subsidize our newspaper *Ny Dag* (let me note that if it is borne in mind that the government newspaper gets a state subsidy of 20 million kronors and a similar sum from the Association of Swedish Entrepreneurs, the money we allocate for the publication of our own newspaper — even with some officially prescribed support from the state — is clearly not enough).

Part of the money is used to pay the wages of officials of the central apparatus and of the aides of our MPs. Approximately 400,000 kronors are spent on education. A similar sum is allocated as a subsidy for district organizations that do not have a strong economic base. About 500,000 kronors go to our youth organization. Also, there are the expenditures on various commissions, working groups and so on.

Party district organizations that have, as I said, their own budget pay the salaries of their officials (in our largest Stockholm organization there are ten officials). Local organizations pay for the work of political secretaries helping to research various matters, and of people who hold jobs and carry out party functions (for instance, propaganda), or work in municipal councils. Most town organizations

have their own newspapers, which they run on their own funds.

Budget planning helps to tie in the party's needs with its financial resources (even if they are limited). Rational, economical spending of party resources and the development of ways and means of increasing them are two sides of a single problem.

## DOCUMENTS

### MONGOLIA

*Economic education for the people*

A resolution on measures to raise the people's level of economic education has been passed by the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. It states that party organizations are doing much in this field and that this is helping to improve the management of the economy and encourages the people to work creatively. At the same time, it is stated that party, government and public organizations are still inadequately using the potentialities being opened by the economic education of the people. The basis of the people's economic education, the resolution says, is the study of Marxist-Leninist economic theory, the economic policy charted by MPRP congresses and CC plenary meetings, the laws governing economic development, the Leninist principles of economic management, the economy and organization of production, scientific and technological achievements and advanced expertise, and the theory and practice of managing production.

The resolution maps out measures to raise the level of economic education and, on that basis, improve economic management. There are to be five-year plans for the economic education of the people in industries, aimaks, towns and somons, and at individual factories, state farms and agricultural associations. The relevant departments of the MPRP Central Committee and the State Committee for Higher, Secondary Specialized and Vocational Education will supervise the drawing up of standard curricula, programs, textbooks and study aids for the differentiated education of all categories of the personnel of the various branches of the national economy.

Propagandists-economists are to be trained at the Refresher Institute for Executives; this institute is to have an economic education methodology department.

Economic study facilities are to be organized at industrial and other enterprises. The quality of economic training at the trade union socialist labor schools and in the political study system run by the Revolutionary Youth League is receiving close attention. There are to be annual courses and seminars for the training and re-training of propagandists-economists. Economic departments are to be set up at the people's universities.

The curricula of institutions of higher learning and technical and vocational schools are to be revised beginning with the 1980/81 academic year to enable students to acquire more profound economic knowledge with account of the specifics of their future professions. The fundamentals of economic knowledge are to be included in the curricula of general education schools.

In order to ensure integral scientific and organizational guidance of economic study, the CC Ideological Department is to have a supernumerary Joint Council composed of the assistant heads of the corresponding departments, CC officials, heads of departments of institutions of higher learning and economists.

### MEXICO

*Theses for the coming congress*

As part of the preparations for the 19th Congress, the leadership of the Mexican Communist Party has published theses adopted at a CC plenary meeting. These contain a brief survey of what has been achieved by the Mexican communists in the three years since the last congress and sets new tasks. The theses note that the MCP has visibly expanded and deepened its work, championing national interests and consistently fighting for socialism, democracy and freedom.

The party has won official recognition, strengthened its alliance with a number of progressive organizations, set up a left coalition on that basis and been successful at the 1979 elections. As a result, there is now a communist group in the Mexican congress. This has substantially increased the party's possibilities for directly influencing the nation's foreign policy and domestic life.

In its relations with the communist and workers' parties of other countries, the theses note, the MCP is guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism and fraternal solidarity. It upholds peace and national independence and makes every effort to contribute to the common struggle against imperialism.

### ISRAEL

*Against the threat of fascism*

A plenary meeting of the CPI Central Committee passed a political resolution charging the government with extending the fascisization of public life in Israel. The resolution denounces the anti-democratic and anti-labor laws passed recently by the Knesset, expresses the party's solidarity with the struggle of the Arab population of Israel against the expropriation of land and oppression, for equality in all areas, demands the immediate release of military personnel who refused to serve in occupied territories, and an end to repressions and to impingements on freedom of speech and political struggle in educational institutions and in society as a whole.

The resolution notes that the class interests of the big bourgeoisie and the continued occupation of Arab territories are the source of the fascist threat. To counter this threat, the resolution states, there is a need for joint actions by all the democratic forces and the creation of a broad front.

## BEHIND THE FACTS

### UNION FOR POPULAR ENLIGHTENMENT

*'This Union is an educational institution whose work is based on the scientific foundations of the working-class worldview — Marxism-Leninism. It is inseparable from the educational and cultural activity of the Finnish working-class movement,' the Union's prospectus states. Its work is described below by Union staff members Veikko Väntänen and Liisa Korhonen.*

The Union's membership consists of 21 organizations uniting more than a million people. A leading place among these organizations is held by the Communist Party of Finland.

Work is conducted along three basic lines. These are, first, the *setting up of extra-mural study circles*. The curriculum depends on the organizations at which they are set up. Members of our Union — the Communist Party, the Democratic Union of the People of Finland, a number of trade unions, and organizations representing democratic young people and women, and the sports and cooperative movements — are our customers, so to speak. In preparing lecture courses and study material we take their wishes into account.

When we draw up the program and themes for party study circles and lecture courses we concentrate on basic divisions, for instance, 'Social Knowledge for the Workers,' 'Economic Knowledge for the Workers' and 'Organizational Questions for Party Life.'

The character of study for trade union activists is somewhat different. It is more closely linked to the people's production and public work. For example, political study is organized for their representatives at factories. They study labor legislation, the history of the trade-union movement, the international trade-union movement and the basic propositions of political economy and philosophy. Also exchanges of experience of work at factories are widespread. For this purpose, special short courses are arranged by the Union's Department for Trade-Union Study in Helsinki.

Every year the Union forms approximately 6,000 study circles for between 60,000 and 70,000 people, and trains instructors for these circles.

Then there is *study by correspondence*. For this purpose the Union has a center for study by correspondence which prepares and mails study material. The center's program covers more than 80 thematic courses on the theory of Marxism-Leninism and socio-economic questions. Representatives of factories are given a knowledge of workers' rights, duties and so on. This form of study usually embraces between 2,000-3,000 persons annually.

Lastly, the Union directs the *cultural and amateur art activities of the working people*. This is handled by our Cultural Department, which supervises the work of the study circles and amateur art groups, draws up programs for them, provides them with music scores, arranges exhibits, sets up camps for amateur artists and arranges study at special courses. The most important event is the annual festival of workers' culture. This is actually a nationwide review of workers' amateur art.

We began on a modest scale: a few study circles and no hired personnel. Today the Union has its own printshop and permanent, well-equipped office premises. We have a trained personnel of 36 persons (two in the localities). Some of them have a university education. We enlist the services of trained lecturers, a list of whom has been sent to all our members so that their services may be called upon when necessary.

Lately there has been a considerable upgrading of the level of instruction and of the requirements in preparing study material. We publish a journal which helps to disseminate our materials, keeps people informed of the organization and course of study, and serves as a means of maintaining contact with self-education circles.

The Finnish Ministry of Education has recognized the Union as an institution providing education for adults. The Union now officially enjoys the status of an educational center and by virtue of that, is entitled to some financial support from the government.

The social democrats have a similar educational center, but its traditions are longer and its material base is larger. Nonetheless, they regard our Union as a serious rival. For our part, we urge cooperation and seek every avenue to contact between the two educational centers. This is particularly important because in many ways both depend on financial assistance from the trade unions, in which communists and social democrats work side by side.

At its latest congress the Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions decided to bankroll the two educational centers. Even the trade unions dominated by the social democrats have been called upon to help us in proportion to the communist strength in them. This will unquestionably help to extend and deepen the work of our Union.

**The Shaping of Sudbury**
**A Labour View**
**by Jim Tester**

The history of a major Canadian industrial city from the point of view of the people who built it.

pamphlet 38 pages 50¢

**PROGRESS BOOKS,**
**71 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**

exchange of views

# Creating a socialist entity of men

## EQUALITY UNDER SOCIALISM

This opens a series of publications prepared by research institutions in various countries, containing an analysis of the most important social trends in the late 1970s and early 1980s and also presenting scientific prognostications of future development. The first is an analysis carried out by the Institute of Social Sciences under the HSWP CC, where an exchange of views was held on the problem of equality under socialism. The Round Table was attended by Sandor Lakos, Director of the Institute and a member of the HSWP CC, and a group of leading associates: Tiber Halay, Peter Schmidt, Ferenc Gazso and Tomas Kolosi. Below is a summary of their statements.

Mankind has never been indifferent to the problem of social equality. It focusses the interests and ideals of classes, strata and groups in society, and exposes social contradictions. That is why the serf levelling the bear-spear against his seigneur, the bourgeois standing up for the rights of the third estate, and the proletarian manning the barricades all gave a different meaning to the demand for equality. The slogan which, according to Engels, was initially 'the spontaneous reaction against the crying social inequalities, against the contrast between rich and poor, the feudal lords and their serfs, the surfeiters and the starving . . . developed into the bourgeois demand for the abolition of class privileges.'[1] It subsequently came to express the proletariat's resolve to abolish classes altogether.

At different stages of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle against exploitation and oppression and for the establishment of a socialist social system, Marx, Engels and Lenin exposed the attempts by bourgeois philosophers and politicians to ascribe to scientific communism the primitive view that equality amounted to identical capabilities and physical and spiritual powers among men. Ridiculing the high-flown scholastic sophistries spun out by Dühring, Engels showed that 'the real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the abolition of classes.'[2] This idea was subsequently elaborated by Lenin in his polemics with Russian liberalism, when he said: 'By political equality Social-Democrats mean *equal rights*, and by economic equality . . . they mean the *abolition of classes*. As for establishing human equality in the sense of equality of strength and abilities (physical and mental), socialists do not even think of such things' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 145).

The Marxist view, which has been fully borne out by practice, is that under socialism social antagonisms are eliminated, but friendly classes, sections and groups continue to exist and their condition and interests differ markedly from each other. Complete equality cannot be achieved in such a society: that is an ideal which is to be realized only at the higher phase of the communist formation. In the period of building a developed socialist society, the question of the prospects for advance, the forms and methods of gradually enhancing social equality tends to become theoretically and politically topical and acquires more distinct contours.

### *What Is Social Equality*

Scientific socialism has never entertained egalitarian utopias or illusions that the way to overcoming the existing inequality allegedly runs through an egalitarian distribution of material and cultural goods. We do not in any sense seek to attain some abstract, absolutely homogeneous state without any distinctions whatsoever. It is labor that is the criterion of equality under socialism, for it determines the individual's status in society and the share of the social product he receives, and his social condition generally. This approach makes it possible to speak of the attained degree of equality, despite the fact that social distinctions and manifestations of inequality remain in almost every sphere of social life.

The 'social equality' category has a complex content, i.e., it includes characteristics of the political, economic and cultural status of men, groups, sections and classes. Its elements do not take shape simultaneously. Historically, equality is first established under socialism in the political sphere: equality of rights, i.e., the general equality of classes from the standpoint of their right to power and its exercise, to participation in social affairs (which does not contradict the leading role of the working class), followed by the shaping of equality of initial conditions for the development of the individual and the gradual attainment of an equal level of education. Inequality in the distribution of material goods and the distinctions in status in social production remain much longer. But even these individual elements of equality do not, for their part, emerge all at once in a complete form. The process here is not more than gradual and does not always run a straight course; the obliteration of some dis-

tinctions and manifestations of inequality may go hand in hand with a temporary enhancement of others, which is why none of them remain in an unchanged state.

It should be emphasized that although social distinctions and some types of inequality do remain under socialism, the society takes a tremendous stride forward as compared with capitalism, toward the attainment of equality, having eliminated the antagonism of classes, established a truly democratic political system, introduced the principle of payment in accordance with work, done away with privileges in education, etc.

Social equality, like inequality, consists of many particular characteristics, and society is far from being indifferent to what concrete combination of favorable and unfavorable economic, political, cultural and other characteristics constitute the social environment of individuals, strata and classes. From the standpoint of the prospects for the development of our system and its ethics it is intolerable that poles could emerge in society with all the positive elements being accumulated at one pole and all the negative ones at the other.

We certainly favor economic incentives and a simultaneous provision of cultural and other advantages to those who work well for the good of society. What we object to is the transfer of differences arising on the basis of the distribution of material goods to other spheres of social life and the formation, on that basis, of a hierarchy of particular characteristics of social status. In other words, we deny the emergence of a material prestige that would command other advantages, because under socialism all those who are engaged in useful activity are equal in social status.

The concentration of negative factors among some sections and groups is undesirable, although it still occurs for objective reasons. An example is offered by unskilled workers who have a relatively low level of income, education, skill, etc. How is such a concentration to be eliminated? Is this to be done through a deliberate change in the connection between some negative features, while the social section which has them will remain, or will it wither away? There are differences of opinion on this point. Our practice rather corroborates the latter version.[3]

Despite the malicious claims of the bourgeois press which seeks to inflate the inequality that exists under socialism to the level of class antagonisms, in Hungary, as in other fraternal countries, there has been a prevalent trend to ever greater social equality throughout the whole history of the construction of the new society. But we do not close our eyes to the fact that some aspects of inequality continue variously to be reproduced and that in the course of the new system's own development new forms of distinctions and inequality may arise.

The remaining types of inequality differ from each other by nature, and the party's policy with respect to them is also differentiated. It goes without saying, for instance, that objectively inequality which springs from the existence of two forms of socialist property cannot be eliminated by an act of will. It is abated as the property of the whole people and cooperative property move closer to each other, and will disappear after they are merged in one form of socialist property as a result of long historical development. Some essential forms of inequality are determined by the social division of labor. The relations between the managers of production and the rank-and-file workers are one of the long-term factors operating in the socialist society. Science has been studying this in order to direct the course of social processes, but the task of eliminating the social inequality it determined will not be set so long as it continues to be objectively necessary. For the time being such inequality can only be compensated to some extent through greater democratic control in production.

Another type of inequality is connected not with the character of work but with the specifics of the structure of consciousness, culture, etc., which remain throughout the lifetime of several generations and which are reproduced in the family. In a sense, they put young people in different conditions at the very first stage of their life. The social and cultural policy of the fraternal parties in the socialist countries aims to provide the rising generation with equal opportunities. Society does its utmost to prevent the beginning from playing the decisive role throughout a lifetime, but it is up to the individual to apply his will, conviction and industry to make the most of these equal opportunities.

But apart from what has been said other factors which are not directly connected with the nature of socialism (like excessively high incomes which do not correspond to a man's actual labor input and its social importance) continue to act and are reproduced. We seek to eradicate or limit them and to prevent such factors from being entrenched in our society.

### *What is the basis of equality*

Changes in the social-class structure of society with the development of social property and the change in the character of labor constitute the basis for the advance toward the establishment of equality. That is an objective process, which is independent of human consciousness, and which cannot be either stopped or sped up by the interference of political forces.

In the early 1960s, the laying of the foundations of socialism was completed in Hungary. The most acute differences between town and country were evened out, there was a numerical growth of the working class, primarily with the influx of people from the countryside. The peasantry was organized in cooperatives, a new intelligentsia took shape, the employee stratum was almost entirely renewed, the number of those employed increased, while the size of the middle urban sections was reduced. The establishment of the complete domination of socialist property marked the next stride, following the abolition of exploiter classes, toward the attainment of socio-political equality: the distinctions in the

status of classes, strata and groups with respect to the means of production were reduced to the point of distinctions between two forms of socialist property.

Following the laying of the foundations of socialism, the need for rapid and frequently stepped-up transformations of social structure disappears. Social mobility is slowed down. It is especially important to emphasize that the change in the strategy of economic development — the switch to an intensive type of reproduction — requires that we create new forms of social management corresponding to the more complex tasks of the present stage. Practice shows that the economic mechanism relying on the broad use of economic regulators helps to bring out more clearly the interests of the various social groups and leads to their internal consolidation.

An analysis of the social-class processes in the socialist countries over the past 10-15 years warrants the conclusion that the new structure emerges as a result of the interaction of two trends: the growing homogeneity of society (as the existing classes and sections are drawn closer together, so helping to overcome the old structure) on the one hand, and its differentiation (stratification within classes), on the other.

The former process is expressed above all in the drawing closer together of the working class and the peasantry, in the emergence of ever greater similarities in the social condition of workers and persons doing non-manual work, the broad spread of mixed families.[4]

Contrary to our earlier and somewhat schematic notions no class of peasants with a coherent inner structure sharply differing from the working class has emerged in the socialist society. In the socialist countries, the size of the peasantry is being reduced. In the early 1970s, only 8 per cent of all employed persons in Hungary were peasants in the precise meaning of the word. Since then, the percentage has been further reduced. The cooperatives are being transformed into large economic units, their indivisible funds[5] have been growing, and industrial methods of production are being ever more extensively used, so gradually evening out their distinctions from industrial enterprises which are the property of the whole people. State control and regulation of cooperative activity on the one hand, and the extension of independent operations by state enterprises on the other, tend to produce, despite the difference in the elements of economic activity, virtually similar or very kindred relations of production both in the state and in the cooperative sector. Because of the build-up of the material and technical basis of agriculture, roughly half the members of cooperatives are now engaged in industrial or mental work, instead of the traditional peasant labor (i.e., manual, unspecialized labor heavily dependent on the seasons). In the 1970s, in many socialist countries there was a rapid growth of the share of workers among members of agricultural cooperatives, and there has emerged a numerous group of wageworkers who are employed in the cooperatives without being their members.

Another characteristic form in which the classes and sections are being drawn closer together is the growing number of mixed families which, for all practical purposes, cannot be included in any single class. In Hungary, nearly one-half of the population are members of such families. What is especially indicative is the large number of families where the actively employed members include both industrial workers and workers by brain. The massive nature of this phenomenon testifies to an actual toning down of the inequalities, the disappearance of the caste consciousness that was so characteristic of the old Hungary, where workers by brain constituted an extremely tight section with considerable privileges.

But the shaping of the new social structure as determined by socialist relations of production has proceeded not only as a result of the growing homogeneity of society, but also of its differentiation — within the framework of the main classes. The most essential distinctions are connected with the opportunities open to this or that social group for participation in deciding on matters in production and distribution. That is why we attach much importance to the shaping of leading party and economic-executive cadres and improvement of the mechanisms through which the working people, the working class in the first place, are involved in the management of social affairs, so as to provide approximately equal opportunities for the social mobility of various social groups.

There is some increase in the distinctions between individual sections determined by place of residence (town or country, size of populated locality, state of infrastructure), level of skill standards, size of family, ratio of working members and dependents, etc. However, differentiation within the individual class is far from always being identical with a deepening of social inequality as a whole: a growing distinction between sections of one class (as for instance, unskilled and skilled workers) could simultaneously signify a greater alignment of other sections (as for instance, of skilled workers and workers by brain).

### *Labor: Criterion of equality*

Socialism has attained a definite degree of equality on the basis of labor, social property and new forms of distribution. We are aware that this is far from being an absolute or full equality, but without any exaggeration we regard it as an achievement of historic importance. For ages, the best men and women carried on a struggle to make labor the measure by which men are valued, instead of class privileges or property status. Today, in our country man's status in society is determined by the results of his personal labor input, even if this is not yet done consistently enough.

In the process of building developed socialism, we shall advance toward a higher level of equality than before. Here, the most tangible results are the alignment of the incomes of workers and peasants, the evening out of their social security, and more

consistent application of the principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women. There has been a marked reduction in unearned income, but the remuneration for labor of a higher quality requiring responsibility and knowledge has become better. But here much remains to be done: to determine more precisely the satisfaction of which main requirements have to be ensured for all the members of the society, in which areas and to what extent greater equality of opportunities and status should be sought, and in which — their further differentiation.

It is a complex problem to measure and assess the differentials in incomes and, consequently, the scale of economic inequality which continues to exist under socialism.[6] Only the historical approach helps to show the trends of development: to show whether there is a growth or an evening out of the distinctions. Besides, there are no scientifically grounded criteria, applicable to all nations at all historical periods, for an optimal differentiation of incomes that could help to judge the extent to which it accords with the socialist ideal. An assessment of the depth of proprietary differentiation evidently includes many variables, like the efficiency of the functioning of the economic mechanism, the socio-political atmosphere and so on.

We think that at present the differences in the remuneration of labor for the mass of those who work are relatively small and insufficient.[7] Since the late 1940s, income inequality in Hungary has been steadily reduced. In some areas there have even been signs of egalitarianism which did not accord with society's economic and social potentialities. This was due to the fact that following the laying of the foundations of socialism, when the bulk of the working people accepted the goals of socialist construction, there has been constant evidence of an urge to increase actual proprietary equality. In concrete situations, even those who accept the justice of distribution according to labor in principle are frequently inclined to egalitarian approaches.

Over the long term, we believe that it is necessary for Hungary to increase the differentials in the remuneration of labor on a socialist basis to have more complex and responsible labor command better pay. Without touching maximum and minimum incomes for the time being, it is advisable to increase the differentiation in earnings for the bulk of those who work. Tremendous new reserves can be brought out by means of higher pay and additional remuneration for more complex and high-quality labor. Most of the existing differentials in pay are determined by the fact that people have different capabilities and knowledge. Society has an interest in developing individual capabilities and will stimulate this, because it is the main source of our economic growth.

Our working people have a keen sense of social justice and realism. The results of polls show that most workers do not object to executives in production being duly remunerated for their labor. What is criticized is only the disproportionally high incomes which do not correspond to a person's actual labor inputs and to the social importance of his activity. But earned incomes also have an economically grounded ceiling which is socially tolerable in the given conditions, a relative magnitude which needs to be taken into account.

In assessing the degree to which incomes are differentiated there is a need to take into account all their types, all their sources, and not merely salaries or wages. Over the past few years, we in Hungary have been making a thorough study of the question of what is known as a 'second, supplementary' economic unit. In our country there are several types of economic activity yielding additional incomes which are fairly different in size. There are the house-and-garden plots whose share in the overall production of pork, poultry, etc., is fairly large. All the technical conditions for this small-scale production are created by the cooperatives which supply the owners of the house-and-garden plots with bloodstock, seeds, fertilizers and feed. It is this close connection with social property that explains the high efficiency of these small farms, which are a source of sizable additions to the working people's budgets. Orchards have a similar role to play but yield lower incomes than the house-and-garden plots. One should also mention the workers in the sphere of the services (like locksmiths, car mechanics) who work officially in their free time as self-employed artisans. The state supports such activity, because behind all these incomes lie actual labor inputs which are useful to society.

However, there are other incomes which cannot be regarded as earned, like the tips received by drivers or waiters. These incomes are indirectly connected with definite services, but they do not involve any additional labor inputs. The same applies to the incomes of those who provide scarce services and who unofficially charge more than the established rate. Considerable income can also be derived from the lease of flats in cities, and of land plots and cottages in places of rest and recreation. We make a point of limiting such incomes, say by means of taxes. These measures were supported by the public, but we shall be able to put the final touches in this area only when the state is able to provide well organized services of all types in a centralized manner.

Differences in wage levels, when they exist for a long time, could also result in unequal proprietary status, which is expressed in the size of movable and immovable personal property. This needs to be reckoned with if we want consistently to practise the principle of distribution according to labor. Far from preventing the accumulation of earned income, our socialist state, in effect, stimulates it by lifting, for instance, the tax on deposits in savings banks. It is not right to contrast extravagant spending and thrift and to regard a person building a house of his own as having a lower level of socialist consciousness than someone who spends his earnings on other purposes. That is why we are against the demagogues who condemn, as a matter of prin-

ciple, the increase in personal property through the saving of wages under socialism.

One cannot ignore the fact either that some personal property originated from what remained of the fortunes from old Hungary. The proprietary distinctions connected with the past will be gradually reduced and will then disappear altogether. But the overcoming of other distinctions in the size of personal property can proceed only within reasonable limits. For instance, a sizable part of our population has continued to save for themselves and their children and to buy movable and immovable property. This concern for one's descendants is understandable, which is why the law recognizes the right of inheritance. However we believe that it is right for young people starting out in life to have roughly equal opportunities and for that reason we allow inheritance only within definite limits.

The growth of the material well-being of the working people of Hungary increases social equality. But what is also obvious is that this process could in some cases have a negative effect on social equality, on people's consciousness and on their way of life. It is not always possible to prevent material goods at the disposal of a person from enhancing his social prestige. That is why our party constantly devotes serious attention to questions of distribution, regarding these as an important element of its social policy.

*Equality of rights and opportunities*

The demand for equal political rights for all citizens, one should recall, was first advanced not by socialists, not by the proletariat but by the bourgeoisie (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, p. 145). The socialist society has completed the consistent fulfillment of this task in the interests of the working people, but the emphasis here was shifted from formal equality before the law to the establishment of democracy guaranteeing a meaningful solution of the problems that arise.

There is good ground to say that in terms of political rights modern socialism is a society of equality. There are no juridical privileges for any class or social group (which does not, of course, mean that the problem of enhancing equality has ceased to be relevant).

The development of socialist society's political organization in present-day conditions signifies above all its adaptation to new demands. The extension of socialist democracy and the enhancement of equality in terms of political rights is not an end in itself. It is highly important to discover in the daily life of society the institutional 'framework' which it has already outgrown, and to seek along that line the ways for solving urgent problems. Actual democratization of activity of all the elements of political organization is just as important as institutional restructuring.

In the 1970s, the attention to developing democracy has been markedly intensified in Hungary, as in other countries of our community, because the present stage in socialist construction has largely thrown a new light on the problem of political and juridical equality. The need has arisen for fuller representation in social institutions of the interests of the individual classes, sections and groups (occupational, local, age, etc.).

Social interests spring from the requirements of individuals as a result of comparison and alignment of their aspirations with those of other individuals and social groups. The most important interests are included in the political system of society in the form of political aspirations. Socialism creates the necessary conditions for satisfying those requirements and interests of individuals and social groups which are an expression of progressive trends in social development: such is the 'boundary-line' of political equality and political freedoms in our society. In it, the interests of the working class and its allies have priority realization.

The mechanism and social consequences of bringing out the interests which do exist objectively but which up to now have either not been expressed or have been expressed in a distorted form are highly complicated and have yet to be adequately studied. Is there at all a need to create special channels to bring the 'latent' interests to the surface of social life? Yes, there apparently is, because slowly and in a veiled form these ultimately tend to make headway.

The political system of socialism functions effectively if the interests objectively existing in a society assume the form of political movements and are openly formulated at various social forums. This ensures the coordination of interests, the discovery and solution of politically acute problems and prevention of any possible conflicts. The more adequately a political system reflects the heterogeneous and hierarchical system of interests, the more broadly it embodies political and juridical equality.

But the extensive identification and consideration of interests, especially of economic interests, in the administration of society results first, in a clearer constitution of sections and groups, the vehicles of these interests and second, in their further differentiation. Both require an improvement of the mechanism of representation, coordination and realization of the relevant interests.

More consistent realization of social interests and enhancement of political and juridical equality require an improvement in the activity of state organs, greater coordination of the work of central and local institutions, and simplification and greater dispatch of business. Thus, in matters which are regarded as 'minor' but which have a strong effect on public opinion, we seek to have administrative bodies increasingly acting as the organ providing services, rather than as an organ of coercion. The greater the state's effort in defending the interests not only of society as a whole but also of every citizen, the more marked our advance toward full political and juridical equality.

The cultural revolution is an important prerequisite for attaining social equality. In all the socialist countries, cultural policy has a marked

influence on enhancing the homogeneity of society. For Hungary, where large gaps in the levels of education historically existed between the various classes and strata, this question was especially important.

Under the influence of the great advances in education it was assumed for some time that unequal opportunities for obtaining an education were an attribute of exploiter societies that would automatically wither away under socialism. There was an obvious exaggeration of the potentialities of the school and teaching methods in eliminating inequality in the cultural sphere. Practice has shown that here we face much more complicated social problems whose solution requires not only time but also a well-considered system of measures.

One can well say with satisfaction that in Hungary the reproduction of cultural differences among the rising generations is less and less pronounced. Still it is obvious that the school is incapable of fully resisting the influence of the environment. Children from different social sections assimilate the values which the school passes on to them in different ways, and this has a strong influence on their whole subsequent life. This problem cannot be solved merely by raising incomes and by socio-political measures because the cultural level and the system of values of individual social groups are substantially autonomous.

Let us recall that after the war favorable conditions for the working people's social advance were created in Hungary, as in other socialist countries. A new, socialist intelligentsia was taking shape and the section of workers by brain was markedly renewed. In the process, there was a sharp increase in the chances not only for so-called 'one-stage' mobility (for instance, conversion from skilled worker to intellectual) but also for 'two-stage' mobility (conversion from agricultural or unskilled worker into a worker by brain). In prewar Hungary, a young man from the family of an unskilled worker had a chance of roughly 200 to 1 of 'rising' into the intelligentsia, and in 1973 — 50 to 1.

In that period, socio-political factors mainly provided the motive force for social mobility. The situation changed with the laying of the foundations of socialism. The building of a developed socialist society calls for accelerated scientific and technical progress and intensification of economic processes. For the rising generation, the possibility of advancing to a higher status is now ever more connected with a definite level of education. The acquisition of knowledge, skills and culture is beginning to have a strong influence on the changing of the social structure. That is why, while being aware that the school can reduce cultural differences only on a limited scale, we have no intention at all of relaxing our influence through this important channel of social mobility.

Socialism is a society to which the ossification of the social structure is organically alien. The task of our public education is to help children from social groups and sections which are in less favorable cultural conditions to become 'competitive' even at school from the standpoint of continuing their education. This will give them equal opportunities just as they leave school.

Over the long term, we in Hungary intend to carry out a reform of school education to eliminate the elements of hierarchy in its organization and to formulate special programs for the youngest children. Experiments have shown that from the age of three to nine years it is possible to exert a highly effective influence on the shaping of children's capabilities, so reducing their 'starting' differences.

While purposefully improving the system of public education, our party seeks to set real goals before society. To what extent can policy in the sphere of public education influence social mobility and what kind of mobility — social and individual — should one strive for in the immediate future?

From the standpoint of socialist interests, an optimal scale of mobility between sections can be created only when there is a change in parents' views of what they want their children to be. This cannot be done by convincing arguments alone. The objective conditions of the work and life of social sections must be drawn closer together in practice, and that is the only condition on which social mobility based on individual capabilities in the first place can be made to prevail.

As a result of the radical changes in society's social structure, the problem of equality is increasingly considered in application to social sections and groups, with its socio-economic aspects coming to the fore. From the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist theory, this is a largely new approach to the problem, because it goes beyond the framework of the problem of eliminating classes and attaining equality.

When determining the main lines of its policy and the pace and priority of social transformations, the HSWP makes a systematic study of public opinion, in particular the working people's assessment of the level of social equality attained. A study carried out in Hungary in 1977 showed that broad sections of the working people have accepted the ideals of social equality. Although they take a critical attitude to many specific phenomena and aspects of social life, satisfaction with the existing socio-political relations on the whole prevails. The establishment of this favorable atmosphere resulted from a number of factors, including our economy's dynamic development in the 1960s and 1970s, the noticeable growth of living standards and the tangible democratization of social practice.

Our studies warrant the assertion that most working people firmly identify themselves with their social section, are satisfied with their condition and seek to maintain it.

It has been established that there is no close relation between the assessment of the justice of the existing social relations and a man's place within the system of the social division of labor. Assessments of the objective degree of the equality attained are determined largely by the structure of individual consciousness, the specifics of individual labor activity, personal impressions and exper-

ience in life, that is, by secondary factors which are more differentiated than the sphere of social-class relations. Only a very small part of the Hungarian working people believes that the inequality in our country is much too great. The majority (nearly 70 per cent of those polled) believe that the bulk of the people live in average material conditions, and only a minority — markedly better or worse than the rest. Roughly 30 per cent of those polled naturally refer themselves to this average group.

The attainment of social equality is a protracted and complicated historical process. It is an endeavor for several generations of working people, it calls for boldness and circumspection, innovation and consistency and an ability to solve current problems without losing sight of the long term. The peoples of the socialist countries have entered on the road leading to full social equality, and under the leadership of their communist parties, are successfully tackling for the first time in history, the tasks of creating a new entity of men.

1. Frederick Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1959, p. 147.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-148.
3. A recent sociological study showed that 28-30 per cent of workers over the age of 30 years were unskilled, whereas only 9 per cent were unskilled in the 15 to 30 age group.
4. Families whose members come from different classes, sections or groups of society. — *Ed.*
5. The main part of the production and non-production assets of cooperatives which is not subject to distribution among their members and which is used in a balanced manner for the purposes of extended reproduction and the raising of the standards of cultural and everyday services available to members of cooperatives. — *Ed.*
6. There are different sources of this inequality: these could be connected with labor (the degree of its complexity, society's preferential attitude to some types of labor activity as being especially important ones, etc.), or these may not be connected with labor (size of family, number of children, etc.).
7. At present, the ratio between the gross wages of the top 10 per cent and the bottom 10 per cent of wageworkers in Hungary now comes to 1 to 6, and the ratio for family incomes, to 1 to 4.5. For the bulk of those working in the national economy, the differences are even smaller. The study of the material condition of individual classes and sections on the strength of several parameters shows that contrary to the widespread notion, the average differences within the working class are higher than they are between skilled workers and the intelligentsia. Roughly 80 per cent of the intelligentsia live in better material conditions than workers, but for their part, nearly 20 per cent of the workers live better than some groups in the intelligentsia.

# Class alliances and political blocs

This subject has been reviewed — in the context of today's class struggles in capitalist countries — by a research group composed of *Zaki Heiri*, CC Political Bureau member of the Communist Party of Iraq, *Kemal Kervan*, representative of the Communist Party of Turkey on the journal, *Hugo Fazio*, CC member of the Communist Party of Chile, and *Grigori Vodolazov*, Ph.D. (Soviet Union).

The review was conducted under a research program drawn up by the Commission on General Problems of Theory under the heading 'Strategic Ideas of Leninism and the Present Day.'

The group concentrated on some controversial issues[1] relating to the involvement of new social forces in the revolutionary process today, the uneven growth of the socio-political activity of disparate classes and strata of capitalist society and the changes that have taken place in the alignment of classes and political parties at this stage of the struggle. These issues include changes in the social structure of capitalist society and the problem of working-class hegemony, the dynamics of class alliances in the revolutionary process, the possibility of agreements with a segment of the bourgeoisie, party alliances and the mass movement.

The following are some results of the review.

*Concepts of 'anti-hegemony'*

The group examined the changes in the composition and condition of the middle strata in capitalist society over the past quarter of a century:[2] a lower rate of employment in agriculture; the growing proportion and influence of workers by brain, primarily scientists, technicians and engineers; the new character and new public role of the urban middle strata and so on. It considers that these changes make it necessary to specify some theoretical propositions on class alliances. First among them is the proposition on working-class hegemony.

Historically, the idea of working-class hegemony in the revolutionary process was advanced by Marxism at a time when the peasantry was still the most numerous class of bourgeois society. By virtue of their objective position in the social production system the peasants could not sustain a consistent drive for progressive changes, which were imminent objectively, nor could they defend their class interests by themselves; their mode of production kept them isolated from one another, the relations between them were only local and not national, and they had no political organization (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 478). The proportion of peasants in the capitalist world has now dropped sharply. Moreover, they are themselves changing. Many are working people who form organizations to defend their rights, use modern techniques, are educated and so on. This gives rise to doubts as to whether the issue of working-class hegemony in regard to this social stratum is as

important for the revolutionary process as before.

To be sure, there is no reason for doubts of this kind globally or in the foreseeable future, for the peasants still make up the majority of the economically active population of many countries or are a large body of working people second in numerical strength to the working class alone. Nevertheless, the substantial decrease that has occurred in the proportion of peasants in a number of countries must be borne in mind when we consider the problem of working-class hegemony.

However, the peasants' role in the class struggle does not at all diminish in step with their decreasing numbers. In fact, this role is acquiring a new quality. The principal change in the peasants' social role is their further transformation from an anti-feudal, anti-landowner force into an anti-monopoly one. This is a result of increasing monopoly capitalist control of agricultural production, of growing direct and indirect exploitation of the countryside by the town through credits, the supply of technical facilities and fertilizers, the marketing of farm produce and so on, all of which are in the hands of big capital. The qualitatively new orientation of the peasant movement offers the working class greater opportunities to exercise its leading role in the struggle against monopoly. Now as in the past, and irrespective of the numerical strength of the peasants, the worker-peasant alliance is, in the opinion of the research group, an important condition for success in the fight against monopoly in view of the peasants' distinctive role in socio-economic life.

The question of working-class hegemony has never been limited to the worker-peasant alliance even in countries with an absolute predominance of peasants. Today it encompasses the whole revolutionary movement in town and countryside alike, at all its stages, whatever the character assumed by the movement (national liberation, anti-fascist, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist, bourgeois democratic, etc.), with all its diverse interconnections. However, its actual substance in terms of the social composition of potential participants in the movement, who see the working class as their natural partner and the most advanced force, does not remain unchanged. With the development of modern capitalism, especially where countries are becoming 'peasantless' at a particularly high rate, the emphasis of the problem shifts because the towns are gaining in importance as factors determining the orientation and pace of political life in capitalist society, and hence the trend of the revolutionary process. Socially however, the towns are centers of both workers and intermediate strata, which are more numerous in some countries than the peasantry.

*Hugo Fazio.* The numerical strength, and socio-political role of the urban middle strata have grown extraordinarily. They are increasingly becoming a vital factor in the proletariat's policy of alliances. In countries like Chile, worker-peasant unity retains its importance. However, in itself it is not the core of the alliance to be formed, for there must be mutual understanding between the working class and the peasantry as well as the urban middle strata and the semi-proletariat. 'Some postulates of the past,' Luis Corvalan said, 'no longer apply or are not equally valid everywhere. The problem of the worker-peasant alliance, for example, cannot be posed in, say, Mexico in the same way as in the United States or in Spain, in the same way as in France. . . . The essence of Marxism-Leninism is precisely its content, not formulas; in this case it is the necessity for the working class to ally itself with those sections of society that can be drawn into struggle for justice and social progress.'[3]

The middle strata are not homogeneous. Wage-workers not belonging to the working class have a considerable revolutionary potential and so do the intellectuals and students. Witness, for example, the triumphal experience of Cuba and Nicaragua.

Group members noted that the increased proportion of workers by brain, of intellectuals, technologists and other white-collar workers in capitalist society is used by contemporary critics of Marxism as the starting point of a further series of arguments to dispute the objective role of the working class as leader of the revolutionary movement. The question is asked whether there can be hegemony in regard to this social group, most of whose members are more educated than the workers. It is argued that since they are not private proprietors but wageworkers unlike the peasants, they do not have to be 'led' to socialism, for they aspire to it anyway. Furthermore, it is held that in the past quarter of a century the middle strata have become much more active politically than the working class. From this it is inferred that the revolutionary potential of the workers and that of other sectors opposed to monopoly capitalism are 'levelling up' and so there are no further grounds for singling out the proletariat as the leading force and it would be more reasonable to speak of forming a front of classes against the monopoly bourgeoisie.

That the revolutionary potential of many categories of middle strata is growing is indisputable. It is an important and lasting trend of the economic and political struggles. Hence, it would be wrong to underestimate the mounting opposition of a substantial part of the middle strata to monopoly capital.

However, the growing protest against monopoly-capital domination in various sectors of capitalist society in no way undermines the objective standing of the working class as the chief socio-political force and leader in the anti-monopoly struggle and the revolutionary movement. The facts show that never before has the working class been so well organized or so strong as today. Its political attitude and action decisively predicate the success of the anti-monopoly struggle and the destiny of the revolution. Unless the working class exercises its leading role in the class struggle there can be no serious question of socialism.

The leading role objectively implicit to the working class and the exercise of this role are not one and the same thing. The latter depends on many factors,

among which a factor of decisive significance is to ensure that revolutionary sentiments prevail over reformist ones and that the workers become aware of their class interests and adopt the scientific, Marxist-Leninist worldview. As for the growth of revolutionary feeling among the workers and other classes and strata of capitalist society, it is an uneven process. Revolutionary initiative can also come from non-proletarian strata. To see the role of the leading class as implying passivity, inaction and lack of initiative on the part of other participants in the anti-monopoly struggle has nothing to do with a really revolutionary stand.

Nor is the growing socio-political role of workers by brain, of intellectuals and white-collar workers, a challenge to working-class hegemony. They become exponents of socialist aspirations, not as a traditional intermediate stratum of capitalist society (which, incidentally, is becoming more and more differentiated), but only when they join the working class and become subjectively aware of their new social status. By drawing close to the working class (objectively and subjectively) and by accepting its interests and ideology, workers by brain come to play a bigger role in revolutionary changes.

*Zaki Heiri.* The problem of exercising hegemony is not simple for the proletariat even in developed capitalist countries, where there are strong working-class parties. But it is infinitely more difficult in developing countries, where the proletariat is numerically weaker. Some people say that in this situation the communist party should join in the movement of the progressive forces of its country and not seek more than to work within the measure of the latter's ability.

Cooperation is necessary, of course. It is important to support a revolutionary petty-bourgeois government or the government of a patriotic bourgeoisie as well as their political parties as long as they consistently fight imperialism, even if there is no formal bloc or coalition government. But under no circumstances can the right to fight the class narrow-mindedness and inconsistency of our allies be sacrificed, nor can the struggle for class hegemony and political leadership be discontinued. For our party the experience of 10 years of political alliance with the Baath Party (1968-1978) and the experience of cooperation with the regime proved again that when it comes to the realization of the basic aims and tasks of socialism no political alliance between the Communist Party and a petty-bourgeois (let alone a bourgeois) party can survive if the petty-bourgeois party dominates the alliance and the government.

The people owe their growing revolutionary strength to the proletariat's exercise of its leading role in the class struggle. The role of outsider, to say nothing of losing an independent policy line, tends to weaken the party, to reduce the revolutionary potential of the political bloc, and ultimately to slow down the revolution as a whole or even reverse it, as was the case in Egypt and also in Iraq.

### *The 'big riddle' of strategy*

The involvement of new social forces belonging to the middle strata in the revolutionary process raises certain questions relating to the exercise of the role of leader that belongs objectively to the working class. One of the most important of these questions is the possibility of a solid and lasting alliance with the middle strata. Its solution encounters considerable theoretical difficulties arising from the fact that while the working class and the middle strata have interests in common there also are very important differences of attitude. This produces a problem occasionally called the 'big riddle' of the strategy of alliance. The problem may be stated as follows: the middle strata are oppressed by monopoly and so can make common cause with the proletariat on the basis of anti-monopoly, general democratic demands. But what is the outlook for this alliance? Will it still be there when general democratic problems have been solved?

It is no easy matter to ascertain this outlook. The middle strata vacillate when it comes to consistently carrying out a socialist program providing, in the final analysis, for the abolition of private property in the means of production. What stand is the working class to take toward these strata when developments bring society to the threshold of a direct struggle for socialism? To answer this question is important, and not only for the future. The solidity of an alliance depends largely on the clarity of the outlook for the future.

To be sure a realignment of class forces is inevitable when the revolutionary process moves from one phase to another. It is said that in these circumstances it will be necessary not merely to realign ranks but to join in a resolute struggle against an ally of yesterday, the middle strata. An ally today, an enemy tomorrow. This is said to be the logic of the revolution. But will the middle strata accept alliance with the proletariat if this is the prospect?

Some people imagine that the difficulty can be overcome by providing for the preservation of small-commodity production, private property, competition and so on, under socialism. This situation would be possible in the early period after the victory of the working class and its allies but is utopian in the long term.

So how should the 'riddle' be solved? Are the middle strata only a temporary ally whose revolutionary potentialities become exhausted at the anti-monopoly stage of the struggle?

In *Theses on Feuerbach* Karl Marx noted that by changing circumstances, people simultaneously change themselves, and that the process of people changing the social environment in the course of revolutionary practice is at the same time a process of their self-change (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol 1, p. 13). This thesis is the methodological key to the 'riddle.' By joining in the revolution, social strata and groups change their social being and themselves in the course of the revolution, ceasing more and more to be what they

were when it began. After putting an end to domination by monopoly capitalism, the middle strata allied with the working class will participate in creating a new system of social relations, in which their own status, condition and nature will change. In the new society the bulk of the middle strata will have fundamentally new opportunities.

Far from ruling out, this implies that a differentiation could come about among the middle strata themselves and that those of its members who rejected socialist change would drop out of the alliance. But then the greater part of the middle strata would free itself from the economic, political and spiritual influence and tutelage of forces determined to stop the anti-monopoly struggle half-way, and would rise to the independent making of history. In this way the alliance of anti-monopoly forces would develop further at the stage of socialist revolution, which is objectively the only means of delivering the middle strata from exploitation by big capital and putting an end to its socially underprivileged condition. The concept of transition from anti-monopoly to socialist changes could apparently be worked out only with account of the changes and differentiation among the middle strata, which not only take place due to objective causes but are prepared by a series of transitional measures and concessions to these strata.

*Vodolazov.* The strategy of Russia's revolutionary proletarians toward the middle peasants in October 1917 is indicative in this respect. The proletariat, Lenin pointed out, 'is obliged, in the interests of the victory of socialism, to *yield* to the small working and exploited peasants in the choice of these transitional measures . . .' (Vol. 26, p. 334). During the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks accepted a proposal for equal land tenure, that is, adopted a bourgeois democratic measure on which the peasants insisted while the proletarian party made 'a declaration of dissent' (*ibid.*, p. 335). The Bolsheviks proceeded from the assumption that only experience could open the peasants' eyes to the benefits of socialist changes. 'We have not the slightest intention of expropriating the middle peasants,' Lenin stressed. '. . .*We shall not tolerate any use of force in respect of the middle peasants*' (Vol. 29, pp. 151, 205).

The experience of the October Revolution gave the lie to the thesis of the Second International's reformist leaders, who affirmed that 'the majority of the exploited toilers can achieve complete clarity of socialist consciousness and firm socialist convictions and character under capitalist slavery, under the yoke of the bourgeoisie' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 187). It also revealed that the non-proletarian masses can shed their illusions and remold themselves in the course of revolutionary changes in alliance with and aided by the working class.

In step with the development of the socialist revolution, the working class and other working people (the middle strata of one-time capitalist society) drew closer together. This means that instead of shrinking, the social basis of the revolution expanded.

*Fazio.* Under the Popular Unity government in Chile, one of the sharpest struggles between revolution and counter-revolution was over the middle strata. In the end, part of these strata sided with the working class, while the majority, relatively neutral at first, ended by defecting to the counter-revolution. On analyzing this fact, some Popular Unity leaders found it inevitable, arguing that whenever the middle strata detect the possibility of fundamental changes, they end by deserting en masse to reaction. This conclusion is wrong, for the condition of a substantial segment of the middle strata is similar to that of the proletariat and, in some cases, even worse, which means they can only find a real solution for their problems in common with the proletariat. As for the petty bourgeoisie, its principal contradiction tends to be — ever more markedly — with monopoly although it has certain contradictions with the working class. This creates the objective conditions for agreement with the proletariat in the struggle against monopoly.

One of the lessons drawn by our party from the defeat sustained by it is that we must form a broader alliance than the one which triumphed in 1970. This is demanded not only by the priority task of ending the dictatorship but by the fact that we see the requisite changes in Chilean society as a continuous process involving all democratic forces. 'Nothing could be further from our intentions,' Luis Corvalan pointed out, 'than to look for allies today only to discard them tomorrow.'[4]

### *Bourgeois-proletarian coalitions*

Compromises with some sections of the bourgeoisie against monopoly capitalist intrigues, a fascist threat, imperialist intervention and so on, do not contradict Lenin's advice not to scorn even a temporary, unstable and unreliable ally. In the revolutionary processes going on in Latin America, Asia and Africa, where the problems of national political and economic emancipation have yet to be fully solved, some segments of the local bourgeoisie play a progressive part in the struggle against imperialism and the biggest magnates of local financial monopoly. This is certain to affect the attitude of the working class to the local bourgeoisie.

*K. Kervan.* Turkey's monopolies are out to assume full control of state power and to leap into state-monopoly capitalism. The alternative to this is an advanced democratic revolution that can pave the way for socialism in our country.

In the overall context of the class struggle in Turkey, action against foreign capital and neo-colonialist methods of exploiting our people, as well as against the present government's repressive policy, is very important. The range of social forces that could join a national democratic front against the reactionary forces allying themselves with foreign capital is very wide. This front could also be joined by a section of the bourgeoisie unassociated with monopoly.

The Republican People's Party, which is backed

mainly by the middle strata as well as by the big and middle non-monopoly bourgeoisie, is among the opponents of the repressive policies of the present Turkish government. While the leadership of this party is in the hands of rightists, who support the policies of imperialism and the collaborationist monopoly bourgeoisie, democratic aspirations are strong among the rank and file. Indeed, there is a 'left wing' in the RPP that has yet to adopt an explicit political orientation, but advances some anti-fascist and anti-imperialist demands. This 'left wing' can be won over by the forces seeking the overthrow of the regime.

*Fazio.* A visible differentiation process is going on among the bourgeoisie of countries like ours; a higher stratum is forming — a finance, monopolistic capital commanding the greatest economic power. The increasingly strong positions of this sector spell out the subjugation and exploitation in various ways of not only the proletariat and other wageworkers but of some segments of the middle and petty bourgeoisie. Moreover, this subjugation is effected through diverse channels. In this context the democratic revolution is anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic (meaning, in our case, primarily struggle against finance capital). Local finance capital is both closely associated with and dependent on imperialism without, however, losing its identity or relative autonomy. It is this alliance, in which imperialism is becoming an increasingly 'internal' factor, that constitutes the class basis of fascism.

The differentiation under way among the bourgeoisie and the contradictions generated by the power mechanism set up to give support to the alliance between local and foreign capital provide a real basis on which to draw part of the bourgeois forces into the struggle against monopoly and imperialist capital. This was demonstrated again, not only in one country (I mean the ample experience of Nicaragua, where the Sandinista National Liberation Front proved equal to bringing bourgeois elements into the fight against Somoza), but at the regional level as well, most governments of Latin America (dominated by bourgeois forces) rejecting imperialism's bid for armed intervention. The facts bear out the correctness of the conclusion of the 1975 Havana Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean about the possibility of united democratic and anti-imperialist action involving, along with popular forces, some sections of the Latin American bourgeoisie. According to the Havana Declaration, this agreement 'will never be achieved in the interest of transient compromises, at the expense of the essential alliance of workers, peasants, and other working people and the middle strata or at the expense of the class independence of the proletariat.'

Cooperation between the working class and the bourgeoisie in the national interest, with a view to ending the economic crisis and eliminating its effects, the group members pointed out, is also advocated by reformists. The working class certainly has a stake in lessening the crunch of the crisis. But the problem is how to end the crisis, whether at the expense of the working class and other working people (wage freeze, austerity, a ban on strikes and so on) and without detriment to monopoly interests, or at the expense of the profits and privileges of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the class that bears all the responsibility for crises.

In other words, 'saving the nation' from the crisis has nothing to do with strengthening the positions of state-monopoly capitalism. 'It is not enough to say, "Let us first end the crisis and then we shall see," ' Luigi Longo, Chairman of the Italian Communist Party, said. 'We must find out how we are to overcome it and in the name of what purposes and prospects. The working people want to be certain that when we come out of the tunnel of the crisis we shall not meet . . . leaders of the past who are willing to try everything all over again.'[5] Ending the crisis and eliminating its effects do not provide a basis for a coincidence of the interests of the working people and the monopoly bourgeoisie. On the contrary, the antagonism between them grows sharper.

*Vodolazov.* The fact that a coalition somehow harmonizing the aspirations of the workers and part of the bourgeoisie occasionally takes shape in a developed capitalist country is explained by the necessity and importance of nationalizing banks and large-scale industries. Measures of this nature are seen from the theoretical standpoint as 'steps toward socialism,' of which Lenin spoke. However, counting on steps toward socialism through a bourgeois-proletarian coalition would seem to be wrong both in theory and in practice.

To begin with, the social content of measures such as nationalization is determined by power relations. Lenin pointed out that these measures may mean 'a step, and more than one step, toward socialism' on the important condition that there will arise 'a revolutionary-democratic state' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 357-358). Under a bourgeois state, however, they are not steps toward socialism, any more than other forms of concentration and centralization of capital. Nor is there any reason to identify the creation under capitalism of the material prerequisites of a new system with steps toward socialism. Besides, these prerequisites have objectively matured already. In this sphere the interests of the workers and the bourgeoisie are in direct conflict, since the working class wants nationalization of a kind that would undercut and not strengthen the positions of capital.

### *Alliance of parties and radicalization of the masses*

In present-day capitalist society with its developed and highly differentiated structures, at a time when political parties influence virtually every population group, the principles of class alliance are applied largely through coalitions and blocs of political parties. An alliance of class forces also develops in the course of direct struggle by the masses, without acquiring the character of a political agreement between parties, and through action by the trade unions and other mass organizations. But it is precisely blocs and alliances between political parties that assure coordinated action by the

masses and make that action durable and productive.

As the researchers see it, political blocs are not a direct projection of class alliances at party level. Most of the political parties, while objectively expressing the interests of definite classes, strive nominally to operate as 'national' parties or parties of the people as a whole. Quite often a party that is bourgeois in character is supported by numerous working people belonging not only to the middle strata but to the working class. This contradiction between the class nature of bourgeois centrist and reformist parties and the objective interests of a substantial part of their social base, their electorate, must not be discounted. Underestimation of this contradiction gives rise to sectarian prejudices, which may prove to be a serious obstacle to anti-monopoly action.

The problem of political blocs with reformist and certain bourgeois parties has the following two basic aspects, if account is taken of the class substance of these blocs in the broad context of the anti-imperialist struggle and not of temporary political considerations: achieving unity of action with the middle strata, and unity of the working class itself. This is why political blocs are not an opportunity that it would be a pity not to use at this or that stage of the class struggle for scoring a momentary gain. They are a necessity arising from a coincidence of class interests, an expression of the objective need for unity among different classes, strata, movements and currents in the anti-monopoly struggle.

Compromises on practical policy issues between parties adhering to different class positions or currents in the working-class movement do not extend to the ideological sphere, that is, they do not involve a change in a party's attitude to its class, a renunciation of the goals of its struggle and so forth. However, the communists do not see this as a pragmatic deal on the principle of 'support in exchange for support.' The criteria of a political alliance of parties are to win new positions (or defend positions won) in struggle against socio-political forces that are particularly reactionary at the given moment, on the one hand, and to enlighten, organize, educate, and radicalize the masses, on the other. These tasks, which are far from coinciding in every respect, can be accomplished on the principle of dialectically combining unity and struggle within the alliance.

Class alliances have their development stages and milestones. A bloc of parties may result in one gaining much greater influence than others. This is not necessarily due to mistakes or miscalculations on the part of an ally. What is sometimes at work is a certain regularity in the development of an alliance of left-wing, democratic forces and in the radicalization of the masses. It is not surprising for instance, that when a swing to the left begins, numerous electors generally side with the moderate forces of the left front. What is much less common is an immediate swing of the masses to the revolutionary wing of the movement. Lenin showed that the masses generally go over from Scheidemann and others like him (that is, from bourgeois parties and parties cooperating with the bourgeoisie) to the revolution through 'intermediate stages' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 74).

The class alliance policy implies a differentiated approach to different political forces.[6] Besides the form of a political bloc mentioned earlier, i.e., agreement between a revolutionary and a reformist party, there is the inter-party alliance such as cooperation among kindred revolutionary currents.

*Kervan.* Operating in the working-class movement of Turkey are, besides the Communist Party, the Workers' Party and the Socialist Workers' Party. They are not affiliated to the Socialist International, nor are they reformist; they are oriented on socialism and revolution and inspired by the ideas of scientific socialism. The Turkish communists regard alliance with these workers' parties (its significance goes far beyond the framework of general democratic tasks) as an objective of the first importance. Such an alliance could become the center of attraction for all workers ensuring their unity of action, a core equal to uniting around it a wide range of democratic forces, and subsequently, a decisive factor for going over from general democratic to socialist changes. The communists of Turkey contribute their share to the international experience of forming alliances of kindred revolutionary currents. Not long ago efforts by circles supporting us, the WP and the SWP, as well as Kurdish revolutionary democrats, resulted in an agreement to evolve a common action platform. We consider that also worthy of special attention is the possibility of joint action with political groups that are devoted to the idea of revolution even though they are not proletarian.

*Fazio.* The process that has led to political division within the West European working class cannot be duplicated in Latin America. We cannot look on the activity of many socialist parties of our hemisphere, including the social democrats, from the standpoint of the line prevailing among the social democrats of Western Europe. It is also important to remember that there exist non-communist forces which are unquestionably revolutionary. I mean various currents and parties which are arriving at Marxism-Leninism or are influenced by it. This is a result of both an evolution of these forces and the influence won by Marxist-Leninist forces in Latin America and the world. It is creating a reality which we must consider open-mindedly and creatively in the interest of the revolution.

The research group came to the following conclusions:

The policy of class alliance shows increasing variety and originality. The unique peculiarity of this policy is typical of countries on different or identical levels of capitalist socio-economic development, countries having different political regimes or regimes of one and the same type, and dissimilar historical and cultural traditions or traditions that are similar. All this makes the key methodological principle of Marxism-Leninism in investigating the

problem of class alliances and blocs of political parties — the specific analyses of concrete situations — all the more important.

For all its national distinctions, the working-class policy of alliance reflects and must take into account principles common to all and worked out as a result of studying the regularities and distinctive characteristics of the world revolutionary process, as well as of generalizing the experience of the class struggle in one's own country and elsewhere. The 'wind of the age' is blowing in one direction, namely revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, which is effected through a number of stages or directly. In this lies the common social root of the policy of class alliance, its essential unity, which manifests itself in the most diverse conditions.

Experience has confirmed the vitality of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on class alliances, whose core is the working class, as the socio-political basis for revolutionary change. Under contemporary capitalism structural changes and the further exacerbation of its crisis extend the range of real and potential allies of the working class in the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom and socialism. The exercise by the working class of its leading role in the struggle — a role that belongs objectively to it — is a decisive condition both for the success of the struggle and for eventually imparting a socialist character to working-class alliances with non-proletarian working people, with the middle strata.

The communist movement has gained considerable and varied experience of using every opportunity to win an ally enjoying mass support. It will be much easier to ascertain such opportunities by further research into the dialectics of class alliances and blocs of political parties with the use of scientific methodology, which means that the principles of working-class revolutionary policy evolved by Marx, Engels and Lenin should be applied in accordance with the peculiarities of the country concerned.

1. In 1975 and 1976 there was an international discussion in *WMR* on 'The Working Class and Its Allies' to which there were 35 contributions. (Discussion records were brought out in book form under the same title in 1977 by Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague.) Subsequently, the journal resumed its discussion of the subject of allies of the working class (*WMR*, July 1977, May, August and December 1978, July and December 1979, and June, July and August 1980). The research group took account of these publications, which made it possible to single out some of the problems now being debated in the communist movement.

2. Marxist scholars do not always define the term *middle strata* identically. Some only refer to *urban middle strata*, leaving out the peasants and intellectuals. We believe it is more reasonable to apply the term *middle strata* to all the social groups that objectively do not belong to either the bourgeoisie or the working class but hold an intermediate place between them (*Zapadnaya Yevropa v sovremennom mire*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1979, p. 274). It is from this angle that Lenin described the class composition of capitalist society, listing 'three main groups, or classes: exploited, exploiting, and intermediate' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 39, p. 453/in Russian/).

3. *Boletin del Exterior*, No. 37, 1979, pp. 40-41.

4. *Boletin del Exterior*, No. 37, 1979, p. 32.

5. *L'Unita*, October 20, 1976.

6. See *Joint Actions: Aims, Lessons, Difficulties*, on p. 64.

---

*viewpoints*

# Searching for effective solutions

*Werner Krolikowski*
Political Bureau member, SUPG Central Committee,
First Deputy Chairman, Council of Ministers of the GDR

Shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic has entered the 1980s in an inseverable alliance with other states of the socialist community. The road to peace, democracy and socialism was opened for the working class and all other working people of our country by the liberative mission fulfilled by the heroic Soviet Army 35 years ago. In unrelenting struggle against imperialist reaction and its flunkies our people led by the working class and its revolutionary party, carried through anti-fascist, democratic changes, laid the groundwork for a new society and set out to build developed socialism.

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany is part of the international communist movement. It abides by proletarian internationalism and steadfastly uses the scientific worldview of the working class, Marxism-Leninism, as its guide. Ever since the republic came into existence, our party has based its activity on the laws governing socialist construction brought to light by Lenin and confirmed by the Soviet experience. With the working class and its vanguard, the revolutionary party, playing the leading role, we founded and consolidated a worker-peasant state as a form of the proletarian dictatorship. At the same time, we introduced and gradually promoted socialist relations of production, making it possible to organize a planned economy.

The peasants set up cooperatives of their own free will. A revolution in the true sense of the word was accomplished in the ideological and cultural spheres, and Marxism-Leninism became the dominant worldview of our society. The socialist way of life took shape in sustained struggle against imperialism.

The 10th SUPG Congress, to be held in April 1981, will assess the progress made by our society; it will also discuss and specify new tasks in socialist construction. The party maintains that the economy and the measures to raise its efficiency are the main sphere in which we can achieve our goals. A developed socialist society cannot be built or exist without a powerful material and technical basis. At the Eighth SUPG Congress in 1971 Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, formulated the party's economic policy in the following terms which are of programmatic value: 'We only have one goal running through the party's whole policy, namely, that of doing everything for the good of man, for the happiness of the people, in the interests of the working class and all other working people. This is the meaning of socialism. It is the purpose of our work and struggle.'

During the past three decades the technical basis of our industry and agriculture has undergone dramatic changes. The strength of our socialist economy has been growing dynamically, with the result that the republic is now among the ten most highly industrialized nations of the world. The historic achievements of the working class and all other working people of our country are most visibly reflected in the growth of our national income; it went up from 22.4 billion marks in 1949 to 166.6 billion marks last year (i.e. increasing from 3,400 to 25,600 marks per worker in the production sphere). Throughout these years the national income has been growing almost exclusively through increased productivity. Last year the volume of industrial output rose to 290 billion marks, which is nearly 11 times as much as 30 years ago. Electric power production per capita today is 200 per cent above the world index.

To develop the material and technical basis, the state increases investments year after year (49 billion marks in 1979, or 17.5 times as much as in 1949). An average of 60 per cent of the investments in industry goes into increasing the supply of raw materials.

Reorganized on socialist lines, agriculture now enables us to meet almost the entire demand for meat, milk, eggs, butter and many other products. It also supplies increasing quantities of important industrial raw materials. Crop-farming and stock-breeding have increased output by approximately 150 per cent in three decades: as much as seven times over in the case of meat (slaughter weight).

The republic's economic and social progress was only made possible by the dependable and deepening socialist economic integration with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. Trade with CMEA countries has grown in 30 years from 1.8 billion to 74.2 billion convertible marks, which amounts to nearly 70 per cent of our entire foreign trade. The Soviet Union holds first place in foreign trade (36.1 per cent), accounting for 36.5 billion marks up from 1 billion during these years. The economies of the GDR and the Soviet Union interlock more and more, this being a characteristic of socialist planned economy.

The Eighth SUPG Congress announced that the paramount task was to raise the people's living and cultural standards by rapidly developing socialist production, raising its efficiency, speeding scientific and technological progress and increasing productivity. Accordingly, our republic has carried out the most extensive socio-political measures in its history. A convincing example is the housing program under which we intend to end the housing shortage as a social problem by 1990. In the past nine years, we have built or modernized more apartments than throughout the previous 19 years; altogether we have improved housing for 3,750,000 people.

Measures of importance for the people's welfare and for their greater social security have been put into effect in other spheres as well. These include a 58 per cent increase in real per capita income and a 49 per cent increase in retail trade, a substantial growth of the social funds provided by the state to keep rent low and maintain the stability of retail prices for necessities and services, as well as of funds for education, public health, social insurance, culture, sport and recreation. Allocations for these purposes have doubled in the past decade in terms of a family of four. Wages and salaries in 1979 were roughly 33 per cent higher than in 1970; within the same period the annual pension fund rose to 15.3 billion from 9.7 billion marks.

Continued socialist construction poses us with new and higher demands. The principal reason is that ever since 1973 the prices of raw and other materials and fuels have been sky-rocketing in the capitalist market.

'We must reckon with the prospect of further price increases,' Erich Honecker said at the 11th plenary meeting of the SUPG Central Committee in 1979. 'We must therefore make it plain that it is a question not only of a further deterioration of a situation that is complicated enough already. We are coming up against a new situation. Nor is this a problem facing the GDR alone, for the other socialist countries have to grapple with it as well, as nearly all the other countries of the world. Due to our raw material situation and our heavy dependence on foreign markets, it affects us to a very considerable extent. We will evidently have to draw far-reaching conclusions from these objective changes and reappraise some problems. No one will find answers, solutions or alternatives for us in the face of this challenge.'*

The changed context of foreign economic activity invites the following conclusion regarding our party's economic policy: economic progress can no longer be achieved by means and methods typical

*11. *Tagung des ZK der SED*. Berlin 1979, p. 39.

of the early 1970s. Our possibilities have changed and new tasks have arisen. Today every socio-political advance necessitates a greater increase in productivity than before. We can succeed in our economic policy only if we raise the efficiency and quality of labor in every respect and consistently combine the advantages of socialism with scientific and technological achievements. The party mobilizes the people to carry out this task under the socialist emulation slogan 'maximum economic effect from every mark, every working hour and every gram of material.' We must maintain the living standard we have achieved and raise it methodically by making full use of the republic's productive and scientific potential. In the 1980s we shall have to expand production rapidly and increase the national income, with the supply of raw and other materials virtually unchanged as to quantity and without any substantial growth of manpower.

A key objective of our economic activity is to gain early and visible results from a saving of materials. To this end we are doing our best to increase the extraction and processing of local materials and to improve their quality. This applies primarily to the mining of brown coal (whose output we plan to raise from 257 to 300 million tons annually) as well as of potash salts, non-ferrous metals, kaolin and some other materials, all of which are essential if we are to meet the growing economic needs to a large extent. An important line of planning is to develop the coal chemistry and reduce consumption of black oil as fuel. In this way we seek to produce more of the articles needed to chemicize the economy, using not only imported oil but also our own resources. Chemical industries putting out highly processed products are being developed at a fast rate.

Our country is poor in raw materials and hence strongly dependent on imports. The significance of fuel and raw material imports from the Soviet Union is illustrated by their share in the republic's domestic consumption. In 1979 it was as follows: oil, 95 per cent; natural gas, 58; coal, 50; rolled steel, 42; cotton, 91; and copper, 38 per cent. In the 1981-1985 period, the Soviet Union will supply us, under the relevant agreement, with 95 million tons of oil, 32,500 million cubic meters of natural gas, 21 million tons of coal, 10 million tons of rolled steel and 440,000 tons of cotton. The GDR purchases these items at lower prices than in the world capitalist market. Moreover, we have the benefit of a guaranteed market for our exports. This is a stability of which no capitalist country can boast.

A prime task in improving the supply of fuels and raw materials is to make multiple use of raw and other materials and greatly increase their economic turnover. We are creating ample opportunities for this. Plans provide that recyclable scrap and other wastes shall meet at least 12 per cent of the demand for the most vital raw materials.

In carrying out the SUPG Program, we concentrate on speeding scientific and technological progress and socialist rationalization at enterprises so as to reduce the number of jobs. Our purpose is to introduce new, more effective technologies. The economy must make greater use of achievements in the main spheres of the scientific and technological revolution, especially in automation, electronics, chemistry, atomic energy, biology and the science of materials. Our technological policy is aimed at accelerating the development and use of microelectronics and industrial robots, equipping machines with electronic controls and using up-to-date computers. This will boost labor productivity in every industry, extend the assortment of high-quality articles and cut costs. The growing internal requirements of our economy and the situation in the world market necessitate the further development of our industrial structure and a renewal of the range of high-technology commodities.

A major task of the party's economic policy is to invest more judiciously. Investment can only be increased to a limited extent, and so we strive to channel investments mainly into the enlargement of the material and technical basis of industry, agriculture, construction and transport. The SUPG insists on economic agencies making accumulation much more effective and this depends primarily on how far it assures rapid scientific and technological progress. At the same time, an effort is being made to reduce construction time by one-third or even by half. Experience has shown that more effective investment depends in no small measure on increasing the funds allocated for the modernization and reconstruction of operating enterprises.

The promotion of fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries on the basis of mutual trust has always been a decisive condition of progress in building a developed socialist society in our country. The program of specialization and cooperation in production up to the year 1990, signed by the GDR and Soviet Union, provides a solid basis for our economy's stability and more dynamic development. Implementation of the CMEA countries' long-term special-purpose programs covering key spheres — fuels, raw materials, mechanical engineering, agriculture, consumer goods and transport — is a major factor furthering the GDR's economic progress and, hence, giving our republic greater political leverage in the world. The fulfillment of these plans will be further evidence of the vitality of socialist economic integration.

Trade with all countries is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutual benefit. Lately we have been expanding trade and economic relations with countries that have freed themselves from colonial dependence. We are making a special effort to strengthen these relations. Our trade with capitalist countries is likewise growing.

Our experience suggests that as the productive forces and socialist relations of production develop, higher demands are made of economic planning and management. In the context of the state's role in socialist construction, party and government bodies are working to improve centralized state planning as a key vehicle of management

guaranteeing planned and balanced economic progress.

In the GDR, as in other socialist countries, large economic units or complexes have been set up to speed the growth of the productive forces. Early this year there were 129 complexes in the republic's industry under central control. These units, each of which employs between 20,000 and 40,000 persons, constitute the stable framework of the management system along with their member branches, research departments and marketing organizations. The formation of these large units and the simultaneous simplification of relations between them and the central government agencies have provided important conditions allowing planning and management to meet the new requirements more effectively.

An important task of our economic agencies today is to introduce quality factors into the production sphere to a larger extent than ever before. We have evolved a set of quantitative and qualitative indices to encourage complexes and individual plants which put out more end products at the lowest cost in terms of raw and other materials. This will help gear economic units more effectively to performance benefiting the whole economy.

The planning and management system functioning in the GDR is based on the principle that what benefits society as a whole should meet the interests of complexes and their subdivisions, as well as of each worker. We consistently provide material and moral incentives to ensure adherence to this principle.

Our party's economic and social policy and the country's economic tasks and plans are not based on wishful thinking but on rational application of socialist economic laws. I must re-emphasize that at the present phase of social development the principle of distribution according to work is applied in full measure. We adhere steadfastly to this principle, seeing it as a characteristic of developed socialism. 'Egalitarianism in the sense of levelling living conditions, requirements and consumption is contrary to the essense of this phase of socialism,' Erich Honecker said at a conference of first secretaries of district party committees last January. 'More than ever, it is important to make full use of the stimulating effect of the socialist principle of distribution according to work in the interest of further economic and social progress, higher productivity, a socialist attitude to labor and public property, better labor discipline and a loftier morality.'*

Improving economic management also involves price policy. Now, as in the past, this policy envisages increasing state subsidies for the prices of consumer staples, basic service charges, and rent. As for high-quality manufactured goods, their prices should generally cover production outlays and include normal receipts needed for economic expenditures.

Our party promotes democratic centralism, ensures a close link between centralized management and planning on the one hand, and the working people's creative effort and the responsibility of enterprises for their public duty on the other. Socialist emulation and the innovation movement play a big part in this. The SUPG encourages these efforts of the working people, who have committed themselves to produce two days' output above plan before the year's end.

By advancing its economy, the GDR demonstrates the superiority of socialism over the historically doomed capitalist system. In capitalist countries the hardships caused by crises are borne by the working people, but in our country crises are unknown. The party abides by its program of maintaining full employment and stability, fostering economic growth and raising the standard of living.

The working class of all countries and progressive mankind can rest assured that the German Democratic Republic will always strive for the triumph of our common cause shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries. Building up the strength of the republic will continue to help in changing the balance of world forces in favor of socialism and peace.

*Erich Honecker, *Die Nächsten Aufgaben der Partei bei der weiteren Durchführung der Beschlüsse des IX. Parteitages der SED*. Berlin, 1980, p. 53.


**To understand and explain socialism understand how the economy works**

Two new books

**The Economic System of Socialism**
L. Abalkin

The theoretical basis; forms of ownership; how production serves the people; how labor's value is measured; all aspects of planning.

cloth 139 pages $3.50

**Planning a Socialist Economy**
Y. Berri, ed.

A full, systematic account of theory, organizational experience and methodology.

cloth 2 volumes $6.95

**PROGRESS BOOKS**
**71 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**

# Fascism — reaction's last hope

*Felipe Rodriguez*
CC member, Communist Party of Bolivia

Punitive operations against the unarmed population, outrages by semi-fascist gangs, ruthless treatment of activists or progressive organizations, and thousands of killed, arrested or listed 'missing' highlight the reality of Bolivia today. Power has again been usurped by extreme right circles of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie with reactionary military carrying out a coup on July 17 and setting up a terroristic dictatorship under General Garcia Meza.

In reporting the developments in Bolivia the bourgeois press ironically speaks of the 'tradicio pronunciamiento'[1] (the latest coup is the 189th in the nation's 155-year history). However, it is clear that the July 17 putsch was not motivated by the ambitions of power-hungry colonels or a redistribution of privileges and revenues among the ruling caste. It marked the beginning of reaction's frontal assault against the people, against democracy.

Instability is a feature of Bolivia's political history. In speaking of the past the explanation must be sought in the heterogeneous character of the ruling strata, their clashing group interests, parochial discord, and the rivalry between the imperialist powers and the large neighboring states that lean on disparate circles of the local oligarchy. But from the 1930s onward governmental instability began to be increasingly determined by the struggle of the working people against poverty, exploitation and foreign capitalist oppression.

Bolivia was the first Latin American nation to challenge the U.S. monopolies: their oil-refinery facilities were nationalized as early as 1937. The revolution of April 1952 brought radical changes to Bolivia's socio-economic structure. The nationalization of the mining industry and the agrarian reform undermined the position of the tin barons and big landowners. The old army was disbanded and a people's militia was formed. A powerful trade union movement unfolded and united to form the Bolivian Workers' Center. Founded in 1950, the Communist Party of Bolivia got its first experience of struggle.

However, the political maturity of the proletariat, the peasant poor, and their leaders was inadequate, and this allowed the initiative to pass to the local bourgeoisie, which used the revolutionary-democratic gains to consolidate its economic and political positions. The transformation process was gradually channelled into reformism. The people's militia was disarmed and disbanded, and the army, restored with the aid of U.S. advisers, was given the function of maintaining 'internal security.' The door was re-opened to foreign capital.

Patriotic officers came to power on the crest of a resurgence of the popular movement at the close of the 1960s. However, the progressive reforms instituted by them were forcibly cut short in 1971 by the military coup led by Hugo Banzer. This was followed by a period of savage dictatorship. The Communist Party of Bolivia declared that this regime 'champions the interests of the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and, at the same time, has the support of the middle bourgeoisie (linked to the public capitalist sector and also to monopoly capital through credits and the market). By its political methods, form of government, declared principles and repressions it fits squarely into the pattern of fascisization.'[2]

At the close of the decade, the bankruptcy of the Banzer dictatorship and the intensifying actions of the masses compelled the ruling circles to modify their policies, announce elections and restore constitutional institutions. It was felt that this concession would bring to power Banzer's successor General Pereda Asbun or the right-bourgeois bloc headed by Victor Paz Estenssoro.[3] As it turned out, the big bourgeoisie and its Washington patrons hoped in vain. In the course of two years the Bolivian people were called to the polls three times, and on all these occasions the largest number of votes was won by Hernan Siles Zuazo, candidate of the Democratic and Popular Unity Front, an association of left forces that included the Communist Party.

In the first two elections reaction managed, by alternating non-violent and violent actions, to prevent a people's government from coming to power. The election results were rigged and the procedure of endorsing them was dragged out. Recourse was had to backstage intrigues to sow discord in and split the left bloc. The U.S. embassy and the Washington lobby of local politicians took part in these maneuvers. At the critical moment reaction brought in the army to restore its positions. In 1978 the election results were cancelled by the Pereda Asbun coup, and in 1979 by the coup led by Colonel Natusch Busch. But neither political maneuvers nor military revolts influenced the people's determination. The unity of the democratic forces, which became possible largely through the growth of the people's militancy, the perservering actions of the CPB and its allies, and support for the democratization process by constitutionalist army officers, prevented the bourgeoisie and imperialism from imposing their will on the people.

At the June 1980 elections the left bloc candidate received more than one-third of the votes, i.e., more than the total polled by his nearest rivals — Paz Estenssoro and ex-dictator Banzer. Under the

Bolivian Constitution installment in the office of President requires an absolute majority of votes. In the event of a relative majority the election of the President is turned over to the National Congress. There was no doubt that the alignment of forces was in favor of the left bloc candidate. Even Paz Estenssoro had to acknowledge that the people had given the mandate to Siles Zuazo. Moreover, considerable success was registered at the June elections by left forces that do not belong to the Democratic and Popular Unity Front. By and large, the DPUF and other progressive organizations polled nearly half of the votes.

It was hardly a secret that the army was planning a coup in the event of a DPUF victory. The putschists fought savagely for the key post of commander of the land forces. The provisional President Lidia Gueiler succumbed to pressure, givng that post to General Garcia Meza, Banzer's henchman. Garcia Meza declared time and again that the army would not let 'Marxist extremists' assume power. Indeed, long before the coup the rightists began the extermination of 'undesirables.' The Long Knives-116 plan became public knowledge: in accordance with Circular 01/80 the army's intelligence branch drew up black lists, while armed gangs of falangists (members of the fascist Bolivian Socialist Falange) set about the physical extermination of militants of left parties and trade unions. At the same time, the conspirators made changes in the command echelon of the armed forces, removing constitutionalists and progressive officers or appointing them to minor posts.

The Communist Party clearly saw the imminent danger. Its Central Committee declared: 'The subversive activities of the fascists and their undisguised revanchism are indications that they are thirsting for a bloody restoration and looking for an opportunity to retrieve their positions in order to escape defeat and smash the actions of the masses by barbarous violence.'[4] In this situation the party sought to unite the people, to rouse them for the defense of democratic gains. The communists were active in the Committee for the Defense of Democracy, which united 28 political parties and organizations. The CPB insisted on the need for close links with progressive military and had taken steps in that direction. However, the forces were unequal: the armed forces were controlled by Banzer's henchmen. And the army turned its guns against the people.

In almost everything the actions of the Bolivian putschists coincide with the methods used by the Chilean military. In both cases they are using storm troopers of the fascist parties: 'Patria y Libertad' in Chile, and 'Falange' in Bolivia. In both instances the putschists used the services of 'trained' combatants. The Chilean gendarmes were trained by ex-SSman Walter Rauf; the Bolivian secret police employed the services of Klaus Barbie (alias Altman), the former Gestapo chief in Lyons. In preparation for the coup, both the Chilean and the Bolivian reactionaries indoctrinated officers ideologically. The latter were told that if a left government came to power it would replace the army with a people's militia.

The Chilean and the Bolivian military speak the same language: the coup was carried out for the sake of 'national reconstruction,' to save the nation from becoming a 'satellite of international communism.' Like Pinochet, Garcia Meza declares: "I will stay as long as I have to to eliminate the Marxist cancer, be it five years, 10 or 20.'[5]

However, the Bolivian people are in no mood to submit to the dictatorship. Communists, progressive bourgeois democrats, socialists, Catholics and all other true patriots are participating in the resistance. Miners and students have taken up arms. The Garcia Meza junta is facing formidable opposition from the trade union movement headed by the Bolivian Workers' Center. A government formed by Siles Zuazo is functioning underground. The Catholic and Methodist churches are up in protest. The new-fledged dictator cannot count on support from the entire army either. His doubts about the loyalty of many officers are well-founded. There have been cases of insubordination even among senior officers. Anti-fascist feeling runs strong in the armed forces. A campaign of international solidarity with the Bolivian people is gathering momentum. The new regime has found itself isolated on the world scene.

Under these conditions the Garcia Meza clique is trying, first, to destroy the organizations forming the bulwark of the resistance as soon as possible and lay the foundations of a corporate state. Second, Garcia Meza and his backers are out to confuse and win over the masses. An order freezing prices has been issued to win the approval of the philistine. The junta speaks of a 'war' against profiteering, unemployment and inflation, of its intention to 'raise the moral level in the administration.' On the other hand, it appeals to nationalistic feeling and uses the bogey of an external threat. In this, too, there is considerable similarity with the Pinochet policy. But Garcia Meza has gone further. He poses as a champion of the middle road ('Bolivia will advance despite imperialism of the left and the right') and tries to benefit even from anti-U.S. feeling. The junta is holding out to the people the lure of participating in the management of industrial enterprises and in the administration of the state. Lastly, and this is ultimate cynicism, Garcia Meza declares that his government 'mirrors the rich theoretical and ideological traditions of militant, nationalist and anti-oligarchic socialism.'

The coincidence of the 'mechanisms' of the coups and of the policies of the military dictatorships in Chile and Bolivia is not accidental. The same style strikes the eye: the Chilean scenario was taken as a basis by the Bolivian military. Pinochet was propped by the CIA and transnationals. On the political scene of Bolivia U.S. diplomats, military experts, intelligence agents posing as entrepreneurs and industrialists 'pluralizing' CIA assignments, have always played a visible role. Lately, they have been very careful to camouflage their

activities, but the fact that these activities have expanded could not be concealed.

Today the Washington administration pretends that so far as it was concerned the coup was totally unexpected. It expresses regret and condemns the violations of human rights in Bolivia. But world opinion knows of the Pentagon's and the CIA's long-standing ties with the Bolivian military. Most of those who forcibly suppressed democracy in Bolivia had received their training in the U.S. army. Pentagon experts trianed Bolivian officers in counter-insurgency operations and helped to form Ranger units, whose hands are stained with the blood of fighters for our people's freedom.

The Carter administration hastened to dissociate itself from the Garcia Meza regime. It announced a halt to military and economic aid to Bolivia, the recall of the U.S. military mission and a cutback of U.S. embassy personnel. Actually however, in the USA they are quite pleased with the actions of the putschists. *The Washington Post* called the coup 'effective.'

What is secret today will come out into the open tomorrow. The world will learn new facts about the complicity of U.S. secret agencies in the dramatic developments in Bolivia. But today it is important to see not so much particulars as the fact that by its characteristics the coup accomplished by the reactionary Bolivian military and the regime established by it harmonize with the new line of the Washington administration's global strategy.

The 'democratic scenario' suggested for Latin America by the Yankee strategists has been truncated. The most that will be countenanced is a right-centrist parliamentary regime. But if the advance of democratic forces cannot be stopped, if all means of political pressure prove ineffective, the scenario makes fascists acceptable. In this connection while seeing the coincidence of the development in Chile and Bolivia, note must be made of the fact that in Bolivia reaction and imperialism used all their forces against democracy as early as the 'Viaux stage.'[6]

Concerning the tactics employed by the reactionaries and imperialists in Chile and Bolivia, Fidel Castro said: 'They speak of parliament, the constitution and democracy. A fine democracy this is when the people are totally ignored, and when at elections they vote for a progressive government, a fascist coup is staged and repressions begin.'[7]

When the sinister business is completed, the imperialists dissociate themselves from it and even cut off relations with the new regime. They then wait for passions to die down and soon assistance reaches unprecedented dimensions. The example of Chile is quite eloquent in this respect. But imperialism needs more modern structures, and its encourages the renewal of the facade of right-authoritarian regimes and supports their line toward political and economic modernization.

Bolivia is regarded as the geographical heartland of the continent. It may also be called the nerve center that is particularly sensitive to changes in the political situation in Latin America. The wave of counter-revolutionary revenge of the early 1970s first passed through our country. The new wave has likewise first hit Bolivia in 1980. But today the peoples in the region have gained in strength. And the people of Bolivia shall withstand the weight of the assault. And they will most certainly take the offensive and shake off the tyrannical junta. The communists are in the front ranks of the fighters against the dictatorship, marching shoulder to shoulder with all patriots, with all true democrats. International solidarity is reinforcing the spirit of resistance. It is needed to expose the crimes of the junta and to organize a wide-ranging campaign for the release of political prisoners, to isolate the fascist regime on the world scene and deprive it of foreign military and economic support.

1. The term for palace coups in Latin America, — *Ed.*
2. *Partido Comunista de Bolivia, Por la victoria democratica y el ejercicio de la soberania nacional hacia un partido de masas. IV congreso nacional (Documentos principales).* La Paz, 1980, p. 18.
3. Leader of the bourgeois Historical Nationalist Revolutionary Movement. — *Ed.*
4. *Partido Comunista de Bolivia. Documentos. Seleccion 1971-1979.* La Paz, 1979, p. 142.
5. *International Herald Tribune.* August 5, 1980.
6. General Roberto Viaux Marambio's group attempted a coup to prevent Salvador Allende's assumption of the presidency. But the Chilean people foiled the conspirators' plans. — *Ed.*
7. *Granma,* July 28, 1980.


**Books by Boris Ponomarev**

published in 1980

**Lenin and the World Revolutionary Process**

Articles and speeches from 1923 to 1971 which span Ponomarev's long career as a Party official and theoretician.
Progress Publishers, Moscow cloth
515 pages $6.95

**Marxism-Leninism: A Flourishing Science**

A forceful polemic against the conception that Marxism-Leninism is outdated.
International Publishers, New York
paper 121 pages $1.75 in U.S.
$2.45 in Canada

**PROGRESS BOOKS,**
**71 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**

# Peculiarities of contemporary reformism

*Allan Booth*
Head of Education Department, CPGB

Reformism has dominated the organized labor movement of Britain for the past hundred years. It presents a major obstacle to a socialist transformation of society which can only result from a revolutionary process, in our country as elsewhere. To overcome reformist influence in the labor movement is a programmatic objective of the Communist Party of Great Britain the realization of which is envisaged by *The British Road to Socialism*. Hence the attention which the British communists devote to the investigation of this phenomenon on the analyses made by Marx, Engels, Lenin and British Marxists.

## I

Reformism is a complex ideological and political formation today, as the case of Britain shows. Its manifestations in political practice depend on the concrete historical situation and change with the passage of time. But generally, reformism seeks social progress and radical changes in social institutions and relationships without resorting to a political revolution or, in some versions, even disturbing the existing social order. Reformism has a distinctive trend due to the nature of measures proposed for 'introducing' a new order. Reformists believe that social reform is a connecting link between capitalism and socialism and makes it unnecessary to break with the capitalist system through a revolution.

Present-day British reformism is characterized primarily by the influence which it has had on the mass party of the working class, the Labour Party, its policies and its conceptions of struggle for the rights of labor.

The place and role of this party in British politics have always been dependent on a working-class vote and an historical alliance with trade unionism. However, the allegiance of Labour Party leaderships to bourgeois democratic structures, which is the strongest indication of reformist influence, left a decisive imprint on the public function of the party.

The objective of Labour Party policy is, in many of its leaders' view, to win a parliamentary majority. Thus they reduce the role of the party to that of an electoral machine; as for everything else they leave it in the hands of a small group, the Labour government.

The Labour Party puts emphasis on formal political processes — basically the marshalling of votes at elections as the means to a Labour majority. Accordingly, it regards less mediated forms of class struggle and power with distrust. At best, they are considered of no great significance to parliamentary work; at worst, they are held to constitute a really undemocratic threat. An example of this can be seen with the parliamentary Labour Party leaderships' attitude to the Tory government. Callaghan and Healey try to discourage the development of a mass movement against the Tories. In practice they accept the Tory agrument that action outside parliament is undemocratic, because the electors have given the government a 'mandate.' This would imply that the political system and parliament exist in a vacuum and that the relations of power in the capitalist state are independent of class struggle.

This integration with the bourgeois parliamentary system is a result of the corrupting influence of reformism on the political struggles of the working class and is a major characteristic of the Labour movement noted by many analysts. As Ralph Miliband puts it, 'Of political parties claiming socialism to be their aim, the Labour Party has always been one of the most dogmatic — not about socialism, but about the parliamentary system. Empirical and flexible about all else, its leaders have always made devotion to that system their fixed point of reference and the conditioning factor of their political behavior . . . The leaders of the Labour Party have always rejected any kind of political action which fell, or which appeared to them to fall, outside the conventions of the parliamentary system. The Labour Party has not only been a parliamentary party, it has been a party deeply imbued by parliamentarianism.'[1] One of the peculiarities of British reformism is that it defers every step toward real socialism to the bourgeois parliamentary system, reducing socialism itself from the outset to what the ruling class permits.

The ideological source and theoretical basis of such views are a belief in the neutrality or potential neutrality of the state, seen as an institution that can serve the interests of all the people and be used for the common good. In line with this belief Labour governments under reformist leaderships have subsumed primarily the class interests within the so-called 'national interest.' The political materialization of their 'socialist' aims has consisted in attempts to draw antagonistic classes into an active partnership with the state, supposed to be able to guarantee 'equality of the interests of labor and capital.'

The idea of a permanent alliance — for the national good — between labor, capital and the state is

the key to reformist social policies. It is 'a means, not of doing away with two extremes of capital and wage-labor, but of weakening their antagonism and transforming it into a harmony' (Karl Marx, *Eighteenth Brumaire*).

This policy is aimed at creating a national consensus, and at institutionalizing the class struggle. According to reformist notions, capital would control its more extremist elements. The unions would discipline their shop-floor militants. Both antagonists could be won for the 'center' and induced to strike 'bargains.' It should be clear, however, that in that case the state, while appearing to subsume into itself the best interests of everyone, would in fact be concerned with those of capital. No wonder such a policy has failed to win widespread acceptance among the workers. This is shown by the fact that in the 1979 general election millions of workers just didn't vote for the Labour Party.

Of course, not every action of a capitalist state is hostile to the interests of the working class. An argument to the contrary would deny the effectiveness of class struggle, the differences among various sections of the capitalist class and the development of the state and its apparatus. But in capitalist society the state serves the long-term, fundamental interests of the ruling class. This does not mean that the state is reducible to the ruling class. In fact its effectiveness as an instrument of class domination lies very much in that it has a certain degree of autonomy. It is a complex and contradictory structure necessitating class struggle both outside and within the state apparatus.

## II

A further aspect of contemporary reformism is how it perceives the 'process of change,' a concept shared by the Labour Party. One of its key ideas is a particular form of social change — 'equality,' a demand for better conditions, for closing the gap between rich and poor. This concept is characterized by an ahistorical, non-class approach. It sees equality as a non-class value serving as a means of cohesion, and rejects inequality because of its divisiveness. Thus a frequent charge levelled at the Conservative Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher, by James Callaghan, leader of the Labour Party, is that her government's policies 'have divided the nation' and upset the consensus his party was trying to create.

'Class' cannot be said to be foreign to reformism. Indeed, reformists admit that class is a problem because it creates social conflicts and domination and also wastes resources. For them, class is inequality and its criteria are confined to income, or at best, occupation. They usually limit the economic criteria to the sphere of circulation.

Thus reformists regard 'class' as a distribution term. It follows that under capitalism there can be more or less of it and so one can speak of 'a more classless society.' Class is said to be removable and, given cooperation and 'good sense,' its worst effects can allegedly be overcome.

The concept of class as something ephemeral, not absolutely necessary, capable of being eliminated and having no organic link with the functioning of the capitalist mode of production is upheld by every variety of reformism. But as class 'divisions' recur on a massive scale (which shows that the concept is untenable), reformists stress the amazing persistence of national traits. To quote Crosland, an ideologue of British reformism, 'British society — slow-moving, rigid and class-ridden — has proved much harder to change than was supposed.'[2] The idea that class is rooted in the production relations of capitalist society is totally absent from reformist ideology.

Successive postwar Labour governments have tried a reformist strategy for social change. There has been no lack of illusions to the effect that the striking inequality prevailing in British society can be ended in this way. As far back as 1952, R.H. Tawney, an ideologue of British social democracy, wrote about 'distinct advances toward the conversion of a class-ridden society into a community in fact as well as name.'[3] Subsequently spokesmen of both the Labour Party and the Tories repeatedly exaggerated the scope, social significance and effect of reformist measures carried out (each group doing it, needless to say, for its own political ends). More important, illusions about the possibility of achieving equality by reformist means were shared by a sizable majority of the working class. At the same time, they occasionally gave rise to apprehensions and outright fear among the capitalists.

Now that the 'great social revolution' announced by the British reformists is marking its 35th anniversary, there is a sobering up in various quarters. Peregrine Worsthorne, a leading conservative journalist, makes a revealing comment. In an article following the Conservative election victory in 1979, he wrote: 'Tory rhetoric in recent years has tended to suggest that socialism and egalitarianism had destroyed the old order beyond repair and that all the rich had been forced to flee . . . This is not quite the picture presented by the new Tory government which is encouragingly full of hereditary peers, self-made and hereditary millionaires, wealthy landowners . . . What price the great social revolution that was meant to have got under way as far back as 1945? Nothing could better highlight the failure of British social democracy since the war to bring about a fundamental change in the structure of society. Much has changed. But the old ruling order is still very much alive and kicking.'[4]

While putting the failure of reformism on record, Worsthorne is silent on the important thing, as are, by the way, all critics from the right. Reformist policy exalted to an official rank, far from bringing society nearer equality by a single step, undermining or at least shaking the economic and political domination of the capitalist class, has been a major factor, if not the greatest single factor, in preserving that domination. By offering the labor movement a false perspective and leading it on to the wrong path, reformism has saved capitalism in postwar Britain.

The results of reformist rule have been most disastrous to the British workers. The failure of reformist

political practice is admitted by many, both in the Labour Party and among the workers. In fact, doubts about the effectiveness of reformist policy have never been as widespread as today. The reformists' sphere of action shrinks in periods of sharpening conflict between labor and capital, recession and increasing social polarization, which is now greater than a mere 10 years ago. In these circumstances many reformist conceptions that won currency in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s prove ineffective.

But while the present generation of workers knows through their own experience the bankruptcy of reformist policies, the political and ideological domination of reformism in the British labor movement is far from being broken. What complicates this task is, in particular, the fact that the immediate result of the failure of the reformist 'strategy for change' is not a swing in parliament to the left but a swing to the right, from the Labour Party to the Tories. The right-wing Tory government is mounting attack after attack on working people and their organizations. In organizing the masses to resist these attacks, Britain's communists try to carry on their ideological work to win the working class to abandon reformist attitudes and policies for radical, revolutionary ones.

III

In the current struggle against reformism it is essential to take into account the national peculiarities and distinctive development of the labor movement. In many capitalist countries of continental Europe the rise of mass parties of the working class based on Marxist principles preceded the emergence of large-scale trade unionism. It is these parties that took the initiative in the formation and development of these mass movements, reflecting their ideology. Not so in Britain. The initiative to found the Labour Party — the first, and so far virtually the only, mass political party of the working class — was taken by the trade unions. To this day, the Labour Party is influenced largely by the trade unions, to which it is organically linked.

Marxism has therefore had a very limited impact on the Labour Party with regard to its theory, program, structure and organizational form. While scientific political economy was developed largely on the basis of Marx's concrete study of British capitalism and of Engels' contribution to this specific study of conditions of the English working class, Marxist ideas never took root in this mass organization of the working class and have always been alien to its leaders and the majority of its rank and file. Ever since the last quarter of the last century, Marxism has existed in our country as a minority trend in the labor movement.

This accounts for the specific phenomenon of British reformism. Unlike its continental counterparts, it did not need to put on a Marxist cloak to fight the revolutionary wing of the working class. It has not taken the form of the revision of Marx, which in many European countries has succeeded to disrupt from within the social democratic movement (committed to Marxism at one time), bring about its ideological and political degeneration and split the working class. This largely explains the fact that the British workers in the main have traditionally been unfamiliar with Marxist language and terminology, to say nothing of Marxist ideas and principles. And yet, despite this different origin, reformism, in our country as well, is the main obstacle to the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and performs the function of a bourgeois alternative to that ideology within the labor movement.

The ideological sources of reformism in Britain are a rather eclectical mixture of traditional trade unionist practices and ideological origins. But the dominant factor is still undoubtedly 'economism,' drawn from pragmatic experiences of the trade unions, which by the end of the last century had for more than five decades applied the principle of 'no politics' in seeking improvements in the workers' condition.

'Economism' and pragmatism combined with a certain contempt for theory have very deep roots in the British labor movement. And this not only because of the class collaboration of the leadership, which from the foundation of the Labour Party until the present was dominated by the right wing. The struggles were many and often surpassed those in the rest of Western Europe but until recently were largely concentrated on bread-and-butter issues, with a minimum of politically and ideologically inspired struggles.

An important element in reformist ideology was a fairly strong religious trend derived from the religious radicalism of the Cromwellian revolution as well as from utopian socialism which was linked in Britain with parliamentary struggle as early as the 17th century and began during the Owenite movement of the first half of the 19th century to link up with workers' struggles.

It follows that to overcome reformism, it is indispensable, first of all, to inject Marxist ideology and politics into the mass labor movement; this involves struggle against revisionism, though to a lesser extent in Britain where revisionism is very weak, than in many countries of the continent. Our paramount task is to expose class collaboration.

IV

Britain's communists maintain that the task of undermining reformist dominance in the labor movement must not be limited to theoretical criticism, ideological discussion and the political education of workers. We have said that reformism is embodied in the structure of the mass organizations of the labor movement formed under the influence of reformism. The Labour Party, and this as a consequence, traditionally reflects in its social function both ideologically and structurally its reformist parentage. Hence to accomplish this task, it is necessary to effect structural and functional changes in the labor movement itself. The prerequisites of the early steps in this direction are created by combining ideological work with class struggle in the workers' trade and political organizations, a struggle which the communists

and the left as a whole are carrying on against the rightist leaderships of these organizations, and not without some success.

As regards the social functions of the trade unions, there are signs of certain changes beginning to express themselves due to the growing disillusionment of the masses with reformism and the conscious and consistent work of communists and other militants. Today the British trade unions see their role in upholding the interests of the workers, who want higher wages and better working conditions, but they have started to recognize the need for action over a wide range of national political issues. This has become evident in their activity only fairly recently.

The attitude to extraparliamentary struggles is changing too. The trade unions are beginning to regard them as a necessary means of bringing about changes in government policy. Last spring, for the first time in a hundred years, the British TUC called for a Day of Action against the government's overall domestic and foreign policy.

The response of the working class to the call was generally quite impressive. This was so despite the fact that the leadership of the BTUC General Council did not campaign actively and assumed a defensive posture when the government and the ruling class, sensing the danger to themselves in this new approach of the trade unions, unleashed an unprecedented campaign against the Day of Action. On the other hand, many workers who were influenced by reformist leaders did not respond to the call, which shows how much more needs to be done to weaken reformism in the minds of the British workers.

Changes are coming about in the Labour Party too. This is understandable, since the trade unions have a decisive say on the policies of the Labour Party as well as the composition of its Executive Committee. Last May, for the first time since it was founded, the Labour Party organized a national mass demonstration in London to express opposition to government and right-wing Labour policies and to the deployment of Cruise missiles in Europe. The demonstration drew 25,000 people. Callaghan stayed away. Another peace demonstration in the autumn organized by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is officially supported for the first time by the Labour Party.

The contradiction between the programmatic policy of the Labour Party and that of the parliamentary Labour Party is growing. The objective of socialism has been resurrected in party documents. The primary issue now is how to realize the objective since the parliamentary Labour Party ignores its party's programmatic policies and rejects its socialist objective as 'outmoded.' It is a measure of the leftward changes of the activists of the Labour Party that the recognition is now widespread amongst them that it is no longer enough to operate within the established party structure, to elect spokesmen of the left to the Executive Committee, or to adopt left policies, although substantial progress has been made in this respect, or that reformist institutional structures and methods are suitable for achieving socialism.

That is why a central policy issue of the British labor movement is the need to democratize the Labour Party. The left forces are fighting to change the party's reformist structure, for the party and not solely the parliamentary Labour Party to elect the leader, for the EC of the party and not the cabinet or shadow cabinet to draft the election manifesto and for the obligatory (automatic) reselection of Labour candidates before each election. The right wing is striving with might and main to frustrate these democratic changes, invoking tradition, encouraging right-wing trade union leaders to ignore and disregard the decisions taken by their rank-and-file delegations on these issues.

One of the biggest obstacles to effective struggle against reformism is still the size of the CPGB, which is itself the consequence of reformism in the labor movement. Thus to increase the size of the party and the circulation of the *Morning Star* are crucial factors for ridding the working class of reformism. We believe this can be done. The influence of the CPGB, despite its small size, is considerable. The proof of this is the election of communists to positions at all levels in the trade unions and other mass organizations, the fact that the CPGB has pioneered a number of the programmatic demands now being made by the trade unions and the Labour Party, and the workers' response to the *Morning Star* 50th Anniversary £80,000 Fund Appeal, highlighted by the £5,000 contribution of the Transport and General Workers' Union (the largest trade union — 2 million strong — in Western Europe) and £3,000 by the National Union of Public Employees with a membership of over half a million. Nor were they intimidated by the mass media attack on them for this support to a communist newspaper.

But financial and moral support, important as they are, are no substitute for a large Communist Party that could effectively fight reformism in the land of its birth, where it is more deeply rooted than in perhaps any other country of the capitalist world.

1. Ralph Miliband, *Parliamentary Socialism*. 1972, p. 13.
2. Anthony Crosland, *Socialism Now and Other Essays*. 1974, p. 44.
3. R.H. Tawney, *Equality*, 1952, p. 26, Epilogue.
4. *Sunday Telegraph*, May 27, 1979.

# Our country's destiny is in our own hands

*Ios Por*
CC General Secretary,
Kampuchean United Front for
National Salvation

This interview was given in Phnom Penh by Ios Por to *WMR* correspondent Vsevolod Rybakov. Part of the interview, related to the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime, was used for the article 'The Ravages of Dogma' in our August 1980 issue.

*You fought the U.S. aggressors and their Lon Nol puppets as a member of the Khmer Rouge. The name is now often used to mean the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Kchieu Samphan gang. But there was a time when they had the support of many decent people, true patriots, and revolutionaries. Why?*

The events of March-April 1970[1] found me in Kampot on a propaganda mission. I immediately joined in the struggle against the U.S.-Saigon aggression and the Lon Nol regime. At the time many people believed in Pol Pot, Ieng Sary and Kchieu Samphan. They camouflaged themselves skillfully, posing as patriots and saying nothing of their Maoist sympathies. We had no suspicion that we were dealing with traitors.

But after they consolidated their authority in the liberated regions in 1971, the Pol Pot gang began butchering revolutionary cadres and intellectuals, picking mainly people who had studied in Vietnam, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Various specious explanations were given for the disappearance of people — transfer to other regions, to new jobs and so on. All this made many people ponder, suspect the sincerity of the aims pursued by Pol Pot and his sycophants. In 1974 we were told that Vietnam was our enemy. This finally opened the eyes of those who for years had fought shoulder to shoulder with the Vietnamese comrades for the common cause.

Meanwhile, the Pol Pot thugs began a methodical extermination of those who had studied, worked or fought together with their Vietnamese friends. I was arrested on April 3, 1974 but in the night, before they could execute me, I fled with bound hands. Since then I have dedicated myself to fighting the Pol Pot clique, which had usurped power and betrayed the revolutionary liberation movement. On January 7, 1979 I entered Phnom Penh together with units of the Kampuchean United Front for National Salvation (KUFNS), and fraternal Vietnamese troops. I held the post of Director of the United Front's Political School, and at the Second KUFNS Congress in September-October 1979 I was elected General Secretary of the Central Committee. The main thing now is to organize the building of a new life.

*The Pol Pot gang was in power for almost four years and in that time it inflicted colossal damage on Kampuchea. But I have also seen green fields, busy markets, and people in new clothes, and I heard laughter. Would you say a few words about what has been achieved by the new government during the period of a little over a year since it came to power on January 7, 1979?*

After our second liberation we began the nation's rehabilitation from scratch. The people who survived now suffered from starvation, from a shortage of practically everything — clothes, housing, food utensils, medicines. Possibly, what has been achieved under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Council may seem to be modest, but these achievements must be assessed against the background of what the criminal Pot Pot-Ieng Sary-Kchieu Samphan regime left behind it.

To put it briefly, our main achievement is that our people are no longer dying of starvation or slave labor; the nation's security has been ensured; surviving families have been reunited, and the bulk of the population have returned to their native villages or towns; people have become masters of their life, society and destiny; a system of people's power from top to bottom has been set up; the education and health systems have been restored; factories are being opened. I'll give you some facts and figures.

The last Pol Pot sanctuaries on Kampuchean territory were destroyed in 1979. At least 45,000 Pol Pot troops were wiped out in these operations. The remnants fled across the frontier to Thailand. The struggle has steeled and strengthened the revolutionary armed forces. Military units are being enlarged, the first regular division was formed recently, and there are local military units and self-defense groups.

At the Second Congress of the KUFNS the Central Committee was enlarged from 12 to 35 members. This has made it a more representative body. Front committees are functioning in almost all the provinces. We now have trade unions, youth, women's and journalists' associations, an Afro-Asian Solidarity and a Peace committee, and associations of friendship with Vietnam, Laos and the Soviet Union.

New ministries have been formed under the People's Revolutionary Council. There are people's

revolutionary councils in all provinces, and local organs of revolutionary power have been set up at the level of districts, cantons and villages.

The peasants who have returned to their native villages with the assistance of the revolutionary authorities have been given seeds and farm implements, and — this is of the utmost importance — household and kitchen utensils, which were forbidden and destroyed by the Pol Pot gang. In 1979 nearly one million hectares of land were sown to rice and other crops. Fishing has been restored with nets (which were likewise destroyed by the Pol Pot gang) provided by fraternal Vietnam. The peasants are uniting in mutual assistance groups — there are some 50,000 of these groups in rice production alone.

Vietnam, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also some international organizations supplied us with hundreds of thousands of tons of food, which was distributed among the people. The threat of starvation — a legacy of the Pol Pot regime — has been averted.

We have restored the Po-chentong international airport, the Phnom Penh river port and, with the aid of Soviet specialists, the sea port at Kompong Som. The Phnom Penh-Kompong Som and Phnom Penh-Battamaban railways are operating. Traffic has resumed on the main highways.

More than 40 factories have become operational in and around Phnom Penh, including textile, household ware and tire factories, and machine-repair shops. The supply of electricity and water to the city has been restored.

In the 1979-1980 academic year a total of 750,000 children were admitted to 13,000 classes at elementary schools. Secondary schools are also being opened. Instruction is given by 15,600 surviving or newly-trained teachers. Classes have begun at the Phnom Penh medical institute, which now has 700 students. Orphanages and day care centers are being set up.

There are three central hospitals in Phnom Penh, 18 in the provinces and 100 in the districts. In the cantons and villages there are 476 paramedic and hygiene centers. With the help of our Vietnamese friends we have trained 1,400 paramedics. In the course of 1979 medical assistance was received by two million people. Some 200,000 have been hospitalized.

Cultural life is being restored.

These achievements are linked to disinterested assistance from our friends, notably Vietnam, Laos, the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries. We express our sincere gratitude to them and also to progressive, peace-loving people throughout the world who support the revolutionary cause of our people.

*Indeed, much has been done in this short period of a little over a year. What are your plans for the future, for the next year at least?*

In mid-April we marked the New Year (by the Kampuchean calendar). This year we are determined to consolidate what we have achieved and make further headway.

The main thing is to promote agriculture, develop fishing and increase the output of food in order to have the possibility of preventing the threat of starvation with our own resources. At the same time, we plan to develop forestry, industry and crafts.

We have to strengthen the people's revolutionary government and armed forces, ensure revolutionary security and disrupt all the maneuvers of our enemies, who are out to undermine and destroy our revolution.

The draft Constitution[2] is soon to be discussed nationwide. After it is adopted there will be elections and elected organs of power will begin to function.

It is important to raise the political awareness of the people, fire them with a spirit of patriotism, and expose the crimes of the henchmen of the expansionist Peking clique and its imperialist allies.

Our next task is to raise the level of our organizational work everywhere — in ministries, organs of people power and the Front. We must have well trained cadres motivated by a true revolutionary spirit.

We intend to continue fostering a sense of solidarity in our cadres, who must live with the interests of the revolution at heart, help each other, combat individualism and parochialism and repulse all the intrigues of the enemy seeking to break the unity of society. Our aim is to do everything to promote true socialist international solidarity, above all with our Vietnamese brothers, with their experts and army, which is fighting shoulder to shoulder with us for the just revolutionary cause of our two nations. We shall do everything to strengthen friendship and solidarity with Laos, the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries. Their assistance and support are invaluable. In this context I should like to note the significance of the agreements on assistance and solidarity signed when a delegation of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea led by Heng Samrin visited the Soviet Union. These agreements and protocols are opening up very favorable prospects.

*Would you comment on the international standing of people's Kampuchea?*

The young republic's international prestige is growing. Less than a year since the victory it has been recognized by more than 30 nations and national liberation movements.[3]

Kampuchea now has representatives in the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Democratic Women's Federation, the International Union of Students, the World Peace Council, the International Organization of Journalists and the International Red Cross Committee. We are exchanging official delegations with other countries and have received delegations from the communist parties of France, Japan, Peru, Spain, Sweden and other countries, and also an international organization of democratic lawyers, the Asian Buddhist Church and other organizations.

The people of Kampuchea highly value the assis-

tance from and the solidarity for their struggle by progressives throughout the world. The nation is actively cooperating in the question of food supplies with international official organizations and private bodies.

*Could you give some details about international assistance to Kampuchea?*

I'll quote statistics of our committee for the receipt and distribution of humanitarian assistance.

In 1979 Vietnam extended Kampuchea a grant of $56 million for the restoration of agriculture, the health system, communications, transport, industry, fishing and other branches of the economy. This assistance is expected to reach $62 million this year.

Soviet assistance to our country amounted to $134 million; the USSR gave us 112,000 tons of food, 130,000 tons of fuel, 8 billion meters of fabrics, and 420 cars, to mention some items.

Food and other commodities were received from Laos, Bulgaria, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and India.

We received 82,463 tons of food from UNICEF, the International Red Cross Committee, the World Food Program and FAO, and 17,317 tons from OXFAM. Food has come from many public and philanthropic organizations and also from private individuals in various countries.

*My last question. You know, of course, what the imperialist press writes of regions of Kampuchea 'controlled by the government of Heng Samrin' and the 'government of Pol Pot,' and now of Kchieu Samphan, and also of 'Free Khmers' and so forth. With these assertions are linked the demand for a 'political settlement of the Kampuchean problem.' I have driven more than a thousand kilometers in the country and saw with my own eyes that there was no zone controlled by anybody except the lawful government of Heng Samrin. But I did not get as far as the frontier with Thailand. Could you say a few words about the situation there?*

I must first declare officially that the lawful government of Kampuchea — the People's Revolutionary Council headed by Heng Samrin — is in full control of the nation's territory. The remnants of the Pol Pot troops hiding in the jungles on the frontier with Thailand (they are supported and armed by Peking) and also the counter-revolutionary 'Khmer Serei' and 'Khmer Sereika' gangs (their ringleader, Son Sann, a former prime minister in the Sihanouk government, was brought to Thailand by the imperialists) are taking advantage of the indefinite frontier in some places as left to us by the French colonialists. They operate along the frontier but claim they 'control part of the country.' In this they are supported by the Peking and imperialist press. But this is a bare-faced lie. Although individual, small gangs sometimes manage to infiltrate into Kampuchea and commit acts of subversion and sabotage, they are quickly rendered harmless by our revolutionary armed forces together with the fraternal Vietnamese troops. The security and integrity of our territory have been ensured. There is no political problem in Kampuchea and the talk about a 'political settlement' is aimless. We regard demands of this kind as interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs.

There is, however, a threat to the nation's independence and sovereignty from without. It comes from the Pol Pot and other bandits, who would like to return to Kampuchea with the aid of the Peking hegemonists and the U.S. imperialists in order to resume their criminal activity against the people. Our people, who will never again reconcile themselves to Pol Pot, Ieng Sary, Kchieu Samphan, Son Sann and their ilk, therefore remain vigilant and prepared to repulse them. This is the reason that Vietnamese troops are still in Kampuchea in accordance with the treaty of peace, friendship and mutual assistance as the guarantee that murderers and reactionaries do not return.

The responsibility for the tension on the frontier devolves directly on the Thai authorities, who are permitting and encouraging the activities on their territory of the remnants of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Kchieu Samphan gang, whom, against all common sense and under pressure from Peking and imperialism, Thailand recognizes as the 'lawful government of Kampuchea.' It is the business of the Thai government to bring order to the frontier. We reject the demand, formulated at the joint meeting of ASEAN and EEC foreign ministers, for the formation of 'international forces' to control the situation along our frontier with Thailand. This project would only encourage the continuation of the conspiracies aimed at undermining Kampuchea's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The Thai government also bears all the responsibility for the situation in the Kampuchean refugee camps on Thai territory. The first flood of refugees from Kampuchea, as you know, was started by U.S. imperialism's barbarous war of aggression against our people in 1970-1975. The next flood was the result of people fleeing genocide by the criminal regime of Pol Pot, Ieng Sary and Kchieu Samphan. Lastly, after the crushing defeat in January 1979 remnants of the Pol Pot troops drove hundreds of thousands of civilians to Thailand to serve as cannon fodder for the Pol Pot clique in its war against the victorious Kampuchean revolution. The Pol Pot gang is now being assisted not only by its masters — the Peking hegemonists — but also by international humanitarian organizations that have arranged food supplies for the camps and this, as a matter of fact, has attracted another influx of refugees. Western correspondents visiting these camps report that the lion's share of this aid is taken by the Pol Pot gangsters and the myrmidons of other counter-revolutionary 'leaders' of the Son Sann type. From these camps they send subversion groups into our territory. In other words, the existence of these Kampuchean refugee camps in Thailand is thus also a source of tension on the frontier.

Our government has repeatedly offered to begin talks with the government of Thailand on the repatriation of refugees. We are prepared to conduct such talks at any level, for instance, Red Cross

committees. Instead, the Thai government started a unilateral 'voluntary repatriation' of refugees. This — as is clear to us and has been confirmed by eye-witnesses and Western correspondents — pursues the aim of forcibly reinforcing the Pol Pot, 'Khmer Sereika' and other bands and sends them into Kampuchea to fight our revolutionary government, our people. We will have none of this, of course.[4] We are developing initiatives to achieve an overall normalization of relations with Thailand.

The Kampuchean people have now taken the destiny of their country into their own hands and will never accept dictation from anybody. The situation in Kampuchea is irreverible. Under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Council and united in the National Salvation Front, our people will build a new peaceful, independent, democratic, neutral and non-aligned Kampuchea advancing toward socialism.

1. The Lon Nol coup took place on March 18, 1970, and U.S. and Saigon troops invaded Kampuchea on April 30.
2. Made public in the summer of 1980.
3. In July 1980 the People's Revolutionary Council headed by Heng Samrin was recognized by the government of India as the lawful government of Kampuchea. — *Ed.*
4. In June 1980 the Thai authorities made an attempt to carry out this operation. Its forcible character and its true purpose, that of reinforcing the bandits fighting the People's Republic of Kampuchea, has been reported by journalists who witnessed it (see, for example, a report by R.P. Paringaux in *Le Monde* on June 21, 1980). This subversive action was cut short by the determined actions of Kampuchean frontier guards and units of the Vietnamese army helping to protect the nation's security in accordance with the Kampuchean-Vietnamese treaty. — *Ed.*

# The class basis of unity

*Hiroshi Arabori*
Member of the Presidium,
Director of the Labor Movement Bureau,
Central Committee, Japanese Communist Party

One of the key issues discussed in the 15th Congress of the Japanese Communist Party (JCP)* is the need to consolidate our democratic base in the mass movements, with the aim of making the 1980s an era of social progress and progressive transformation. The Congress resolution specifically proposed the establishment on class and democratic principles of a trade-union national center as a major task for the unification of the labor front. The resolution says: 'The aim of labor front unification should not be limited to simply rallying different national organizations of trade unions to make them into a bigger one. The aim must be to achieve the class-oriented unification of trade unions in organization and action, so that the trade-union movement, facing the organized powerful enemy under the state-monopoly capitalist system, can meet the economic and political demands of the workers. Specifically, it must be to establish a national center, whose function and rule, based on just, class-oriented democratic principles, will be to unify and arrange the struggles of trade unions at both national and industrial levels.'

This call has caused widespread repercussions among the trade-union movement in Japan, and has greatly encouraged wide sections of the workers and trade unions. This is because the issue we raise is closely related to the situation in which the Japanese working class finds itself today.

*The Congress was held from February 26 to March 1, 1980.

## *Inducement to action*

Since the end of the Second World War, the Japanese economy has operated in deep subordination to U.S. monopoly capital, while national capital has been increasingly conglutinate with the state. Especially in the 1960s, it achieved a rapid growth with no parallel in the history of world capitalism, overruling not only the working class but the vast majority of small enterprise operators, as well as small and medium subcontracting companies.

Since 1968, the Japanese GNP has exceeded that of West Germany and now, in the capitalist world, ranks second only to the United States. The U.S. magazine *Fortune*, in its listing of the world's 100 big corporations in order of total sales, included no Japanese firm in 1956; but in 1975, 12 Japanese firms appeared, second in number to the United States.

This high growth rate of the Japanese capitalist economy has been possible only by means of exploitation, low wages, security of high capital accumulation, inadequate social welfare provisions and favorable treatment of big capital in taxes on profits and in financing. These conditions mean a serious worsening of the position of the working class, accompanied by a deepening structural crisis of the present establishment.

By international comparison, the level of real wages in Japan is only 49.7 per cent of the U.S. level and 63.6 per cent of West Germany's. The working people are not sure of their jobs. We actually have several million unemployed.

The over-intensified labor of Japanese workers is well-known throughout the world, and is clearly confirmed by recent UN statistics on the productivity intensity index of each country for 1978, against 100 for 1970: U.S. 129; West Germany 137; France 144; and Japan the highest at 147. Weekly working hours in manufacturing industries in Japan are 3.3 hours longer than in the United States and 4.5 hours longer than in West Germany. The government 'survey on workforce' indicates that in 1978 workers working 60 hours or more per week amounted to 13.3 per cent of all non-agricultural employees. This intensified labor productivity has naturally resulted in increased work accidents, with one accident-caused death of a worker every three hours and one worker injured every 1.5 minutes.

To show the low level of conditions governing workers in Japan, I must refer to the extremely inadequate social security system. The ratio of spending on social security benefits against the national income is 24.6 per cent in France, 20.5 per cent in Italy, 25.2 per cent in West Germany and only 9.5 per cent in Japan.

The deterioration of conditions of the working class is seen in the extreme contrast between workers and capital, which even in the present economic crisis, is being accumulated enormously. Eight hundred and forty-six big corporations on the stock-exchange list in Japan increased profits in their March 1977 accounting by 24 per cent, a postwar high. Still, monopoly capital is trying to shift the burden onto the workers and working people of all strata in an attempt to overcome the present economic crisis, to which end massive compulsory dismissals are taking place to reduce personnel, using such pretexts as 'a change in industrial structure' and 'for higher efficiency in low productivity sectors.' Monopoly capital is also intensifying wage restraint policies on the false claim of stopping inflation.

The Liberal-Democratic government for its part, is planning to increase the cost of medical care to be borne by the people and to negatively revise the social security system. It is also raising public utility rates; national railway fares, air fares; gas and electricity rates; postal charges and so on.

In this situation, workers in the annual Spring Labor Offensive of the Japanese trade unions have suffered fierce attacks by monopoly capital for several years past. In the 1975 Spring Labor Offensive, the wage increase rate was held down within the framework of guidelines set by monopoly capital for a 15 per cent increase. Since then, the trade unions have been unable to break through such 'guidelines' for wage restraints, formulated by monopoly capital. As a result, the level of wages was well short of the price level and workers also had to suffer increased attacks of capitalist 'rationalization' launched by monopoly capital.

The major reason for this is that the trade-union national centers, including the General Council of the Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo) and the Japanese Confederation of Labor (Domei), which are under the control of social democrats, failed to carry on an effective fight against the government-monopoly capital wage restraint policy and failed to stand firm in support of the workers' interests. These trade-union organizations cling to the 'pie theory,' which calls for 'larger resources for distribution needed for pay raises.' But the present situation shows how bankrupt this theory is.

The current situation constitutes a call to the Japanese Communist Party and conscious forces within the trade union movement to increase the role they play in the struggle for defense of the vital economic and social interests of the working class. In the summer of 1977, the JCP published a 'Proposition for the Japanese Economy,' which clearly indicated that the economic crisis was both structural and complex, born of the postwar high-economic growth rate that served the interests of monopoly capital in subordination to the United States. Proceeding from this analysis, the Proposition says that the present crisis can be solved only by correcting the structure of the limping economy, with a switch to well-balanced economic development for the benefit of the working people; i.e., the way of democratic development.

By contrast with the makeshift steps taken so far by the LDP to stimulate the economy in the interests of monopoly capital, the Proposition offers two pillars of reconstruction of the Japanese economy: (1) to defend the living standards and lift the purchasing power of the working people by curbing inflation, raising wages, reducing taxes and improving social security and welfare services, and (2) to change the flow of investments so that the major emphasis is on public programs that will closely serve the working people's well-being.

On the suggestion of the JCP, since the 1978 Spring Labor Offensive, trade unions supporting the movement for a united front have set up an Organizing Committee for Central General Action for Solution of the Economic Crisis. It now has branches in more than half of Japan's prefectures, with the important task of involving the mass movements in the overall struggle.

The Committee has taken up the serious demands of people of all strata and this movement has now clearly proposed a way for achieving the democratic reconstruction of the Japanese economy, centering on increasing the people's purchasing power and switching to public investments that relate closely to the people's lives. The Organizing Committee, which represents 37 organizations with a total membership of 2.9 million people, in March and September 1978, and in February and July 1979, organized central general actions, which directed their demands toward the government.

### *Democracy in the workplace*

Monopoly capital is forcing the sacrifices caused by the economic crisis onto the workers. In workplaces, attacks aimed at intimidating the working people are directed against Communist Party members and other activists, using such means as stopping regular pay increases and promotion.

The Constitution of Japan lays down the people's

fundamental rights as 'eternal and inviolate rights.' But monopoly capital is asserting that such fundamental human rights as are laid down in the Constitution 'do not bind relations between the company and workers, which are private human relations.' Monopoly capital is putting the label of 'industrial saboteurs' on Communist Party members, in an attempt to justify discrimination and oppression.

The JCP, standing for scientific socialism, cannot of course be 'industrial saboteurs.' The aim of scientific socialism is to emancipate the working class and the majority of the people from poverty, raise productivity and build a society in which rich material and moral life is possible for all.

In July 1976, the Japanese Communist Party published an appeal 'For Freedom and Democracy in Workplaces,' which declared that the civic and political freedoms of workers in the workplace are absolutely essential to guarantee the workers' right to life, for workers to use their ability to the full and for their human dignity to be respected. It calls for an increased struggle built around the demand for freedom including opposition to discrimination on the grounds of ideology. Under the impact of the call, the struggle in defense of freedom and democracy in the workplace has come to assume an increasingly systematic and unyielding character. An organization was set up known as the National Liaison Council for the Defense of Freedom and Democracy in the Workplace, comprising trade unions that support the movement for a united labor front, democratic lawyers' associations and other democratic organizations. This struggle has won many victories: between June 1977 and December 1979, 216 disputes ended in victory for labor. Workers who succeeded in having unjust dismissals revoked total 1,089, and more than 7.1 billion yen in back wages were recovered from unjust discrimination.

One very important lesson has been learned from this struggle: there is a contradiction between the fascistic rule established in the workplaces by big companies and democratic conditions in Japanese society as a whole, and the workers' struggle can be turned into a socio-political struggle by linking it with action in the Diet (parliament) and other official bodies. The struggle in big enterprises owned by the monopolies has a very important part to play in the struggle between progressive and anti-progressive forces on problems of democracy. As long as the civic and political freedom of workers is oppressed in big companies, the stronghold of monopoly capital, democracy cannot bloom and bear fruit. The defense and extension of freedom and democracy in the workplace is the very foundation of the nation's development of political democracy.

Anti-communists cast doubt on the idea spelled out by the JCP, that other political parties will continue even when the Communist Party becomes the governing party. But special note must be made of the fact that in Japan support for one particular political party is being forced on the workers both at the enterprises of big companies and in the trade unions. It is well known, for instance, that the LDP and the Democratic Socialist Party (DSP) seek to force the workers to vote for them. For that purpose both parties campaign through the firms, management and trade unions, join in forcing unionists into campaigning and voting for particular candidates. Frequently trade unions support a party in elections on the strength of congress and conference decisions, and membership dues even include election funds for a particular party; if one refuses to contribute to the party, one will be controlled and punished by restriction of rights and even expulsion from the union.

Such practices are a violation of the working people's constitutional rights. Such unseemly dodges kill the gist of parliamentary democracy and pave the way for authoritarianism. Let us note that it is not only the LDP and the DSP but also the Socialist Party of Japan that resorts to this undemocratic practice.

### *Shift to the right and its consequences*

Fearing dissatisfaction on the part of the workers and the rest of the people and opposition to their anti-people policies, Japan's ruling circles are trying to maintain their reactionary rule by looking to and driving more toward the most reactionary means. They are striving to enact wartime legislation, notably a law to protect national secrets. There are calls for the 'restoration of conscription,' and attacks are increasing on the peace and democracy clauses of the Constitution.

One particularly serious development is the LDP government's plan to introduce a single-member constituency system, a revision of the electoral system planned under the cover of a need for 'less costly elections.' This single-member constituency system is planned to enable the LDP to win a big majority of seats in the Diet with a relatively small percentage of votes, eventually to buttress the Liberal Democrats' rule. This seriously affects the fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy, in that it will destroy the concept of the Diet as 'representing all the people.'

The Carter strategy coming into full swing, made clear by the U.S. military action against Iran, has increased international tension at one stroke. The dangerous role of the Japan-U.S. military alliance expanded to global scale is now becoming more evident. The Carter Administration's plan for military intervention in the Middle East is built around the 'rapid deployment' strategy. The plan incorporates U.S. marines stationed in Okinawa as the core of the rapid deployment force, making Okinawa a stepping stone for their passage, directed against the Middle East.

The LDP government is not only cooperating fully in the U.S. global strategy, but has set about a de facto revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. 'Guidelines for Japan-U.S. defense cooperation' having been adopted, joint military exercises of Japanese and U.S. forces are taking place and preparations are being made for war operations; the U.S.

Marine Corps carried out extensive landing operation exercises in Okinawa; the Maritime Self-Defense Forces joined in exercises with U.S., Australian, New Zealand and Canadian forces; the Self-Defense Forces are being rapidly reinforced and turned into combat troops.

The LDP government's reactionary policies are supported by the Komei Party, the Democratic Socialist Party and other right-leaning opposition parties seeking the role of governing parties of a new type, and by the degenerating Socialist Party. Take, as an example, the plan for a single-member constituency stystem: chairman Takemoto of the 'political power vision commission' of the DSP says that they will 'study it in a forward-looking way;' and within the Socialist Party too, there are some who advocate the introduction of this electoral system, including Hori, their ex-policy board chairman.

It is not only the right-leaning opposition parties that have affirmed support for the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty; even the Socialist Party has put out the idea of 'abrogation of the Security Treaty by agreement between Japan and the United States,' which is a tricky move to give support to the Security Treaty.

In its action program for 1980, the Socialist Party propounds a plan to form a coalition government on a 'Socialist-Komei axis line,' 'excluding the Communist Party.' The Socialists have thus unilaterally broken the agreement made with our party to endeavor to establish a progressive united front, which is a serious degeneration and betrayal of the task of effecting a progressive change.

These rightward moves are also evident in the trade-union movement: the Domei leadership first took an open stand for the Japanese-American military alliance. The Sohyo leadership, which subjects everything to the one aim of winning Socialist seats in the House of Councilors election, is now pushing the anti-communist and anti-progressive Socialist-Komei axis line, which will lead to their recognition of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and union with the LDP. The JCP is criticizing the right-inclined opposition parties for their turn into supplementary forces of the ruling party, and the Socialist Party for its betrayal.

The Communist Party is striving to form a progressive united front. It is working for a vigorous advance in joint struggles with all democratic forces centering on the people's immediate tasks, including defense of the people's living standards and opposition to Japan-U.S. joint military operations. This is clear from recent actions of the Central Executive Committee of the Movement for the Abrogation of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and Realization of Various Demands, the joint struggle organization that links 48 organizations of the democratic forces, including the Japanese Communist Party. The Central Executive Committee organized the struggle to oppose the Self-Defense Forces taking part in the 'RimPac' joint military exercise, and against the government proposal for the 1980 budget.

### *Toward a new center*

The work for the unification of the labor front is one of the most important tasks, an urgent need of the trade union movement for confrontation with the powerful organized enemy, monopoly capital and the government, in the present institutional crisis.

In the immediate postwar period, Japan had a class-oriented trade-union national center called the Congress of Industrial Unions of Japan (Sambetsu Kaigi). At that time, in 1949, 55.8 per cent of all workers were organized. But after Sambetsu Kaigi disbanded under pressure from the U.S. Occupation Forces and national monopoly capital, and social democrats took over the leadership of the trade unions organized on an enterprise basis, the ratio of organized workers began to fall each year. Today, only some 12 million workers are organized, about 32 per cent of all Japanese workers.

The labor front is disunited in Japan, with three national centers, each existing separately: the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (Sohyo) comprising 4.5 million workers; the Japanese Confederation of Labor (Domei) 2.3 million; and the Liaison Council of Independent Unions (Churitsuroren) 1.8 million. Some 3.5 million workers belong to unions not affiliated with any of these national centers.

Sohyo imposes support for the Socialist Party on union members and Domei does the same in support of the Democratic Socialist Party. This sectarian attitude of the social democratic parties is one of the fundamental reasons for the split among the working people. Related to the social democratic parties' tendency to exercise exclusive control over trade unions is the strong bureaucratic tendency in the union leadership, another important factor. Take the election of union officers. The present system ensures that a particular group winning 51 per cent of the vote can monopolize all official posts. This is now even more dangerous when the leadership of Domei and Sohyo are intensifying steps for the rightward reorganization of the labor front.

The rightward degeneration of Sohyo, the largest trade-union central organization in Japan, is a very serious problem that affects the whole Japanese trade-union movement. Historically, the founding of Sohyo by the intervention of the U.S. Occupation Forces in 1950 meant the inauguration of an anti-communist trade-union organization, as a rival to the Congress of Industrial Unions of Japan (Sambetsu Kaigi). Later, however, under the influence of the developing situation and the struggle of the workers, it gradually freed itself of the anti-communist framework, and in 1959-60 played a strong part in the People's Council against the Security Treaty.

During the 20 years since then, it took part in joint struggles with other forces, including the Communist Party, on various issues. It even gave its support for the formation of a progressive united front. But when Sohyo decided at the extraordinary convention held last February to support the Socialist-Komei agreement on the plan for an anti-

communist coalition government, it meant turning the clock back more than 20 years, by restoring the anti-communist and pro-establishment line in the new situation and in a new form.

This change proved again that the fallacy of requiring unionists to 'support a particular political party' results in a most serious aberration, by departing from the principles of the trade union movement. By reason of its 'support for the Socialist Party,' this national organization of trade unions gives its support to the new anti-communist line adopted by the Socialist Party and imposes the decision on all member unions and workers. What a strange anomaly in light of the class character and role of trade unions!

Still, there is a rapidly developing and spreading trend in the Japanese trade-union movement for promotion of class unity of the labor front, in support of a progressive united front. It has the support of over a million workers. But the unnatural situation still remains in that this trend is not reflected in the upper bodies of the labor front.

The resolution of the latest Party Congress emphasized the importance of establishing a national trade-union center that will stand for the following three principles:

(1) To stand firmly for 'independence from capital' in all trade-union activities.

(2) To reaffirm 'independence from political parties;' this means rejection of organizational support for a particular political party and a guarantee of the free choice of union members for party support, promotion of necessary cooperation and joint action with progressive political parties.

(3) To promote unity of action based on demands agreed upon among workers, both nationally, industrially and regionally.

These principles conform to the basic characteristics of a trade-union movement that unites the workers in the struggle regardless of differences of ideology, creed or political party support.

Inspired by this proposal of the Japanese Communist Party, 29 trade unions, which make up the Conference of Trade Unions for Promotion of a United Front, are developing a mass debate on the meaning of the grave moves made for the rightward reorganization of the labor front; on the principles of the unification of the labor front and what should be the real character of a trade-union national center. Activities to organize national and regional united actions for the realization of workers' economic and political demands are being increased, along with the work to promote the formation of a progressive united front.

Anti-communist and right-wing social democrats are attacking this proposal of the Communist Party and the Conference of Trade Unions for Promotion of a United Front, slandering it as 'splitting' action. But actually the existing national trade-union centers are betraying the workers by their serious degeneration. In this situation, if those unions that disagree with them, after vainly striving for democratic reform of these national centers, form the conclusion that they must rally for the formation of a new national center which will clearly stand for class principles, no one would have the right to brand these efforts as splitting. That is why the establishment of a class-oriented trade-union national center is now a key task.

---

# Portugal: destiny of the April Revolution

*Yuri Potyomkin*
*WMR* staff member

Lisbon ranks high on the list of the world's most popular tourist attractions. Founded by the Phoenicians many centuries before our era, the city sprawls picturesquely over the hilly right bank of the full-flowing Tejo. Every new arrival makes certain of going to the Cabo da Roca, there for a small fee to receive a 'document' certifying that he has been to the westernmost point of Europe 'where hovers the spirit of Faith and Adventure that set off the Portuguese caravellas on their search for new worlds.' Practically everybody goes to the citadel of St. George to admire the marvellous view of the city from its walls, also to the Belem Tower, and the many other places of historical interest.

### *Reaction attacks*

Lisbon, of course, is notable not just for its sights and museum rarities. What strikes people coming to the Portuguese capital for the first time are the walls of many of its dwelling houses and administrative buildings, the old and the new, the grand and the modest. Not the walls themselves, rather, but the slogans inscribed on them: 'Vote for ...' followed by the abbreviated name of a political party. These inscriptions were made on the walls last autumn, before the December parliamentary elections. 'Down with Sa Carneiro!' and similar slogans appeared after the elections, and they were aimed against the government of the so-called Democratic Alliance — a bloc of rightist parties which won a narrow majority of votes in December. The eloquence of Lisbon's walls is evidence of that tense atmosphere and that struggle between the forces of progress and reaction which prevailed after the revolution of April 1974, and in more recent times especially.

Having put an end to the fascist dictatorship, which lasted in Portugal for a little under half a

century, the revolution accomplished socio-economic reforms of primary importance. The nationalization of banks and industrial monopolies undermined the positions of big capital as a bulwark of fascism, and helped to create an extensive public sector of the economy. The radical agrarian reform eliminated the semi-feudal landed estates and turned the land over to those who till it. The powerful revolutionary upsurge of the masses enabled Portugal to adopt the most progressive constitution in the capitalist world. The gains of the people — the abolition of the monopolies and the landed estates — were pronounced irreversible, the working people were given extensive rights in managing and monitoring production and a most important clause was included providing for the transition to socialism and the creation of conditions for realistically ensuring the working people's right to power.

All that, however, did not inflict a decisive defeat on reaction. Although they found themselves unable to prevent the momentous progressive changes of the first few years of the revolution, the reactionary circles had no intention whatever of resigning themselves to these changes. The inconsistency of the Socialist Party's leadership, its political opportunism, its refusal to act jointly with the communists — which meant a division of the main democratic forces — as well as some actions on the part of leftist elements, strengthened the forces of the right. As a result, the coalition of the reactionary parties managed to tilt the balance in its favor at the intermediary elections to the Assembly of the Republic and to form the cabinet of Sa Carneiro.

Having secured seats in the government, the rightists sharply intensified their attacks on the principal gains of the April revolution. They are making haste, knowing how little time they have left until the next parliamentary elections, scheduled for October of this year.

Reaction varies its actions to suit a given situation. It uses caution in coming out against the nationalized section of the municipal economy: here, it has not been able to create a legal camouflage for more decisive actions. On the other hand, it goes into open, brazen attack against the agricultural cooperatives, on the strength of the Barreto law adopted in 1977 with the aim of 'reinstating justice' in the case of the 'wronged' landowners.

The working people of Portugal can clearly see the class aims of Sa Carneiro's government. These are: to enable the monopolies and big landowners to retrieve the positions they have lost; to let private capital into the nationalized sectors of the economy; and to eliminate the cooperatives set up on the lands of the former landed estates by metayers and farm laborers. These aims are as easy to see as they are difficult to attain. And not only because the reactionary cabinet does not have complete freedom of action, bound as it is to reckon with the Constitution it cannot amend, and with the existing sovereign bodies of power — in the first place the Revolutionary Council which in the spring of this year had vetoed the government's bill on altering the boundary lines between the private and the nationalized sectors of the economy. Reaction's maneuvers and attacks are encountering increasingly powerful resistance from progressive social forces. At their center stands the working class, industrial and agricultural, a militant, well-organized working class led by a strong political vanguard — the Portuguese Communist Party.

### *Barreiro, Quimigal*

Barreiro, a large industrial center on the left bank of the Tejo, does not figure in tourist guidebooks. There are no exceptional scenic beauties or memorials here, nor will one find any postcards with views of the town in the kiosks. The river is sluggish and dirty from industrial waste, and the few boys with fishing rods patiently waiting for a bite must surely believe in miracles.

The chief 'monument' in Barreiro is Quimigal, the state chemical plant (Quimica de Portugal). In August 1975 the Goncalves government nationalized the banking-industrial monpoly CUF (Companhia Uniao Fabril), which had belonged to the Mello family. This monopolistic group, a gigantic one for Portugal, owned hundreds of enterprises in different branches of the economy, among them several chemical factories. At the end of 1977 the chemical industries of CUF and two other companies — Amoniaco Portugues and Nitratos de Portugal — were merged to form the Quimigal. The majority of its production facilities — more than 50 enterprises employing over 6,000 people — are in Barreiro.

As I have already said, the government failed in its attempts to create a legal basis for a direct offensive against the nationalized sector. Even so, the rightists manage to harm this sector by resorting to covert sabotage and other devious means. I have been told many facts in evidence of this by two communists, members of the Quimigal workers' commission — mechanical engineer Alvaro Monteiro and electrolytist Gil Ladislau.

The authorities are doing everything possible to make the chemical plant incapable of competing successfully with private enterprises, and thus turn it into an unprofitable operation. For instance, they rejected an economically substantiated plan for starting the production of formadite, a high-profit-yielding material used in furniture making. Their pretext was a lack of money for the necessary outlay, although it was planned to bankroll the construction of the new enterprise mainly from Quimigal's profits. Eventually, the finished technical project was given to a private financial group.

Needless to say, the authorities do these things on the quiet, carefully avoiding publicity. At the same time, they use every possible means to bring public opinion round to the view that the unprofitableness of nationalized enterprises is all but a foregone conclusion. Not only do they obstruct the building of new industrial units, but they actually cause this sector to lose existing facilities. One of the latest instances is that in June it became known that the plant was losing its right to manage it own port. The

workers' commission thinks that this is very likely the first step toward handing the port over to private enterprise with all the ensuing consequences, among them — transport difficulties for the plant.

The government's policy of restricting the nationalized sector has also affected the project of developing the pyrite deposits in the south of Portugal. Until this year it was taken for granted that together with private firms Quimigal would participate in the project as it is vitally interested in obtaining pyrites. But it is not even a moot question anymore, since the government has put the project entirely into the hands of Portuguese private capital and international monopolies.

The policy of covertly strangling the nationalized enterprise economically is also seen in the government's striving to restrict its products to fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides. Since the prices for these products do not cover overhead expenses, the enterprise actually exists on state subsidies, which are invariably late in coming. This year, for instance, Quimigal should have already received more than 3 billion escudos, but so far it has been given nothing but promises.

Our conversation was interrupted by a telephone call. Monteiro's answers were brusque. 'Here is a perfectly fresh example,' he told me. Quimigal and two private firms jointly owned Sovena, a mixed company which marketed the output of their soap-works. And now, Monteiro was told on the telephone, one of these firms was being taken over by the Mello family, whose banking and industrial empire was nationalized in 1975. Portuguese monopoly capital is obviously recovering from the heavy blow it was dealt at the time, and recapturing the ground it had lost.

'As you can see,' Ladislau said, 'political reaction and the monopolies are firing at the same target. The fact that they are advancing little by little does not, of course, mean that the working class is weakening or that workers are losing control over production. Still, our opponents are acting expertly. Take Quimigal again. The decisions made to its detriment are adopted mainly where there is no workers' control. This does not mean that we don't venture outside the plant's territory at all. It's clear, however, that our main strength is concentrated here, in the sphere of production. But the mechanism of adopting economic and other decisions, largely determining the affairs of the plant, is at present in the hands of the rightists, and the situation can change only as a result of general shifts in the alignment of political forces.'

As a rule, reaction treads warily when it acts against the nationalized sector, but sometimes it infringes openly on the interests of the workers. For example, in accordance with the law adopted last autumn, seven of the nine members of Quimigal's council, or board of directors, were appointed by the government, and two — elected by the workers. But until now the Ministry of Industry has not allowed the elected members to take part in the council's work. The workers have thereby been denied the right to influence the day-by-day management of the plant through their representatives.

In effect, the main purpose of the workers' commission is to repulse the subversive maneuvers of reaction. The commission, re-elected every 18 months, has 11 members, 3 of them working full-time. It was last elected in February.

Being the main body of worker control, the commission tries to keep abreast of everything that goes on at the plant. In the course of work the need arises for it to speak with officials, sometimes as high-ranking as the Minister of Industry and even the President of the republic. Lately it has been very difficult for it to make these contacts. Once a month the commission has a meeting with the council, at which it brings up all kinds of problems connected with production with an opinion on them to defend.

For instance, there is a limit to overtime at the plant, but in disregard of the rules the department heads keep exceeding the limit. A sum of 30 million escudos was paid out for overtime in June alone. The commission objects to this practice. For one thing, overtime is anything but the best way of improving the life of the workers (highly paid, it is given only to a chosen few), and is in fact, a method of disuniting and weakening them, and putting obstacles in the way of the trade union. For another thing, instead of paying the same people for overtime, the money could be used for hiring more workers, considering the mass unemployment in the country. The commission has now undertaken the far from easy job of explaining the situation to all concerned, and its efforts are already beginning to bear fruit.

Monteiro and Ladislau then offered to show me one of the plant's workshops. A tall stack of mimeographed leaflets had been placed on a chair at the entrance gate. They were the commission's communiqué (No. 12), informing the workers that it had sent a letter to the Ministry of Industry demanding the immediate and positive settlement of the question of the two elected council members and warning the Ministry that legal action would be taken against it for disregarding the law if nothing was done about the matter within 10 days.

It was a change of shift, and as the workers streamed through the gate the stack of leaflets quickly dwindled.

### *Alentejo*

A huge musk-melon weighing 70 kilos and brought from the zone of agrarian reform in the Montemor-o-Novo district, is displayed on a wooden stand in the always busy vestibule of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party.

This zone of agrarian reform is mainly in the south, Alentejo, which before the revolution was virtually ruled by a few big landowners. Socially poles apart were the people who worked the land for them, having none of their own, and comprising nine-tenths of the rural population. Those who had no land and no jobs were compelled to leave and

seek work in the capital, in the north of Portugal, or perhaps in other countries.

The revolution of April 25 took place at a time when the capitalist world was already sinking into the deepest economic crisis since the war. Many of those who had emigrated from Alentejo returned home, having lost their jobs abroad, while the big agrarian barons, frightened by the revolution, either abandoned their estates altogether or continued on a much smaller scale. Under the circumstances, the working people were called upon by the Communist Party to occupy the abandoned lands. In mid-1975 the area thus occupied equalled approximately half a million hectares.

July 25 of the same year saw the adoption of the agrarian reform law 406-A/75 under which the landed estates were nationalized and turned over to the working people. On the initiative of agricultural workers, the land went over not to individual but to the joint use of collectives setting up cooperatives. At the end of 1976 there were 550 cooperatives and producers' associations working a total of 1,150,000 hectares of land. As many as 60,000 former agricultural workers and small-farm peasants became members. It was indeed a profound revolutionary breakthrough. The Communist Party called the agrarian reform 'a splendid gain of the revolution, a historic achievement of the Portuguese working people, an integral part of the democratic regime, and an essential factor for the development of agriculture and the national economy' (*Avante*, July 17, 1980).

We wanted to know how the agrarian reform was doing now that a few years have passed, and what was being done to keep safe this splendid gain of the revolution. The answer was given us in Evora, the district center and, actually, the capital of the entire agricultural south, by Antonio Gervasio, a member of the Political Commission of the PCP Central Committee and head of the provincial party committee.

Portuguese reaction, he told us, did not take things lying down. In November 1977 it got the new agrarian reform law, the Barreto law, enacted, and launched an attack against the cooperatives with the aim of restoring the landed estates. By July of this year the area occupied by cooperative farming was decreased by 350,000 hectares, while the pace at which the land was handed back to its former owners increased visibly under the Sa Carneiro government. In the first six months of this government the cooperatives lost 105,000 hectares. Livestock and farm machines were also taken away from them. As a result, 70 of the 550 cooperatives were eliminated — small ones in the main. Unemployment, which had been almost completely ended after the reform, struck the villages of Alentejo once again.

Even so, the results of reaction's onslaught are not at all what they were expected to be. The workers are putting up an ever stronger and better organized resistance to the robbing of the cooperatives, as they qualify the actions of the authorities. The vanguard of this resistance is composed of 30,000 local communists. The cooperatives' land can, as a rule, be alienated only with the help of large detachments of the gendarmerie (columns of the National Guard's covered green trucks are often to be seen on the roads). But neither armored cars, police dogs, truncheons nor bullets* can break the resistance of the cooperative members.

An organizational pattern has come into being in the course of the struggle against reaction, and tactical principles have been evolved to defend the agrarian reform. The means of resistance include strikes, rallying people in the threatened zones, demonstrations, road blocks, leaflets, slogans on the houses of the big landowners and corrupt officials and appeals to court against decisions taken by the authorities, to mention only a few. Although some losses were unavoidable, basically the cooperative sector has been preserved. That is an important political outcome of the resistance.

The cooperatives have also managed to withstand various economic pressures. One form was to practically stop crediting the cooperatives and eventually forcing them to fold up. This discrimination naturally made things difficult for the cooperatives, but did not produce the expected result. The cooperatives, taken as a whole, far from falling into decay are growing stronger with every passing year.

In response to the ostracism to which the government was subjecting them, the working people voluntarily restricted the growth of their personal consumption and instead of dividing up part of the profits among themselves, directed the whole of it toward the cooperatives' economic and social needs. Thanks to their highly developed class and political consciousness, revolutionary discipline and dedicated effort, a great deal has been achieved in recent years to surmount the backwardness of Alentejo's agriculture — a legacy of exploitation by landowners.

We saw this for ourselves when we visited the large May Day Cooperative in Portalegre. The head of this cooperative is José Louis, a stocky, amiable man of 40, who spent many years in a fascist prison. He is now an alternate member of the PCP Central Committee. He showed us round with well-justified pride in the fields of ripening wheat, in the thriving cork-tree plantations, the excellently equipped livestock farms, the artificially irrigated zones where vegetables and rice are grown, the large repair shop, and the noisy day care center in the spacious two-storey house which had belonged to Barradas Carvalho, a landowner who had once reigned over this district; also the three shops where the prices are from 5 to 10 per cent lower than elsewhere, and the newly-built cultural center with its auditorium, library, playrooms and bar.

One of the chief purposes of the agrarian reform was to give work to as many jobless as possible.

---

*No less than 1,500 people have been manhandled by the gendarmes, and two men were killed in one of these operations last September: José Geraldo, a communist of 57, and Antonio Casquinha, a 17-year-old member of the Communist Youth League.

Before the reform, Carvalho had 92 laborers working the 9,000-10,000 hectares now belonging to the cooperative. Today there are 472 people in the May Day Cooperative. An artificial increase of manpower, you'd say? Not at all. The increase was necessitated, in the first place, by the change in the social character of the work, by the abolition of exploiter relations (the workers receive a month's annual paid leave, they have set working hours and so forth), and by servicing the many new facilities that were unthinkable in the past, such as the day care center, for instance. What is more important still, the cooperative has grown into a diversified, modern agricultural enterprise. Now that I am familiar with its specific development since it was founded in the autumn of 1976, I can definitely say that the May Day people are enthusiastically giving everything they can to their work.

I feel I have to stress this because reaction is trying to justify its offensive against the agrarian reform by insinuating that the economic efficiency of production in Alentejo has dropped in the last few years. Apart from the fact that such allegations are constructed from an exploiter's approach to the question of economic efficiency, with disregard for social returns, they are actually untrue. This was noted at the fourth conference on the agrarian reform held in Evora in April. The cooperatives, it was pointed out, were carrying out a large program of agricultural development designed to place more land under cultivation and increase the livestock population.*

In other words, the agrarian reform means progress, accelerated development, and not stagnation and a decline of agriculture. It means an all-round improvement in the life of the working people. That is why every time the officials, accompanied by National Guardsmen, come down to re-possess the cooperative land for its former owner they are confronted by a solid wall of men with horny, toil-hardened hands and faces burned black by the sun. A hard, uncompromising class struggle is on in Alentejo's beautiful, gently undulating plains on which olive and cork trees grow in abundance.

*April shall triumph!*

Speaking to foreign journalists who came for the festival of the newspaper *Avante*, Alvaro Cunhal put the questions as follows: Why were the gains of the revolution of April 25 being preserved in spite of all the attacks of reaction? He answered this question himself, saying that it was because the working class was virile, because the working-class and democratic movements were steadily growing stronger.

The maneuvers of the right are countered by the working class with its indomitable determination to defend the gains of the April revolution. This determination is manifested in the spreading strike movement, in mass political action against the reactionary government and in other forms.

There have been impressive anti-government demonstrations in many towns. In the capital the demonstrators moved in an endless column along the city's main street, chanting: 'Fascism out!' In Oporto, Braga and Leiria the working people protested against the official policy of nullifying the revolutionary gains and voiced their firm resolve to use all lawful means to defend the democratic constitution, the nationalized sector of the economy and the agrarian reform from encroachments by the right. The Day of Struggle was marked in 33 towns with demonstrations and rallies demanding the government's resignation.

The movement is spreading at the factories themselves. At 500 enterprises the workers took action in defense of their rights in the first three months alone of the Democratic Alliance government. In the spring, during the actions of solidarity with the agrarian reform, there were 422 short strikes, 747 meetings and 70 demonstrations. The working class and all other working people are showing in word and deed that the democratic forces can block the way of reaction.

The masses are led by the Portuguese Communist Party, their recognized and prestigious vanguard, a staunch and tested bulwark of all that is progressive in Portugal today, a bulwark that is growing stronger with every passing day. Alvaro Cunhal has cited these figures: a few months after the revolution of April 25, the Portuguese Communist Party, which was founded in 1921 and remained underground for half a century, had 15,000 members, but by the time its Ninth Congress was convened in 1979 its membership stood at 164,000. Today, communists number nearly 190,000, not counting the 36,000 members of the Communist Youth League. The PCP is now a factor of such enormous importance that without it the democratic course of the country's development cannot possibly be ensured.

The active presence of the communists is felt everywhere. Eight of the 11 members of the Quimigal workers' commission are communists. This is as it should be since 1,500 of its workers, or one in four, are party members. It is also easy to understand the fear motivating the refusal of the Industry Ministry's reactionary chiefs to admit the two representatives elected by the workers to the management, for both are communists.

Aviz, where the May Day Cooperative is located, has a population of 16,000 and of this number 1,500 are communists. More than half the electors here vote for the Portuguese Communist Party. The Red Carnation Cooperative has 305 members, 150 of whom are communists. The district party organization of Montemor-o-Novo has nearly 3,000 members. At the last parliamentary elections, 9,000 of the 15,000 electors voted for the PCP.

*In the years after the reform the irrigated area increased 121 per cent; the area sown to fodder crops was doubled, and the cultivated land in general was enlarged 200 per cent. The livestock population increased 130 per cent. The cooperatives, occupying about 18 per cent of the country's arable land, provide 42 per cent of Portugal's grain, 32 per cent of the olives, 36 per cent of the rice. In spite of being robbed by the authorities, the cooperatives own more farm machines than before.

Many more examples may be given. The party's dedicated struggle against fascism and reaction, for the consolidation of democracy and for the vital interests of the workers has earned it enormous prestige and the profound esteem of the people.

At the beginning of this article, I spoke of the eloquence of Lisbon's walls. Now that I have been in Alentejo and other parts of Portugal, I know that this eloquence thrives everywhere. One of the most popular slogans is 'With the PCP April shall triumph!' It is especially timely in view of the upcoming October elections to the Assembly of the Republic. The Portuguese Communist Party has drawn up a comprehensive program. The party is a resolute, consistent and powerful champion of the democratic alternative to the policy of the right, a champion pressing for the continuation of the 'revolution of red carnations.'

Lisbon — Prague
August 1980

---

*facts and figures*

# Joint actions: aims, lessons, difficulties

Joint actions by progressive, democratic forces are the guarantee of success in the struggle for the interests of working people, against imperialism and reaction. The *WMR* Commission for Scientific Information and Documentation has studied the stand and practical actions of a number of communist and workers' parties on this question. For its survey it has used data provided by representatives of the various parties on the journal[1] and other materials. Attention was given mainly to the following aspects:

— aims of joint action by progressive forces;
— experience of such action;
— obstructive factors.

Further account was taken of the article 'Class Alliances and Political Blocs' published in this issue.

## I

The history of the international communist and working-class movement shows that from the day of their foundation most of the Marxist-Leninist parties have bent their efforts toward ensuring the maximum mobilization of the working class for the struggle against capitalism and securing broad unity among socially heterogeneous forces for the attainment of specific national, democratic aims (for instance, the liberation, anti-fascist struggle in Western Europe during World War II, the liberation anti-colonialist movement of the Asian and African peoples after the war, the struggle against dictatorial regimes and fascism in Latin America, and the struggle for peace and social progress). Documents of fraternal parties indicate that today the unitary guideline of their policy not only retains its significance but is acquiring growing importance. For instance, the program of the German Communist Party, adopted at the Mannheim Congress in October 1978, notes society's division into a handful of industrial barons and multimillionaires on the one hand, and the vast majority of the people, on the other, and stresses 'the need for and possibility of joint actions by the working class and a broad alliance of all non-monopoly forces.'[2] There are analogous provisions in the documents of the communist and workers' parties of other countries.

From these documents it is seen that the unitary policy of the communists retains its dual orientation: class (unity of the working class) and democratic (united actions by socially heterogeneous forces). Of course, the disparate economic and socio-economic situations determine the diverse correlation of these two aspects of the unitary work of the communists. Fundamentally, the class aspect, i.e., the unity of the working class in the struggle for its direct interests and against the capitalist system, becomes more pronounced as the development of that system matures and, correspondingly, as its contradictions, including the contradiction between labor and capital, grow more acute. Consequently, the significance of the proletariat's class-political unity, which is vital at any level of capitalist development, is greater where the proportion of workers in society is larger.

However, this pattern changes visibly when the correlation of the class and democratic aspects of the communists' unitary policy is considered in the context of the entire spectrum of economic, social political and other conditions actually obtaining in each country and also of the political situation in the given region and the international situation as a whole. The most crucial of these modifying elements are as follows.

*In developed capitalist countries.* (1) The concentration and centralization of capital and production has led to an unparalleled monopolization of economic and political power. Monopoly policy, backed unconditionally by the state, clashes with

the interests not only of the working class but of all other working people, and also of the petty and, in many ways the middle bourgeoisie, in other words, of the overwhelming majority of the population. (2) U.S. imperialism's foreign policy ambitions, its attempts to halt and nullify progressive political changes in the world by all possible means, including military force, the involvement in this policy of some other capitalist countries (for instance, through the NATO mechanism), and the efforts of military-industrial complexes to sustain permanent international tension that often creates a direct threat to peace — all this likewise conflicts with the interests of the masses.

*In countries with a medium development of capitalism* (chiefly Latin American states such as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and Chile). The economic domination of monopoly capital based in the USA and other imperialist powers, and also of the local oligarchy, and the existence of pro-imperialist and pro-oligarchic semi or entirely dictatorial regimes retard national progress. This creates the soil for broad anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic alliances with the participation of the workers and other classes and segments of the population.

*In developing Asian and African countries.* In these countries the situation is characterized by socio-economic backwardness and heavy economic dependence on industrialized capitalist states. Imperialist monopolies, chiefly transnationals, pursue an undisguised neo-colonialist policy; there are centers of national and racial oppression formed or supported by imperialism (Palestine, South Africa); and direct assaults and subversion are conducted against progressive regimes. In these countries the solution of the problem of ending backwardness, the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and the consolidation of national independence require the active participation of all patriotic forces.

In the unitary policy of the communists the prevalence of the class or democratic aspects depends on the character of the main social contradictions at the given stage. Party documents show that today in practically all the nations in the non-socialist world, in relation to the principal contradictions the interests of the working class objectively harmonize with the interests of the great majority of the population. However, it is only in developed capitalist countries that the confrontation between labor and capital can be and frequently is the core of the principal social contradiction.

Of course, this by no means belittles the need for working-class unity in all situations, including situations where economic weakness makes the capitalists seek ways and means of quickly ending this weakness by stepping up the exploitation of the working people. The prevalence of democratic aims does not imply the dissolution, the abandonment of the class struggle of the proletariat. This struggle is part and parcel of the broader struggle for economic, social and political progress. This means that the democratic and class aspects of the communists' unitary policy are closely interrelated. In this connection the political manifesto adopted by the Communist Party of Denmark at its 26th Congress in 1980 notes that 'our goal is to unite all the forces opposed to the assaults of big capital and to the dangerous intrigues of the cold war proponents. Unity of action is the key to unfolding the militant might of the working class and the people.'

This is essentially the approach to this question by all the Marxist-Leninist parties. For instance, the program theses of the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Bolivia (1971) state that 'the future of the Bolivian revolution lies in the unity of the people' and that 'this unity can be achieved on the basis of the inner cohesion of the working class, its alliance with the peasantry, and the formation of a broad front embracing these social classes and also all the non-proletarian masses, students, progressive intellectuals and other segments of the petty urban bourgeoisie.' The program of the Communist Party of Bangladesh, adopted at its Third Congress (February 1980), stresses that at the stage of the national democratic revolution the cardinal aim is to achieve unity between the workers, the peasants, the middle strata and sections of the national bourgeoisie and create a national democratic front. The People's Party of Iran, to quote the First Secretary of its Central Committee Nureddin Kianouri, 'sees its most important task in creating a close-knit united front. We want to unite all revolutionary, anti-imperialist, democratic and other forces serving the people under the banner of struggle against reaction and counter-revolution. We are propagating scientific socialism amongst the working people, popularizing our political program, and working to enhance the strength of the revolutionary masses.'[3]

In Turkey the national-democratic front against imperialism, the local monopolies and big landowners, will direct its efforts toward accomplishing a democratic revolution paving the way for socialism. In order to create this front as a strategic alliance of the motive forces of revolution, the Communist Party of Turkey is working to broaden the democratic movement to embrace even sections that are not necessarily revolutionary. A party document states: 'In order to achieve its strategic objective, the party must correctly defiine its tactical aims . . . What takes our party to the forefront is the need for a strong movement for democracy.'

The unitary policy of the communist parties, as parties of the working class, does not bring its class aims into conflict with its democratic aspects: these are mutually complementary elements. Where the proletariat is united it is much easier to work for unity of action by all democratic, progressive forces. This is a factor of no little significance in facilitating the cohesion of the working class. The interrelation between the class and democratic aspects is natural and vital.

However, it is evident that the actual political conditions in most countries of the non-socialist world and the overall international situation are now bringing democratic aims into the forefront.

In their general form they boil down to the following.

*The strengthening of peace.* The specific orientations of the struggle of progressive forces differ in this sphere: against increases in military spending, the arms race, various foreign policy actions generating international tension, military bases on foreign territory; for progress toward détente, the settlement of disputes by negotiation, disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of such weapons, cutbacks of armed forces.

*Struggle against imperialism.* In developed capitalist countries this is a struggle to limit the domination of monopolies, to prevent big capital from infringing upon the social gains of the working people. In developing countries this is a struggle against neo-colonialist oppression, inequities in international economic relations and military and political interference by imperialist powers.

*Socio-economic and political progress.* Extension of democratic rights, improvement of social conditions and safeguarding the people's living standard; consolidation of all aspects of national independence; removal of pro-imperialist regimes and counteraction to neo-fascism.

While they put forward democratic aims and make every effort to draw all progressive forces into the struggle for these aims, the communists do not conceal their ultimate goal of building a society free of exploitation of man by man. The conditions for attaining this goal are created with the fulfillment of democratic tasks. Obviously it is of immense significance in itself to achieve that goal.

## II

The composition of the political forces with whom the Marxist-Leninist parties can take joint action depends on the character of the most urgent tasks of each given period. As mentioned earlier, at the present stage democratic aims are of great importance in all or almost all countries of the non-socialist world. Their actual content and orientation are largely determined by the socio-economic development level and the political conditions in one or another country or group of countries. For instance, there is a distinction between the democratic tasks in the centers and in the 'outskirts' of the capitalist world system, in other words, in developed and developing nations. In the former the principal target — monopoly capitalism and its domination — against which the progressive forces are acting or endeavoring to act, comprises the underlying element of the existing social system. In these countries there is a certain intra-orientation of the struggle waged by the democratic forces. In developing nations, on the other hand, the extra-orientation of democratic tasks is more important, because the target — the selfsame monopoly capital and imperialist policy — is extraneous. Needless to say, in countries where a big bourgeoisie exists, for example in India, the anti-imperialist struggle of the democratic forces is directed against that bourgeoisie, while in others (many Latin American states) it is directed against the local oligarchy.

These distinctions have direct bearing on unity of action by progressive forces in the two main groups of countries, directly influencing the forms and organizational frameworks in which it is possible to coordinate such actions. 'Front' slogans are widespread in Asian, African and Latin American countries,[4] and are rarely to be met with in developed capitalist nations. A front presupposes an alliance, a coalition of various national parties. Given all other equal conditions, the larger degree of extra-orientation of democratic tasks conforms to the broader possibilities for such a coalition.

In developed capitalist countries the situation is different. In these countries it is, more often than not, extremely difficult to form broad *inter-party* alliances: bourgeois parties of all orientations — conservative, liberal or clerical — in fact serve big capital even in cases where the latter's predominance in society hardly dovetails with their traditional view; the 'anti-monopoly stand' of the social democrats is, regrettably, in much too many cases purely verbal, and correspondingly a 'front' or alliance between communist and social-democratic (socialist) parties has been, wherever it came into being in the postwar period, short-lived.[5]

Hence the distinctions in the methods used by the communists of various countries in pursuing a unitary policy. In particular, this policy depends on the place held by 'upper' and 'lower' channels of coordinating actions, i.e., agreement of a communist party with other parties and joint actions at the grassroots level in the absence of inter-party alliances.

The communists seek to utilize all possibilities for ensuring unity of action by progressive forces. But the correlation of the various ways of achieving unity depends on specific political conditions, including the stand of the leadership of the parties and organizations to which the communists proffer cooperation. Experience indicates that, by and large, the practical possibilities for the communist parties of developed capitalist countries for using 'upper' channels are very small indeed. This enhances the significance of united action at the grassroots level — at factories, the shopfloor, universities, residential neighborhoods and so on.

This is, for instance, the stand of the Communist Party of Greece. At its 10th Congress in May 1978 it was noted that with the party seeking unity of the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist 'majority of the nation' both at the grassroots and the top, 'the basic orientation of the struggle . . . is to achieve unity at the grassroots, unity of action by members and supporters of each mass organization and movement, coordination of the efforts of the various mass organizations and progressive movements, and their fusion in a single stream.'

The Portuguese Communist Party, which is active in parliament and urges unity among progressives against reaction, constantly stresses the decisive role of mass action in defense of the democratic system and the gains of the revolution.

While noting the enormous strength of the mass

trade-union movement and the fact that in some trade unions the communists hold posts of national significance, the 36th Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain (November 1979) underscored the significance of the high level of unity amongst workers at the level of enterprises, where many communists are shop stewards or members of committees of shop stewards.

While the German Communist Party does not deny that elected bodies, including parliament, are an important field of work by progressive forces, it attaches paramount significance to the 'extra-parliamentary struggle, especially to the struggle of the working class at factories and in trade unions, to actions by young workers and students and to democratic civil initiatives.'[6]

This is also the attitude of the Communist Party of the USA. At its 22nd Convention in August 1979 the General Secretary Gus Hall spoke of the significance of these changes, describing them as 'the framework for our mass united front policies.'[7]

A clear-cut stand was defined for the French Communist Party by its 23rd Congress in 1979. The French communists urge the development of an alliance and agreement especially with the Socialist Party. But a powerful grassroots unitary movement is vital to this alliance. This movement, which is expressed in the struggle of the working people for their basic interests, increasingly brings them an awareness of the need for deep-going revolutionary changes. 'It must be our continued concern that this alliance (of progressive forces — *Ed.*) should increasingly become a matter of the working people themselves,' Georges Marchais, the FCP General Secretary, said recently. 'Summit meetings, compromises between leaders and joint statements by them are definitely not the road that can take the people's movement to success.'[8]

The communist parties of Belgium and the Netherlands (23rd Congress of the CPB and the 26th and 27th congresses of the CPN) attach paramount importance to united concrete actions at the grassroots level.

In the developing countries the situation is not so uniform in this respect. We have already noted that the objective possibilities exist in these countries for the formation of alliances (fronts) of national parties and mass organizations on the platform of struggle against imperialism, against the segment of the local bourgeoisie coalescing with it, and against the forces supporting international reaction and Maoism. Here the communist parties press for the creation of national-democratic fronts uniting workers, peasants, the middle strata and a segment of the local bourgeoisie.

Experience shows, however, that in Asia and Africa the politico-organizational formation of such fronts is extremely rare. One of the reasons for this evidently lies in the gradual and irreversible growth of internal socio-class contradictions. A political expression of this process is often the reluctance of bourgeois parties to cooperate with the communists.

The attitude of bourgeois, pro-bourgeois and nationalist petty-bourgeois parties to alliances with the communists gives the need for united actions by grassroots progressive forces growing significance. The scale of such action depends on how far the masses understand the aims of the struggle. A vivid illustration is the anti-imperialist and anti-monarchist revolution in Iran in 1979. Despite the repeated unitary appeals of the People's Party of Iran to other national organizations, no united front was formed on an inter-party level. However, at the level of the masses, unity of action grew steadily, as seen in the massive demonstrations, rallies and other anti-imperialist and anti-monarchist actions that continued for a whole year. As a result, during the decisive days of February 1979 the shah's regime was dealt its death blow and the historic victory of the Iranian revolution was assured.

Subsequently, the need for a united front of progressive forces grew even more pressing, especially in the face of U.S. imperialism's designs and actions against Iran. A statement issued by the Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran on March 31, 1980 declared that 'today, more than ever before, the revolution stands in need of an alliance and unity amongst all forces in order to frustrate this dangerous conspiracy (of U.S. imperialism — *Ed.*). Let us therefore unite and reinvigorate all our forces for the sake of this aim . . ., for the preservation of our revolution's achievements.'[9] But this was not followed by any inter-party agreement.

The absence of a united front at the inter-party level, which is a characteristic in African and Asian countries, is not at all typical on the Latin American continent. There the opposition parties and organizations, including the communist parties, in many cases agree on a united front (the Patriotic Front of Honduras, uniting more than 60 political and public organizations; the Broad Front of Uruguay; the Unity of Left Forces bloc in Peru; the National Opposition Alliance and then the Democratic Front in Colombia; the Democratic and People's Unity Front in Bolivia). It seems that this Latin American primacy in the realization of the principle of unity of action among progressive forces is linked to, among other things, more deep-rooted traditions of political organizations and struggle than in the Afro-Asian world.

## III

The main factors hindering or limiting unity of action among progressive forces are closely interrelated. The data at the Commission's disposal makes it possible to identify the following elements.

*Anti-communist views and prejudices.* The reference here is not, of course, to such natural exponents of anti-communism as imperialist circles or the bourgeoisie and its political organizations. In many instances, these views and prejudices, especially in developed capitalist countries, are held by forces that by their class and political character could be allies of the communists, notably the socialist (social democratic) parties. However, the possibility of cooperating with them in the struggle for democratic aims is left largely untapped because

of their leadership's negative attitude to the communists. The Communist Party of Great Britain, for instance, has repeatedly made offers of cooperation to the Labour Party Executive, but all these offers were rejected.

Anti-communism is to be met with in the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties of many developing nations. This often goes to the point of denying communist parties the right to legal existence (for example, in Sudan, Iraq, Turkey and Tunisia). Moreover, this denial sometimes takes the shape of a claim by a ruling revolutionary-democratic party to a monopoly of political power.

*The influence of social-reformism on the working class.* The developed capitalist countries where social-reformism is particularly widespread include Austria, Belgium, Britain, Canada, the FRG and Sweden. In some countries these ideas encounter the strong politico-ideological influence of the communists. The spirit of social reforms infiltrates some developing countries.

Social-reformist influence saps the political militancy of the working class, leaves it largely at the mercy of the monopolies and in the long run, is a major obstacle to unity among the working class itself and among all other democratic forces. Under these conditions, in order to avoid magnifying contradictions the communists usually offer to act jointly with other parties of the working class on issues where there is agreement. The growing crisis phenomena in developed capitalist countries and the accompanying offensive of monopoly capital against the socio-economic gains of the working people are intensifying the trend toward unity among the latter. As was noted, for instance, at the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium, this does not, of course, free the communists from the need to work unremittingly for the deliverance of the main forces of the working-class and democratic movements from the influence of reformist ideology and practices.

*The problem of relations between parties and organizations in a united front.* This is a crucial problem. The durability of an alliance, the prestige that a united front enjoys among the people, and the capacity for effective political actions depend on the extent to which the parties and organizations are equal and on how far the relations between them are democratic.

We have noted the broad realization of the slogan of a national-democratic front in Latin America and the weak support it gets in African and Asian countries. One of the reasons for this Latin American 'phenomenon' is that there are long-standing traditions of political organization and struggle, traditions that help to maintain the equality of the parties in united fronts. Traditions of this kind are nonexistent or weak in African and Asian countries. It is not accidental that a negative example of 'inner-front' relations is given by the Afro-Asian zone, specifically Iraq. Because this is a particularly instructive example, the Commission feels it would be expedient to discuss it in some detail.

Ever since its foundation in the 1930s, the Iraqi Communist Party has worked consistently for unity of action among national progressive forces. In 1969 it proposed a draft charter of a Progressive National-Patriotic Front to all of the nation's political organizations. At the close of 1971 the ICP began talks with the Baath Party on this question, and two years later the formation of that front was announced.

The Iraqi communists have always stressed that it was necessary to respect the political, ideological and organizational independence of all the sides in the front, ensure freedom of constructive comradely criticism within the front, and also the freedom of its participants to propagate their principles and aims provided these do not conflict with mutual commitments. Further, the ICP insisted on a democratic settlement of possible disagreements in a spirit of cooperation. Relative to leadership of the front, its stand was that such leadership should be exercised by the party enjoying the greatest confidence of the people.

The activities of the governing Baath Party came into conflict with all these principles and brought about the disintegration of the Progressive National-Patriotic Front. The ICP was forced to go over to opposition and has lately been conducting preparatory work aimed at setting up a national-democratic front for a struggle to remove the dictatorial, repressive regime and forming a democratic coalition administration.

The example of Iraq eloquently shows the incompatability of the line toward trampling elementary norms of democracy and the equality of participants in a front with the very idea of unity of action by progressive forces.

*Sectarianism.* This disease, which hinders unity of action, is particularly dangerous to small parties.

Here the Commission will confine itself to quoting the above-mentioned report by Gus Hall to the 22nd Convention of the Communist Party of the USA. The communists should, he said, shed the syndrome that they were being pushed aside, rejected and driven into a corner, or that they were a tiny minority. They should drop the complex of political orphanage. They should swim better in a big pond. Today the main weakness preventing them from keeping abreast of the times could be defined as sectarianism ... This sprang from underestimating the upsurge of the masses and of the party's role in that upsurge ... The struggle against sectarianism required conscious, consistent and tireless quests for allies and a solicitous attitude to them, especially to those prepared to cooperate with the communists as such.[10]

The negative impact of all these factors cannot be overcome without persevering, patient and diversified work by the communists. One of its key orientations is the strengthening of the Communist Party. Georges Marchais has noted that its further strengthening is a key question of the political struggle, the decisive condition for progressive change in France.[11] The same may be said of other communist and workers' parties: the strengthening

of their ranks is the principal condition for cohesion and unity of action among the progressive forces.

1. The Commission extends its gratitude for information received to representatives of the communist or workers' parties of Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Boliva, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Paraguay, the Philippines, Sudan, Turkey, Uruguay and the USA.
2. *Protokoll des Mannheimer Parteitags der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei, 20-22 Oktober 1978*, p. 257.
3. *Horizont*, No. 10, 1980, p. 12.
4. Slogans of this kind have been adopted by, for example, the communist or workers' parties of Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Guyana, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Sudan, Turkey and Uruguay.
5. The communists have taken this circumstance into account without modifying their fundamentally positive attitude to cooperation with the socialists.
6. *Protokoll des Mannheimer Parteitags der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei, October 20-22, 1978*, p. 225.
7. Gus Hall, *Labor Up Front In the People's Fight Against the Crisis*, New York, 1979, p. 93.
8. *L'Humanité*, April 22, 1980, June 28, 1980.
9. *Mardom*, March 31, 1980.
10. Gus Hall, op. cit., pp. 93-94.
11. *L'Humanité-Dimanche*, May 30, 1980.

# Book reviews

## IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENT AND PROSPECTS

Erich Honecker. *Reden und Aufsätze* (Speeches and Articles), Vols, 1-5. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1975-1978.

These volumes contain almost 270 speeches, interviews and publications by Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, from May 1971 to December 1977.

They give a full and allround picture of the most important aspects of the SUPG's policy for building a developed socialist society in the GDR and creating the basic prerequisites for a gradual transition to communism. These works show the organic interconnection between the party's internal and foreign-policy lines.

While reflecting the collective style of the SUPG leadership, the works by the General Secretary of its Central Committee also show his great personal contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the party's policy. They emphasize the SUPG's loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and testify to its creative attitude to the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and to the organic connection between theory and practice in the whole of the party's activity.

Under the SUPG's leadership, the Republic traveled a long way in the 1970s, with its Eighth and Ninth Congresses being the most important milestones. The Eighth Congress in 1971 gave an allround substantiation of the tasks in shaping a developed socialist society. The chief of these is 'to ensure a further rise in the people's material and cultural standards through a high rate of development in socialist production, its greater efficiency, scientific and technical progress and growing labor productivity.' In defining this task, Honecker says, the congress took account of the fact that the level of economic development in the GDR created qualitatively new conditions for conducting in practice an integrated economic and social policy.

The Ninth Congress of the SUPG in 1976 confirmed the general line mapped out by the previous congress, and in the new Party Program gave 'a scientifically substantiated picture, in line with the practical requirements, of a developed socialist society and the prerequisites for a gradual transition to communism' (Vol. 4, p. 301). Honecker's works show the profound theoretical content and practical importance of this document. The program relies on the experience of the SUPG and the international communist movement, notably the CPSU. It characterizes the construction of a developed socialist society as a historical process of in-depth political, economic, social, spiritual and cultural transformations. In this context, Honecker emphasizes their revolutionary character and the demands which follow from them: 'The growth of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party,' he writes, 'is law-governed. The scale of the process corresponds to the higher stage of the social development, and the growing responsibility of the working class and the consciousness of the masses. The greater the social tasks, the deeper the party's ties with the working people, of which it is a part, and for whose good it is tirelessly working' (Vol. 4, p. 302).

On the party's combat capacity and on its ties with the masses depends above all the extent to which there is success in further combining economic and social policy in the much more complicated external economic conditions. Honecker's works show how complicated the problem is, but they are permeated with a spirit of revolutionary optimism, and give the party and every communist a clear-cut orientation. On the strength of Lenin's proposition that once the people's power is established, economic construction becomes the main arena of struggle, the author circumstantially analyzes questions like the socialist rationalization of production, efficiency and quality of workmanship, expansion of the material and technical basis, management and economic planning.

The development of the state system is an important question in these volumes. The consolidation

of the workers' and peasants' power, a form of proletarian dictatorship which represents the interests of the whole people, continues to be a constant and primary task in building a developed socialist society in the GDR. The main line in further developing the GDR state system is perfection of socialist democracy, which is designed to release the people's creative powers and ensure the unity of the working people, of all the classes and sections of society. In this connection, Honecker notes that the objectively based leadership of the working class does nothing to minimize the role of other classes and sections. On the contrary, the working class demonstrates its capacity to exercise its leadership not least importantly by the fact that it helps the other working people by providing them with the opportunity of displaying their creative powers and making their own considerable contribution to socialist construction.

The interests of the socialist society require peace and a constant struggle for peace. The idea that the national and the international elements in the party's activity are indissolubly connected with each other is repeatedly emphasized in Honecker's work. These five volumes give a full picture of the policy of the SUPG and the GDR aimed to ensure peace and the security of nations, a policy which is closely coordinated with that of the other fraternal socialist countries.

'The unity of the socialist community, the security of the socialist states, and the interests of the world communist movement,' Honecker declares, 'are the highest principles which determine every step in our coordinated foreign policy' (Vol. 3, p. 306). That is why the further consolidation of the fraternal alliance with the USSR and the other socialist community countries continues to be a primary task of the GDR's foreign policy. This alliance provides a reliable foundation for the important revolutionary gains of the GDR people and ensures its vital interests.

The SUPG promotes the further drawing together of the peoples of the socialist community, with socialist economic integration providing the material basis of this process. The author says that with the development of allround cooperation between the socialist-community countries, more and more common elements emerge in their policies, economics and social life. 'This process of gradual integration of the socialist countries is now most manifest as a law-governed phenomenon' (Vol. 5, p. 339).

Proletarian internationalism is a fundamental pillar of the GDR's foreign policy, and is expressed in the fraternal solidarity with the peoples fighting for national independence and social progress. Honecker shows that the interests of the socialist community and of the national-liberation movement in the fight against imperialism are identical (see Vol. 5, p. 623).

One of the central subjects of the collection is translation into life of the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. The basis for the normalization of relations between the GDR and the FRG, as two sovereign and equal states, is recognition of realities resulting from the Second World War and postwar development. A key component part of the positive changes in the international situation was the breaking of the imperialist diplomatic blockade of the GDR, and universal international recognition of the first socialist state on German soil. Honecker shows the contribution the GDR has been making to international détente.

When the European Conference successfully completed its work in 1975 and its Final Act recorded the turn from the cold war to détente, Honecker assessed this as an important advance for which the socialist states had worked over a period of many years. At the same time, he pointed to the fact that the aggressive character of imperialism has not changed; 'The policy of peaceful coexistence does not eliminate the class struggle. Imperialism has far from reconciled itself with the situation that has arisen. That is why there is no reason to entertain any illusions about imperialism and its aims. The substance of imperialism has not changed; the socio-economic roots of the imperialist aggressive policy of war are still there' (Vol. 3, pp. 503-504). He went on to state: 'We have every reason to remain vigilant and to assume that sharp swerves in the international arena are not ruled out' (Vol. 3, p. 496). That is why the SUPG gives due attention to the military defense of the socialist state and the raising of its defense capability within the framework of the socialist military coalition, the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The strengthening of the unity of the world communist movement and the communists' international responsibility in their joint anti-imperialist struggle are important questions in Honecker's speeches and articles. The need for cohesion on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism flows from the greater complexity and diversity of the conditions and tasks the fraternal parties have to face, and from the ever greater internationalization of the class struggle. That is why Honecker points to the need to use and further develop every form of cooperation among the fraternal parties: bilateral and multilateral meetings of leaders, regional and international meetings, together with broad exchanges of experience, scientific and theoretical conferences, etc.

The unity of the communist movement is also a prerequisite for closer interaction of all the progressive forces fighting for peace and against imperialism, for national liberation and social emancipation, and for socialism. At the same time, the unity of the communist movement calls for consistent struggle against those who try to undermine it. This applies above all to Maoism, the policy of the Peking leaders, who have openly taken an anti-Soviet stand and are directly collaborating with imperialism.

The GDR communists believe that loyalty to proletarian internationalism is verified above all by one's attitude to the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union. It has withstood the hardest tests of the class struggle, it has a wealth of experience, and this determines its vanguard role in the world communist movement. 'The CPSU's contribution along this historical way to the theory and practice of scientific socialism has always been of great importance for the struggle of the working class and the revolutionary forces of all countries' (Vol. 4, p. 318).

The five volumes of Honecker's speeches and articles are a record of a fairly long period of history, and also confirmation of the vitality of our world view and the unity of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

*Professor Dr. Günter Heyden*

## WHO IS PLUNDERING CHILE

Fernando Dahse, *El Mapa de la Extrema Riqueza* (A Map of Excessive Wealth), Ediciones Aconcagua, Santiago de Chile. 1979. 209 pp.

Some recent studies show the marked growth of the power of a handful of big financial and economic groups in Chile. The book under review by Fernando Dahse, a professor of the Catholic University at Santiago, has aroused much interest and sharp polemics in the country.

Having analyzed the activity of the 250 largest private enterprises, the author reached the conclusion that since September 1973, when Pinochet took power in a military coup, 'a sharp concentration of property and control of private enterprises has occurred in almost every sphere of the national economy' (p. 13).

His study ends in December 1978, a point at which three financial and economic groups controlled 45.9 per cent of the capital of these enterprises. These are the groups headed by Manuel Cruzat and Fernando Larrain (24.7 per cent), Javier Vial (12.6 per cent) and Eleodoro Matte (8.6 per cent). The author uses their activity to show the tremendous growth of the influence of Chilean finance capital. The decisions of the financial groups exert an influence on the national economy, and this is compounded by their direct ties with the regime. The leading members of the financial oligarchy ever more frequently take up ministerial and other high-ranking posts under the dictatorship, which means direct participation in government.

The fascist state played the leading role in the economic expansion of finance capital, by denationalizing and handing back to private ownership numerous enterprises at artificially depressed prices. The author says that the total book value of the enterprises returned to private ownership from 1974 to September 1977 was $250 million below their actual value. 'The process of reprivatization of state assets,' Dahse concludes, 'amounts to a subsidized transfer of state funds to economic groups' (p. 174).

Of most importance was the reprivatization of the commercial banks, which were almost entirely nationalized by the Allende government. The most powerful financial and economic groups were provided with an opportunity of establishing their control over a large part of the accumulation fund and the available cash resources. Besides, when the junta permitted foreign loans in 1977, these groups largely began to act as intermediaries between the transnational banks and the Pinochet regime. This resulted in close connections between the fascist state and finance capital, both international and national.

The reprivatization of commercial banks also started an accelerated concentration of capital. By mid-1979, the Cruzat-Larrain, Vial, Luksic and Banna groups controlled 44.9 per cent of all bank deposits and earned tremendous profits. The author has calculated that in the period he studied, the profits of such banking groups totalled roughly $1 billion. Broad sections of the middle and petty bourgeoisie fell victim to their speculative machinations. This eventually amounted to a forced re-distribution of the high profits from super-exploitation to which fascism subjects the working people. The re-distribution was in favor of big finance capital.

The concentration of capital in Chile, the author says, was promoted by all the political measures which made it possible to sharply lower real wages, while the working people markedly increased their productivity. The facts contained in the book confirm the view expressed by Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile: 'Fascism projects to the utmost the function of coercion by the whole state machine in favor of imperialism and a small group of magnates, mainly financial magnates, in addition to the fact that it puts all the mechanisms of economic management at their disposal.'[1]

The author also considers the obnoxious role of foreign capital. Under the Pinochet regime, Chile's dependence on the United States and other capitalist countries has been increased mainly in the financial sphere. International capital has derived considerable benefits from the fact that the economic structure imposed on Chile cannot function without the funds set aside for it by the transnational banks. Dependence on foreign sources has also increased as a result of the country's involvement in the international capitalist division of labor. The dictatorial regime mainly encourages the export of raw materials, while flinging the doors wide open to unimpeded imports of all kinds of goods which ruin local industry.

Although the Chilean financial and economic groups are increasingly drawn into the sphere of domination of international imperialist finance capital and depend on it, Dahse shows that they have remained relatively independent, have their own field of activity and operate with an eye to their own interests.

The President of Chile's Central Bank Alvaro Bardon, who has publicly disagreed with the author, declares that 'the private groups are a product of the dynamism of the system and are, consequent-

ly, appropriate.'[2] This means that the more 'dynamic' the fascist system, the greater the power of the financial oligarchy.

One important conclusion follows from this for Chile's democratic forces: it is impossible to eradicate fascism without putting an end to the domination of big finance capital. Success in this struggle can be achieved only through a broad agreement among the various classes and sections of the population — from the proletariat to a part of the bourgeoisie — because they all suffer from the domination of foreign imperialists and local oligarchs.

*Hugo Fazio*

1. *Boletin del Exterior del Partido Comunista de Chile*, No. 37, 1979, p. 9.
2. *El Mercurio*, January 6, 1980.


# Books on Questions of the National Liberation Movement

**National Liberation Revolutions Today**
Brutents
A two volume major analysis of the present-day stage
cloth $8.95

**Non-Capitalist Development**
Solodovnikov
An historical outline examining questions on socialist orientation
cloth $3.50

**Non-Capitalist Way**
Andreyev
In-depth analysis of all aspects
cloth $2.95

**A Socialist-Oriented State**
Chirkin
The state as an instrument of change in countries which have recently thrown off colonialism
cloth $3.50

**National Liberation**
Ulyanovsky
Thorough survey of basic theory and particular studies of India, Burma and Southern Africa
cloth $6.95

**PROGRESS BOOKS**
**71 Bathurst St. Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**



**50 VOLUME EDITION IN ENGLISH**

# Marx and Engels Collected Works

**Volumes 1 to 14 now available**

**In Canada order from:**
**PROGRESS BOOKS**
**71 Bathurst St.**
**Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**
**$9.35 (Can.) per volume**

**In the USA order from:**
**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS**
**381 Park Ave. S.**
**New York, N.Y. 10016**
**$8.50 (U.S.) per volume**

## 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