

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

January 1982, Volume 25, Number 1 \$1.00



France / 39

USSR —
Tikhonov / 2

Hall on U.S.
imperialism / 9

“Sante Fé” &
intellectuals / 14

Nature of the
party / 31

Uruguay / 64



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

January 1982, Vol. 25, No. 1

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

- 1 Communiqué on the discussion of the
work of *World Marxist Review*

Features

- 2 The unity of economic and social policy
in a developed socialist society
N. Tikhonov
- 9 U.S. imperialism in the real world
Gus Hall
- 14 Latin America: the Santa Fé seducers
V. Teitelboim
- 22 Let 1982 be a year of peace
P. Auersperg

The party

- 27 Senegal: loyalty to Leninist principles
S. Gueye
- 31 The nature of a communist organization
- 39 The French communists in a new situation
R. Bourderon
- 45 New experience

Exchange of views

- 50 Development trends in the
liberated countries of the East

- 58 The crisis of state intervention in the
economy, and bourgeois science

Viewpoints

- 64 Uruguay: the political climate is changing
E. Viera
- 67 Pakistan: "cooperation" in torture camp
R. Afzal
- 68 A latter-day Cato from Washington
R. Valdes Vivo
- 69 USA: obscurantism in law
E. Jorgen

Facts and figures

- 71 Socialist integration: what has been
and what remains to be done

Book reviews

- 76 Swept overboard
J. Alexander
- 79 An eye-witness writes about
the Land of Lenin
W. Hutmann

Communiqué

ON THE DISCUSSION OF THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL WORLD MARXIST REVIEW (PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM)

The work of the international journal of communist and workers' parties *World Marxist Review* (Problems of Peace and Socialism) was considered at a meeting in Prague on November 24-27, 1981. It was attended by 90 parties: People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, MPLA—Party of Labor (Angola), Communist Party of Argentina, Socialist Party of Australia, Communist Party of Austria, National Liberation Front of Bahrain, Communist Party of Bangladesh, Communist Party of Belgium, People's Revolution Party of Benin, Communist Party of Bolivia, Brazilian Communist Party, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Chile, Colombian Communist Party, Congolese Party of Labor, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, Communist Party of Cuba, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL), Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Dominican Communist Party, Egyptian Communist Party, Communist Party of El Salvador, Commission for Organizing the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE), Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, German Communist Party, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Greece, Guadeloupe Communist Party, Guatemalan Party of Labor, People's Progressive Party of Guyana, United Party of Haitian Communists, Communist Party of Honduras, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Communist Party of India, Communist Party of Indonesia, People's Party of Iran, Iraqi Communist Party, Communist Party of Ireland, Communist Party of Israel, Italian Communist Party, Workers' Party of Jamaica, Communist Party of Japan, Jordanian Communist Party, People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, Lao People's Revolutionary Party, Lebanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Lesotho, Communist Party of Luxembourg, Independence Congress Party of Madagascar,

Communist Party of Malta, Martinique Communist Party, United Socialist Party of Mexico, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco, FRELIMO Party of Mozambique, Communist Party of Nepal, Socialist Unity Party of New Zealand, Socialist Working People's Party of Nigeria, Communist Party of Pakistan, People's Party of Panama, Paraguayan Communist Party, Peruvian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Philippines, Polish United Workers' Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Romanian Communist Party, San Marino Communist Party, Communist Party of Saudi Arabia, Independence and Labor Party of Senegal, South African Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Spain, Communist Party of Sri Lanka, Sudanese Communist Party, Left Party—Communists of Sweden, Swiss Party of Labor, Syrian Communist Party, Tunisian Communist Party, Communist Party of Turkey, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of the USA, Communist Party of Venezuela, Communist Party of Vietnam, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, Yemen Socialist Party.

The report on the work of the journal from April 1977, the day of the previous meeting, to October 1981 was submitted by the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council.

The party delegations substantively discussed the report and the journal's further tasks. On behalf of their parties the speakers gave positive assessments and made critical remarks and suggestions on the work of the journal in order to help achieve a further improvement of this collective publication. The party representatives recommended that the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council should take the wishes expressed by them into account.

It was stressed that the international collective of party representatives on the journal should work in a spirit of equality and cooperation in the interests of peace, democracy, national liberation, national independence and socialism.

The discussion proceeded in a frank, constructive and comradely atmosphere.



The unity of economic and social policy in a developed socialist society

Nikolai Tikhonov

CC Political Bureau member, CPSU,
Chairman, USSR Council of Ministers

This is the beginning of the year in which our people will mark the 60th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the world's first multinational socialist state. It has travelled a great and glorious way. The country is entering upon the anniversary year with our society having reached an important historical landmark, the stage of mature socialism.

Developed socialism is the triumph of the Leninist economic and social policy of the Communist Party, the leading and guiding force of Soviet society. But at this stage, the demands on party and state policy are very much greater, because it has to tackle tasks in economic and social progress and the construction of communism which are of tremendous historical importance, scale and complexity. Aware of its responsibility, our party has been creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory, summing up practical experience and subjecting the concrete reality to scientific analysis in order to bring out the potentialities and to create the conditions for the ever fuller unfolding of the creative powers of socialism and their effective use for the benefit of every individual and society as a whole.

That is the basis for a program for the country's further economic and social development put forward by the 26th congress of the CPSU. The CPSU CC report, delivered by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, contains a comprehensive theoretical and political substantiation of this program and shows the ways to realize it. The program was translated into concrete terms in the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR from 1981 to 1985, and for the period until 1990, approved by the congress, and in the 11th five-year plan, adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. This program embodies the unity of economic and social policy and takes account of the specific interaction of economic and social processes at the present stage.

I

The unity of the economic and social policy of a ruling communist party is a principle that naturally springs from the Marxist-Leninist view of the purpose of social production under socialism. Long before the revolution, when drawing up the party's first program, Lenin wrote that its purpose is to ensure "full well-being and free, *all-round* development for *all* members of society" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 6, p. 54). The priority of social goals has the force of an objective law in the sense that with social property in the means of production and distribution according to labor, the successful fulfillment of social tasks is not only a purpose but also an incentive, an important factor in the development of production.

The assumption of the priority of social goals expressing long-term, fundamental tasks before the economy under socialism has always oriented the economic policy of our party and the Soviet State and predetermined strategy and tactics in the development of socialist production. Leonid Brezhnev has emphasized: "The party approach, the political approach to the economy has invariably been placed on the programmatic requirements — everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man." But in concrete historical conditions, at various stages of socialist construction this general uniformity has manifested itself in different ways. In practice, the inter-relation between economic and social tasks always presents itself in concrete form, manifesting itself as a problem in the distribution of the national income, the correlation between accumulation and consumption, and so on.

In the early Soviet period, when the foundations of socialism were being laid, economic and social problems were so closely interwoven and were so acute and urgent, that the distinction between them was not always readily visible. As the party and the state overcame the economic dislocation, they had to tackle vital tasks like elimination of unemployment

and provision of full employment for the population, the overcoming of the technical lag behind the industrial countries, the drive against the illiteracy of the bulk of the people, and the evening out of the profound socio-economic and cultural differences between Russia's central areas and its former national fringes.

Each of our five-year plans was an appreciable advance in the development of the economy and the balanced solution of social problems. But for a number of internal and international reasons the party's potentialities in realizing its programmatic goals in raising the people's well-being remained limited for a long time. Large-scale material and financial resources were required to industrialize the country, to collectivize agriculture and to strengthen the defense capability of the state. The imperialist countries strove by means of economic blockade to strangle the young Soviet Republic and to prevent it from building up its own highly developed industry and a collective agriculture based on modern technology. Almost one-third of the whole period of the existence of our socialist state was spent in beating back the military aggression of the imperialists and rehabilitating the economy, and this narrowed down the potentialities for more rapidly tackling social problems. Let us recall, for instance that fascist Germany's attack alone cost the Soviet Union almost 30 per cent of its national wealth, and over 20 million lives. Every honest and unbiased person will realize that it is not easy to heal such wounds.

But even in that difficult period, no dangerous contradictions between economic and social development arose within the society, because the party's policy was always in line with the people's vital interests. The Soviet people were aware that priority efforts went into the tackling of truly vital tasks and that the party was doing its utmost to raise the people's well-being. That was the basis for the moral-political unity in the country and the confidence of the masses in the Communist Party. Experience has convinced us that that is something of fundamental importance. The point is not just that in politics it is intolerable to have subjectivism which arbitrarily gives preference to this or that aspect — the economic or the social — but that the people should understand and support the policy of the party and the state and their decisions concerning priorities. Those who fail to realize this will inevitably have to face both economic and political difficulties.

Our party, consistently using the advantages of socialism, succeeded in carrying the country

to advanced frontiers in economic and social progress and scoring major successes in every field of social life. The country entered upon the period of developed socialism, which is characterized both by a greater range of possibilities connected with the immensely greater economic potential, and by the new scale of the tasks which have to be tackled. Today, national income is nearly 21 times and industrial production almost 34 times greater than it was in the second half of the 1930s, when the USSR had laid the foundations of socialism. The Soviet Union now leads the world in the output of many key products, among them oil and steel, cement and mineral fertilizers, wheat and cotton, main line electric locomotives and diesel locomotives. The socio-economic achievements of the 1970s have had an especially important role to play in the country's social development.

The importance of the Soviet people's achievements is determined not only by quantitative indicators, but also by the deep-going qualitative changes in the people's socio-economic life, under whose impact a number of fundamentally new factors have arisen and now determine the specific interconnection between economic and social progress in developed socialist society. What are these factors?

First, the mighty economic potential and the highly developed productive forces of mature socialism not only make it possible to tackle simultaneously a broad range of economic and social tasks but also to focus the party's practical policy, directly and immediately, on the task of ever more fully satisfying the people's diverse material and cultural requirements. In other words, at the stage of mature socialism the social tenor of economic development tends to increase, bringing about a noticeable swing of the economy to the solution of tasks connected with the growth of the people's well-being.

Second, social progress, the goal and ultimate synthetic result of the growth of social production, simultaneously becomes an ever more important prerequisite for further economic growth; there is an immense increase in this feed-back effect, that is the influence exerted on economic development by social factors like living standards, the degree of the people's education and spiritual growth, and social relations.

Third, new and more favorable conditions for the solution of social and economic problems are created by the political system of de-

veloped socialism, which has taken shape as a result of the increased role of the Communist Party in the life of society, the development of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a socialist state of the whole people, and a deepening and all-round development of socialist democracy. This system ensures creative and concerned participation in economic and social progress by the broadest masses of the working people.

However, these factors do not operate automatically and can produce positive results only through their purposeful use by the party and the state. With the tremendous growth in the scale of the economy, the interdependence of its components, the ever closer interconnection of all the social processes and the increasing complexity of the tasks, it is especially important to provide political leadership and administration that would guarantee against the emergence of contradictions between economic growth and social progress, between accumulation and consumption, and between state-wide and local interests. This is attained through a blend of scientifically grounded policy and the involvement of broad masses of working people in its elaboration, in decision-making, and in management. The democratic elaboration and broad discussion of our economic plans, the verification in the course of this of the proposals coming from specialists and experts, and establishment of the extent to which they coincide with the expectations of the masses help not only to find the right solutions and to improve plans but also promote the people's understanding that this is correct, a comprehension of what can already be done and what not yet, an awareness that the whole of this policy meets the interests of the working people.

It is here in the consistent development of democracy in socio-economic relations and in the enhancement of the role of the masses in economic management — that the party sees an important guarantee against the emergence of contradictions between economic and social factors. It is precisely on this basis that we have been working, to have every politically conscious worker feel that he is not only the master in his own factory, but that he is also a representative of the country, to have him feel responsibility (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 403).

The socio-economic policy pursued by the party and the Soviet state, coupled with the creativity, initiative and energy of the masses, ensures the progress of our society.

II

The further boosting and improvement of social production is the basis for successfully solving social problems and fulfilling the extensive program for raising the people's well-being, as mapped out by the party for the 1980s. Everyone knows that what has not been produced cannot be used for social needs, for distribution, and if social tasks of growing scale and complexity are set, corresponding steps must be taken in the economy to ensure their successful fulfillment. That is why the administration of the economy is the core of the whole activity of the party and the state in the developed socialist society.

What are the main lines of our strategy in the current five-year period? First of all, in the 1980s we must complete the switch of the economy to *intensive development*, and ensure the further enhancement of the efficiency of production.

The new five-year plan provides for the priority growth of final economic results as compared with the increase of labor and material inputs. In the past, the economic growth rested mainly on a high rate of capital investments, on extensive factors; material and labor inputs then grew faster than the national income. Today, a fundamentally different correlation between inputs and results is envisaged. In particular, in the 11th five-year plan period, capital investments will go up by 10.4 per cent, and the national income, by 18 per cent. In other words, the point is that the society's resources should be used in accordance with the principle formulated at the 26th congress of the CPSU by Leonid Brezhnev: "The economy must be economical."

The main factor in advancing in this direction is to be economies in labor and faster labor productivity growth, which, in accordance with the 11th five-year plan, is to account for 90 per cent of national income growth, about 90 per cent of industrial growth, and the whole increase in agricultural produce. Let us note here that under socialism economies in labor are not tantamount to economies in the remuneration of labor. It is neither a reduction in the level of wages nor cuts in spending on social needs that are to yield the desired economic effect. It is not intensification of labor but the intensification of production, its better organization, the use of scientific and technological achievements, mechanization and automation of operations that should increase labor productivity and make production more efficient.

In the 11th five-year period, these measures which in the capitalist West are called "rationalization" will result in the release of 17 million workers in the economy, or as we say, will "tentatively release," because they will, of course, not make up any reserve army of unemployed, but will take up jobs in industries where there is a shortage of labor power — a practice which shows the distinction between our measures and those of capitalist "rationalization."

The rational use of raw materials, fuel, energy and other material resources, now tends to acquire special importance for the whole of the economy. With the present-day scale of production, it is every more costly to maintain, to say nothing of increasing, the volume of raw materials and fuel extracted. The shift of the material and technical base of the extracting industries into sparsely settled areas of the north and the east with a difficult terrain has involved a marked increase in expenditures. That is why the effect from the economy of every ton of oil, coal and metal becomes ever more tangible. Let us note that for the time being, we tend to spend more raw materials and energy per unit of national income as compared with the best world indicators. Measures to intensify the regime of economies help to establish a thrifty attitude to the social wealth both among executives and broad masses of working people.

Improvement in the use of fixed production assets is an important line in intensifying production. The growth of fixed assets in the USSR has proceeded apace, and it is all the more important to overcome the shortcomings in their use as soon as possible, to advance the industrialization of capital construction, remodelling of operating enterprises, and accelerate the starting of new production facilities. Much importance is attached to the fulfillment of programs for the building of production, housing, cultural and everyday amenities, and training skilled personnel. Serious attention is being given to creating modern, convenient working and living conditions and to having the funds earmarked for the social development of enterprises, towns and villages used strictly according to designation, fully and by the established deadline. Here, for all practical purposes, economic and social goals tend to merge into a single whole.

The same applies to ensuring the high quality of products, to improving their use and technico-economic properties, something that is regarded both as a factor in enhancing the efficiency of production and as a means of bet-

ter satisfaction of the requirements of the population, which has a stake in the overall enhancement of product quality. From 1981 to 1985, the renewal of the product-mix is to be accelerated.

The solution of large-scale and complicated problems in enhancing the efficiency of production and raising product quality determines the need for accelerating scientific and technological progress. The main task in this field was formulated by the 26th congress of the CPSU as the need to carry all the sectors of the economy to the advanced frontiers of science and technology. The highroad here is orientation toward the development and improvement of the instruments of labor and introduction of advanced technology. The design and production of systems and complexes of machines and equipment helps to mechanize and automate to the utmost the key production processes in industry, building, agriculture and transport, and to eliminate manual, low-skilled and arduous physical labor. The manufacture of tiny electronic control devices and industrial robots, which are in ever more extensive use, opens up truly revolutionary opportunities.

Another essential feature of the five-year plan period is that the party's strategic line of altering the economic proportions in favor of industries ensuring the production of consumer goods is to be continued. This explains why output by Group B industries is to grow somewhat faster than output by Group A industries. The expansion of the manufacture of goods for the population and the substantial enhancement of their quality are an important indication of the growing social orientation of the economy. In the 11th five-year period, output in the food industries is to go up by 22 per cent, in the light industry by 19 per cent, and in the production of cultural, everyday and household goods, by 40 per cent. Meanwhile, such basic industries as electric power, metallurgy, chemistry and engineering will continue to play the definitive role in economic development and the attainment of high final results.

The growing social orientation of the Soviet economy is also expressed in the intensive formation of an integrated agro-industrial complex in the country. The food program being worked out in the USSR on Leonid Brezhnev's initiative is oriented toward better provision of foodstuffs for the population. The food problem, as Brezhnev said at the November 1981 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, is now the central problem of the

whole five-year period both in economic and in political terms.

Nearly one-third of all the capital investments in the economy is earmarked for the development and improvement of an integrated agro-industrial complex, with a large part of them going directly into the boosting of agricultural production. As a result, as much money will go into the development of this sector from 1981 to 1985, as in the whole period from 1918 to 1970. This will help to accelerate the growth of agricultural output, and to increase the annual average cereal crop over the five years by nearly 35 million tons, and the production of meat by more than 2 million tons.

Consequently, the program of deep-going social transformations in the 1980s rests on a sound economic basis and is backed up with corresponding profound shifts in production.

While giving credit to the Soviet people's truly historic accomplishments and highly appreciating the potentialities for further economic and social progress, our party clearly sees the difficulties, shortcomings and outstanding problems. Not all the envisaged frontiers have been reached. Not all the industries have been working with the necessary efficiency. In the economy there are still bottlenecks and disproportions. The causes are diverse, among them the operation of objective circumstances, which do not depend on our will, and shortcomings in planning and management, insufficient exactingness by some party organs and economic executives, breaches of discipline, and cases of mismanagement. But, as it was said at the 26th congress of the CPSU, the main cause is perhaps that the force of momentum, tradition and habit has not yet been fully overcome, a force which took shape in the period when it was not so much the qualitative as the quantitative aspects that came to the fore in virtue of different conditions and our much smaller potentialities.

Our economy has been developing without crises, and it is free from the defects which are inherent in capitalist production, but it does require constant improvement of management in the light of the operation of objective economic laws, it does not tolerate voluntarism, or uncontrolled haphazard processes. The substance of the tasks now being put forward by the party and the state consists in the best possible use of the advantages of the socialist economic system and the tremendous economic potentialities and reserves. This will make it possible to solve successfully the major problems of socio-economic development facing us

in the 11th five-year period and in the period after that.

III

When we speak of the new level and scale of the social tasks being tackled in the period of mature socialism through the progressive development of the socialist economy, we do not start from a narrow view of the problem in the spirit of purely consumer "ideals," but from the task of securing positive advances in the whole way of life of the Soviet people.

The implementation of measures aimed to boost the economy enables the party and the state constantly to increase the working people's real income. The funds centrally allocated by the state to raise the people's well-being totalled 16.5 billion rubles in the seventh and eighth five-year periods, and 32.0 billion rubles in the ninth and tenth periods, including measures to raise the wages of industrial and office workers, at a cost of 12.8 billion and 22.5 billion rubles respectively. Let us bear in mind that the wages of industrial and office workers and the income of collective farmers also continued to grow as a result of the rising skill standards and labor productivity of every worker. As a result, real income per head over the past decade has gone up by roughly 50 per cent. In the current five-year period, there is to be a further increase of real income per head by 16.5 per cent. Social consumption funds, a tangible addition to the working people's wages, are to increase by 23 per cent. One should also take into account the fact that all of this is proceeding against the background of prices for staple consumer goods, rents and urban transport fares remaining unchanged for several decades.

Together with the overall increase in the income of the population, there is a process of their alignment. This is brought about by a further increase in minimum wages and also through a distribution of social funds which makes it possible to reduce the differences in incomes and conditions for the satisfaction of the key social requirements of various strata of the population (free tuition for children, medical services, pensions, scholarships, etc.). At the stage of mature socialism, growing importance is attached to the evening out of social conditions in territorial terms. With that end in view, in particular, the building of houses and of the whole socio-cultural infrastructure, and improvement of consumer goods supplies to the population are to proceed in the new five-year period at an ever faster rate in the areas

of Siberia, the Far East and in the northern regions.

The policy pursued by the party and the state leads to a *steady extension of the Soviet people's socio-economic rights*. In the mature socialist society, the economic basis of socialist democracy has expanded, the rights of citizens are backed up with more fundamental material content, and the guarantees of these rights have become sounder, a fact that is entrenched in the new constitution of the USSR. Thus, the state ensures the right to work and provides free occupational training, helps to raise labor skills, to train men and women in new specialities, to develop the system of job orientation and placement, and introduces progressive forms of labor organization and remuneration. All of this helps organically to blend the interests of the working person, the collective and the society, and to make fuller use of the socialist labor potential.

For the first time ever, the USSR constitution establishes the right to housing. This is reliably guaranteed by the large-scale housing construction. Eighty-five per cent of the housing in the country is built at the expense of the state. In the past five-year period, over 50 million Soviet citizens (one in five) improved their housing conditions. Let us also note the following: we have no vacant houses, like those one frequently hears of in the capitalist countries, where the ordinary people cannot afford expensive dwellings. Rents in the USSR do not exceed three per cent of family earnings. The bulk of the costs of housing maintenance is borne by the state, which in 1980 paid additionally something like seven billion rubles for these purposes. For over a half-century, rents in the USSR, as I have already said, have remained unchanged, although the incomes of the population, the outlays by the state on housing construction and its operation (dwellings are now much more comfortable and with greater amenities) have increased.

The social policy of the party and the state is characterized by *profound humanism*. This is vividly expressed in their concern for the family, children, old-age pensioners and disabled citizens. In the 11th five-year period and in the years ahead, a new system of measures for improving the life of mothers and the rising generation, and for increasing state assistance to families with children and newlyweds is to be put into effect. This means higher incomes for families with children, an improvement of their housing and living conditions, especially for young families, further development of the network of child welfare institutions, to enable

every family to use their services so increasing the leisure available to mothers and creating better conditions for the upbringing of children. There is also to be an improvement in the living conditions of retiring labor veterans and an increase in the minimum old age and disability pensions for industrial and office workers and collective farmers, and in pensions in the event of loss of a bread-winner. New measures are envisaged in the material and everyday provision for veterans of the Great Patriotic War. It is estimated that as a result of these measures, roughly 50 million Soviet citizens will have their incomes increased.

Every measure — be it increase in money incomes, improvement of social security, or solution of the housing problem — is designed for the *all-round and harmonious development of the individual*. In his speech at the closing of the 26th congress of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Mature socialism gives every citizen very broad opportunities for revealing his capabilities. What remains to be done is to exercise these opportunities."

In the Soviet Union, there is a process which brings closer together *all the classes and social groups of the society*. The social distinctions between town and country are being further obliterated. Manual and mental labor are ever more closely interwoven in the production activity of millions of working people. Having analyzed all these social changes in-depth, the 26th congress of the CPSU declared that the formation of the classless structure of the society will in the main apparently occur within the historical framework of developed socialism. The modern working class is the leading force of this process; its revolutionary ideology and morality, its collective mentality, its interests and ideals are now being adopted by every section of Soviet society.

The obliteration of the distinctions between classes, it was said at the congress, sets new tasks before social policy: it is increasingly concentrated on overcoming the distinctions which go beyond the framework of individual classes, and on the solution of problems requiring the closest consideration of the peculiarities and interests of each group of society.

The *complete elimination of the gap between development levels in the center of Russia and the former national outskirts* is a historic achievement of socialism. The development of all the Soviet Republics is now stable and dynamic. These results are convincing evidence of the fruitfulness of the CPSU's Leninist nationalities policy and of its well-tested principles — equality, fraternal cooperation and

voluntary participation — which provide the basis for the strengthening of the fraternal friendship of all the peoples of the multinational Soviet Union at the stage of mature socialism. This trend is expressed in the accelerating all-round approximation of nations and nationalities in the country and the development of the Soviet people, a new historical entity.

The bright facets of the socialist way of life — collectivism and comradeship, the friendship of all the nations and nationalities of the country, moral health and social optimism — are not only being further polished in the process of communist construction, but also provide an inspiring basis for the whole of the society's transformative activity.

IV

The party and the government constantly reckon with the importance of a favorable international situation for the country's economic and social development. The approach of the CPSU and the Soviet state to international affairs is fundamentally the same as their approach to internal problems: it is an expression of the working people's interests and aspirations. That is why the domestic and foreign policy of the party and the state is uniform in social content: at home, it is manifested in the Soviet people's creative labor effort as they build communism, and in the international arena, in the USSR's consistent struggle to consolidate peace.

The Soviet people are profoundly at one with Leonid Brezhnev in the idea, which he voiced at the 26th congress of the CPSU, that the clue to the future does not lie in war preparations, which doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but in the consolidation of peace. If the Soviet Union has strengthened its defense capability and spent a definite part of its budget resources for this purpose, so diverting them from peaceful construction, it has been forced to do so in face of the overt military threat on the part of the aggressive circles of imperialism. But for this threat, the country's economy would have developed even more successfully, and our people would be living better. Our urge for this is clearly expressed in the Peace Program, and our concrete proposals are well known.

The Soviet Union's long-term plans contain orientations toward the development of broad and multilateral intercourse with other peoples, above all, of mutually advantageous economic cooperation. Our assumption is that

the Soviet economy is a component part of the world economy and is connected with it through a diversity of relations, which need to be strengthened for the common benefit of all the peoples.

The Soviet Union has quite naturally developed its ties most vigorously above all with the countries of the socialist community. We are solidly united through our common socio-economic system and close interaction in the construction and defense of socialism. While this inviolable basis is maintained, there is a constant improvement of the mechanism of businesslike cooperation. The long-term goal-oriented programs adopted over the past few years have helped to deepen socialist economic integration. Virtually in every sphere of the economy, science and technology there is evidence of the fruits of production specialization. The coordination of long-term economic plans of the CMEA countries is being completed. The fraternal countries are now charting a course to turn the 1980s into a period of intensive production, scientific and technological cooperation between the socialist countries. On the agenda they have questions like the approximation of the structures of their economic mechanisms, further development of direct ties between ministries, associations and enterprises involved in cooperation and the creation of joint firms. The guidelines set the task of finding new opportunities for developing cooperation for the rational use of scientific, technological and production potential, and the material, financial and labor resources of the socialist community countries so as to join efforts in solving the problems of intensification and creation of additional sources of commodity resources.

The experience in cooperation gained by the CMEA countries shows that the higher the mutual exactingness of our economic organizations in business relations the greater the success in solving the prime problems of enhancing efficiency and quality of workmanship. Economic ties between the states based on the principles of solidarity and fraternal mutual assistance need to be backed up with sound calculations resulting in mutual benefit. We regard the further deepening and improvement of all-round cooperation with the fraternal countries not only as an important factor of overall economic and social progress, but also as an effective means for strengthening the positions of socialism in the world economy and protecting the socialist countries against the impact of the unfavorable trends which are in evidence in the world capitalist economy.

While reckoning with these trends, the USSR has consistently advocated stable mutually advantageous ties with the capitalist countries and an extension of business relations in diverse forms. It is well worthwhile to emphasize in this context that the USSR and other socialist community countries have a stabilizing influence on the world market and the overall economic outlook. In the West European countries alone, the socialist countries' export orders provide jobs for nearly 2 million persons, so that no one can cast doubt on the mutual benefit of cooperation. Of special importance is the fact that business cooperation today is the economic basis for peace and an important factor working for good relations between nations, and a guarantee of the preservation and development of human civilization.

The Soviet Union's line of broad and all-round international cooperation remains unchanged, for it is our fundamental line reflecting the purposeful orientation of the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government toward efforts to avert war, deepen détente and mutual understanding among men and women of all nations and nationalities, and ensure the conditions for worldwide social progress.

We realize full well that fulfillment of the great program for economic and social development of Soviet society, put forward by the 26th con-

gress of the CPSU, will also require tremendous efforts and the solution of many complicated internal and international problems.

Just now the Central Committee of our party and the Soviet government have concentrated their attention on practical measures to realize the historic decisions of the party's 26th congress. The CPSU CC plenary meeting in November 1981 has taken the most important step: following the adoption of the economic policy for the 1980s by the congress, it has comprehensively analyzed and approved in the main the draft state plan for the USSR's economic and social development from 1981 to 1985. The plan expresses in concrete terms the propositions of the 26th congress, for the first half of the 1980s.

Much organizational work is under way. Special attention is being given to improving economic management and further developing the economic mechanism so that it should help to bring out more fully and use the tremendous potentialities of the society of mature socialism.

As Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th congress, we are optimists, we look to the future with confidence, because we have faith in the power of labor, in our country, in our people, because we have faith in our party and know that the road it is indicating is the only sure one. It leads to the realization of communist ideals.

U.S. imperialism in the real world

Gus Hall
General Secretary, CPUSA

THE MAIN THING IS TO FORCE REACTION INTO RETREAT

All political and economic developments in the United States must be seen in the framework of a special historical situation. The United States finds itself in a unique and unprecedented situation. It has never faced problems like the ones it now faces.

After the Second World War the United States emerged as the dominant world power. And for many reasons, including the fact that it was not devastated by war; on the contrary, it made profits — trillions of dollars from the war itself. U.S. banks and corporations penetrated the economies of the capitalist countries that had become weakened and ravaged by the war. They took over the resources and markets of

both war-time friend and foe. Another important factor was that it had the monopoly on the atomic bomb. The U.S. imperialist dream of world domination and huge superprofits became nearly intoxicating. Its centerpiece was the Dulles plan to "surround" and "roll back" socialism.

While U.S. imperialism does not openly proclaim it, it has never given up the plan for an "American Century." A consistent part of U.S. imperialist policy is to find a way to "roll back" the borders of socialism. There is great excitement in U.S. imperialist circles because of the events in Poland. The idea of "rolling back" socialism has taken on new meaning, so to speak new if ephemeral life.

The fact is that in the early post-war period

U.S. imperialism not only had plans but more than any other power in history it succeeded in gaining dominance and control over the economy in more areas of the world than any other power. Hitler never achieved anything like what U.S. imperialism did after the war.

But there is the old saying — that the best-laid plans of mice and men can go astray, and that is exactly what happened to U.S. imperialism. About 10 or 15 years ago the so-called "American Century" began to unravel, to fall apart, and a domino trend set in. Eisenhower spoke about the domino trend that was moving against the interests of U.S. imperialism.

Among the obstacles thrown in the path of U.S. world domination was the fact that the Soviet Union broke the atomic bomb monopoly. That was a most important development. Looking back, we may describe it as an event that changed the course of world history. It is difficult to imagine what the world would be like if the United States continued to have the monopoly on the atomic bomb.

When you consider that atomic bomb monopoly, you have to keep in mind that it was the U.S. government that used the bomb against civilian centers, and it had no qualms about doing so. Since then the United States has planned and threatened to use it some 30 times. Therefore, if it continued to have that monopoly we most likely would have had more Hiroshimas and Nagasakis.

During this same period the community of socialist countries emerged as a powerful counterforce to U.S. imperialism. This has been the central factor of world reality ever since. It established a new balance of world forces. Again, if there weren't the socialist counterforce, it would be impossible to imagine what the world would be like. The fact that the socialist community appeared in time and in great economic and military strength was decisive. It had a sobering effect on those who sought imperialist world domination.

Moreover, the countries under the rule of the old colonial empires did not shift into the U.S. orbit. U.S. imperialism definitely had plans to take over the areas that won independence from these empires. But most of the new states moved toward an independent position; and many established close relations with the socialist world. That also became a part of the world reality U.S. imperialism had a very difficult time with. It still has a great deal of trouble dealing with this reality.

The prolonged war and the defeat in Vietnam left a very deep imprint in the American consciousness because it was the first time in his-

tory that the USA had been defeated in a war. It not only left an imprint on the monopoly circles and the militarists, but also on the minds of the U.S. people generally. Millions of U.S. people had grown up with the idea that their country was the biggest, the best and undefeatable. This illusion was smashed in Vietnam. The shock effect of the defeat still remains.

Lastly, there was the fact that countries which suffered terrible setbacks in the Second World War rebuilt their economies and became competitors of the USA in the world market dealing still another blow at the dream of an "American Century."

Thus, a new situation was created.

In a sense, history dealt U.S. imperialism a heavy blow. What had been an expanding world power on the way to dominating the world became a country losing ground economically, politically and militarily. This is a fundamental and very painful shift for a country like the United States. U.S. imperialism remains the most powerful of the capitalist countries, but it is no more the unchallenged top dog.

There are many kinds of effects of this development in the United States, particularly in the economic sphere. For instance, for almost 100 years the USA had been number one in steel production. Now it is in third place, and this is very significant because the steel industry had always been the very nub of the economic structure in the United States.

The basic industry, steelmaking, tends to be phased out. Steelmaking from iron ore is being shifted by the multinationals to Taiwan, Mexico, Venezuela and other countries. This process can mean that the only steel production in the USA that will be left will be the small, highly technologically-advanced mills making steel from scrap iron. Steel towns are becoming ghost towns as the mills close down; chronic unemployment is higher now than it has ever been.

In automobile production the USA is now number two and in machine tools, number three. In machine tool technology, the United States is, in effect, far behind Japan, West Germany and other countries.

This new situation has created a major split in the ranks of U.S. monopoly capital. The split is over whether monopoly capital should recognize the new reality and adjust to it. Refusal to adjust means, for instance, trillion-dollar war budgets. And not all sections of monopoly capital are ready to assume such a huge burden. High military budgets result in high deficits, which in turn result in high in-

terest rates and inflation, which create economic problems for some sections of monopoly capital.

The 1982 \$700 billion dollar federal government budget which includes more than \$200 billion dollars for military purposes, is seriously out of balance with the level of economic development. Instead of adjusting to the new realities and new balance of world forces, the government continues to escalate military expenditures.

Besides the military budget there are items like the \$100 billion dollars that go annually to pay the interest on the money the government has borrowed from private banks. And this keeps increasing every year.

While making unprecedented profits, the monopolies pay less and less taxes. Twenty years ago taxes from the corporations took care of 24 per cent of the federal government budget. With the Reagan tax cut they will pay only 7 per cent of the budget. These policies are fanning the flames of inflation.

In the standard of living of the people, the wages of U.S. workers have dropped to third place in the capitalist world. This, of course, includes the effects of inflation. Take some dramatic figures relating to the standard of living of U.S. workers: 40 per cent of a worker's wages goes to pay taxes. A U.S. worker works from January 1 to May 15 just to pay taxes. Thirty per cent of a worker's wages goes for rent, for housing. Ten per cent goes for medical care: a hospital room, without doctors' fees and medicine costs, averages now over \$200 per day.

The big lie of the "Soviet threat" is the most expensive lie in the history of the United States. It amounts to trillions of dollars. And the cost is not only the military budgets. It is a major factor in pushing up inflation and taxes.

These developments have many side effects. The huge military budgets give the state a bigger role. The state becomes increasingly an instrument in the hands of the most powerful monopoly sectors. And virtually all phases of U.S. life become more dominated by the military-industrial complex.

The trillion-dollar military expenditures are speeding up the process of monopolization and militarization at a tremendous rate. And with such military budgets, increasingly, the military-industrial complex becomes a bigger factor in the operations of the state. The growing leverage of the military does not, however, change the funda-

mental structure of U.S. state-monopoly capitalism.

President Ronald Reagan was supported mainly by those who are not ready to adjust to the new realities of the world. His main financial support came from such elements and he campaigned on the basis that America cannot accept or adjust to the new world situation.

But their arguments for not adjusting are on wrong grounds. They are not based on objective developments but on illusions. For instance, they say the United States is a declining power for subjective reasons and that there are no objective factors in the world that cause the United States to decline. They ignore the ravages resulting from the deepening general crisis of capitalism. Reagan's backers say the United States has lost ground for mainly three reasons: one is poor leadership, and therefore with strong leadership the USA would not be in a decline. Second, the United States taxes the rich and corporations too heavily. Third, the military budgets have been too low.

So the Reagan administration has set out to correct these "three weaknesses" said to be the cause of the U.S. decline.

The concept of "strong leadership" translates into war-like statements. Those in power think that this is the way to show the world the USA is not weak. They have been trying to achieve this since the election. They compete with each other to see who can sound more warlike. They actually think this is going to correct one of the weaknesses and the USA will emerge as the dominant world power.

They think the world will accept and follow the new U.S. charge that all socialist countries, all national liberation movements are "international terrorists."

This "international terrorism" campaign is for the purpose of creating an atmosphere that will justify the war buildup and military aggression against national liberation movements. Because if they could convince the American people that all national liberation movements are "international terrorists" that would justify aggressive acts against "terrorists."

Of course, it is ironic that this kind of campaign is being conducted by a government involved in assassination plots throughout the world. For instance, there is absolute proof the CIA was involved in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and in the murder of former Chilean Ambassador to the USA Orlando Letelier, in

the very heart of Washington, D.C., the seat of the federal government. And it is public knowledge that the CIA has worked for years planning attempts on Fidel Castro's life.

Now, the second question. There is a mania about spending money for the military. They think they can achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union by literally shovelling billions and trillions to the Pentagon. It is a military spending fanaticism — an insanity — that has taken hold of the Reagan administration. There are no substantive reasons for the amounts they propose or arguments as to what they are needed for. And as Leonid Brezhnev said, "To try to outstrip each other in the arms race and expect to win a nuclear war is dangerous madness."

The Reagan administration has cut taxes further for the rich and corporations. In fact, big corporations like Exxon and General Motors haven't paid any taxes for years. To offset the trillions for war there are the Reagan cuts in the people's standard of living. Not since the Roosevelt administration — the New Deal days — has there been an open government policy such as today's to cut the living standard of the people. This new policy of state-monopoly capitalism appears both in the United States and Great Britain. We are now seeing the end of Keynesian economics that has been an economic factor in major capitalist countries.

State-monopoly capitalism is shifting away from a policy of concessions. While the United States has been moving in that direction since the Nixon administration, slowly, one step at a time, the Reagan administration is taking a big leap.

The excuse for cutting the standard of living of the people is that if you cut consumption the supply will go up and, therefore, it will become a pressure against inflation. Of course that's false, because monopoly now has such control over prices that cutting consumption will not bring prices down or basically influence inflation one way or the other.

There are attempts to interpret Reagan's election as a right-wing reactionary landslide. The fact is that Reagan was elected by less than 25 per cent of the electorate. The New York Times and CBS (Columbia Broadcasting System) took a poll of voters as they came out of the voting booth. Half of those who said they voted for Reagan, said they did not agree with Reagan's conservative views but were desperate to get rid of Carter. Therefore, if less than 25% of the electorate voted for Reagan and half of those don't agree with his views and policies, it certainly does not provide a mass base or a

mandate for his reactionary policies. On the contrary, it provides the broadest base for struggle against Reagan's policies, which contrast increasingly with the realities of both the USA and the world.

The proposals for peace and disarmament presented at the 26th CPSU Congress are an important part of the new reality. The decisions of the congress, an important event that strongly influenced the thinking of people in many countries, have a tremendous significance and effect on the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and on developments in the United States.

What lends a very special meaning to the theses set out in comrade Brezhnev's report and repeated more than once afterward is that they make it difficult for the Reagan administration to speak about a "Soviet threat," since the Soviet Union presents concrete proposals for peace, disarmament, détente, resumption of the political dialogue and a summit with the U.S. leadership.

There is a domestic backlash developing, an important movement of rank and file trade unionists, a new mass upsurge. Marches to Washington, D.C. are now almost a weekly occurrence. There is great motion in the Afro-American community. It started because of the racist policies of the Reagan administration. And the section of monopoly capital that has always been for adjusting to the new reality is beginning to speak up. This is sharpening the rifts in monopoly circles. Such divisions are very important when they coincide with mass struggles and movements.

The farmers don't like grain embargoes; they don't like the idea of using food as a political weapon because it is not profitable for farmers. And the corporations dealing in technology don't like embargoes on technology because it affects their profits. These become pressures on the administration. One can assume that the pressures will continue to build against the policies of confrontation and toward policies of negotiations and détente.

In this situation, even what is called the "China card" does not look as promising as it did about a year ago. The huge trade agreements that appeared on the horizon have faded into Maoist rhetoric instead of materializing into big trade deals.

In this connection, there is a new development of the issue of hegemony. There is a growing U.S. imperialist hegemony in relations with both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China. Increasingly, the ideology and policy of Maoism serve U.S. imperialist ideology and

policy. The United States has arrangements with the PRC on joint intelligence operations. But these operations are dominated by the CIA. U.S. electronic surveillance equipment for use against the Soviet Union is now stationed in China. The U.S.-China military agreements are under the hegemony of the Pentagon. Financial arrangements are under the hegemony of U.S. banks. This is a serious development, especially for the people of China but also for the world generally. It is a dangerous situation because U.S. hegemonic influence will create further problems for China's internal development.

Because of the Reagan administration's policy, the world faces greater dangers now. A wounded animal becomes particularly dangerous when pushed into a corner. In a sense U.S. imperialism is wounded and hence dangerous.

The more immediate danger is around Central America — El Salvador, Nicaragua. Even more immediate is the danger of using reactionary forces in other countries of the region. The CIA is working overtime to set up these reactionary forces. It is arming them with the idea of sending them into El Salvador, Nicaragua and Cuba. Nor can the danger of direct military intervention by U.S. forces be ruled out.

The new danger comes from the increasing arming of reactionary forces around the world. The Carter administration was moving in this direction during its last two years. But they covered it up. They denied they were giving arms to the counter-revolutionary forces in Afghanistan and Angola. The Reagan administration is continuing the same policies. The difference is that it is publicly admitting what it is doing.

As far as a major confrontation with the Soviet Union is concerned, the plans of the Reagan administration move in the direction of developing nuclear military superiority. They consider that quantitative development of older arms systems is not enough. Therefore much of the huge military budgets will go for crash programs to achieve technological breakthroughs which they believe will provide the basis of military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The new strategic military concept is to build for wars, primarily directed against newly liberated and developing countries, while preparing the new technology for the "historic confrontation with the Soviet Union."

On the U.S. domestic front, there are some new dangers besides the war danger. Racism is definitely on the rise and the Reagan administration is pushing all its forms and practices.

There are some new proposals against the rights of trade unions — strike-breaking by the government is now an everyday occurrence. There are forces in the USA who are most rabid against the right to strike and work at passing laws against striking workers and the right to strike. This anti-union activity includes using the military force and issuing court injunctions against strikers. But these are the very same forces who support strikes in Poland. There is some real irony in this situation.

In assessing U.S. imperialism, we always have to keep in mind that imperialism never retreats on its own. It retreats only when it is forced to. It retreats when it is confronted with a united movement. When there is unity it retreats; when there is disunity imperialism takes advantage and moves in. This elementary idea has not sunk deep enough roots in enough places and it is not given the necessary priority in the world movement.

History shows that the decline of U.S. imperialism is the result of retreats, forced retreats. U.S. imperialism did not want to get out of Vietnam. It was forced to by the power of the Vietnamese struggle, by the power of mass movements and public opinion. The mass movement and public opinion in the United States played a very decisive role. The U.S. peace movement was a majority movement that lasted for years. It is necessary to measure the political significance of such phenomena on the basis that they were movements against one's own country's imperialism. It was a movement of the U.S. majority against U.S. imperialism, a movement of the people of the USA against their own country's imperialism. It is much easier to be against imperialism in general or against some other country's imperialism.

The new administration will try to move in many reactionary directions. But it will also be forced to back down on many fronts. Struggle can turn its maneuvers into retreats.

The ideological struggle is an essential part of the struggle for unity against imperialism. Because of the nature of U.S. imperialism, we cannot afford to play games with ideological questions. We cannot overlook or minimize the class aspects of our reality. The class struggle is in the very center of everything in the United States. It affects everything. We would ignore it at our own peril. To minimize the issues of the class struggle is to excuse and cover up for the capitalist class.

We cannot afford to play games with the struggle against racism. That is a major question in the United States. There are left move-

ments that try to go around the question of racism. We have to face it head on, ideologically and in concrete terms of the struggle against inequality. Therefore, our party has a very principled position. Again, this is not unique or limited to our party.

We also cannot afford to play games with anti-Sovietism because it is the main ideological pillar of U.S. imperialism. We do not try to opportunistically "use" anti-Sovietism. As with everything else, you must deal with the truth. We must tell the truth about the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is impermissible and a violation of the truth to spread falsehoods about the Soviet Union for any reason. Experience also shows that in the long run the use of anti-Sovietism backfires.

We go even a step further than not "using" anti-Soviet falsehoods. Because we are partisans of socialism we will not even use weaknesses that existing socialism may have. You can deal with a weakness in a socialist country in two ways. You can deal with it as a partisan of socialism. You can discuss it with the comrades and help to correct a weakness. You may become convinced there is no weakness where you thought there might have been one. Or you can pick up a real weakness or a falsehood or slander and go to the capitalist mass media and criticize and holler about it in order to make yourself look and sound "autonomous," "non-partisan." This is not an effective way to fight anti-communism, to say the least.

The "benefits" of opportunism are illusory. They have a way of "coming home to roost." The steps toward opportunism are relatively easy. The struggle to overcome their effects is much more difficult.

A party wins its support by fighting for the self-interests of the people of its country, not by fakery. That is our basic position. We will fight for the interests of the people of the United States, the working class of the United States. We take a principled position against U.S. imperialism. On this basis we gain the support of our people.

We believe that just as it is impossible to be just a little bit pregnant, it is also impossible to be just a little bit anti-Soviet. Once you play this game there is no end to it. Therefore, we take our principled position and deal only with the truth. We are for flexibility in tactics. But we are very watchful about tactics sliding into positions of opportunism. We have experienced that in our party. Browderism started with certain tactical innovations which were necessary. But afterward it adopted a pro-monopoly position.

Our party continues to be a small party. While it continues to grow slowly, our influence grows much faster than our actual size. One of the reasons for this is that while there are no laws now that forbid membership in the Communist Party, we are not a fully legal organization because the atmosphere, the role of the FBI and the CIA, prevents us from operating as a fully legal, public organization. Therefore, the majority of our members do not function as open members of the Communist Party, much as they would like to do so.

We know we are heading into a period of sharp, intense struggles. There will be bitter class battles. However, we also know there can be no victories without struggles. So there will be sharper struggles, but there will also be victories because of them.

The Santa Fé seducers

Volodia Teitelboim
CC Political Commission Member,
Communist Party of Chile

HOW THEY WANT TO TAKE LATIN AMERICAN INTELLECTUALS FOR A RIDE

On August 6, 1981, exactly 36 years after the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, U.S. President Ronald Reagan ordered the production of the neutron bomb. It is said to be "clean," for it leaves behind practically no ruins — only corpses. It is merciful and selective. Somebody called it a "capitalist bomb": it does not hit real

estate, quailing and humbling itself before it. It destroys people, not things. The population vanishes; cities remain as vast cemeteries. A mysterious, ominously silent and chilling reality, where time has come to a halt, everybody is dead, and there is nobody to dig the graves: the impression is of a gigantic crypt, or of a world suddenly fallen asleep. Having used the bomb in the best manner, one can achieve an original aim: a world free of people but abounding in things nobody needs, for there is nobody to use

them. Things will destroy and outlive the people who made them. In the view of Egon Bahr,¹ the neutron bomb, which can cleanse the planet of the impurity called humankind, is the most dramatic symbol of depraved human thought.

The White House decision brings, in the first place, the whole of Europe face to face with a cataclysm. But Latin America, too, is not forgotten in this game. That this is not the invention of communists is shown by a secret document² prepared by the so-called Committee of Santa Fé and made public last year. It has recently been commented on in *WMR*.³ We should like to draw attention to those of its theses and provisions that concern intellectuals one way or another.

Its very foreword arouses alarm. In a global war, it says, the fight must also be for people's minds. Ideology and politics are one of the basic elements of the battle for Latin America; the United States should regain the initiative and prove that while seemingly so different the two Americas are in fact not all that dissimilar. It is alleged that the ideals of private enterprise, political freedom and moderate patriotism inherited from Greek culture, Roman law and Judeo-Christian ethics are common to the English and Spanish-speaking Americas.

A loose word, culture casts a spell. For its sake, in the opinion of the Santa Fé experts, peoples and nations preserve and continue their past, and even go beyond it. And he who controls culture and its inalienable element — education — may not only retrospectively assess the past of America but also control its future. The future, sings the invisible chorus of Presidential advisers, is created in the minds and made by the hands of those who are being molded today. Consequently, the USA should waste no time taking the ideological initiative. The main thing is to stimulate in Latin America a system of education fostering a sense of cultural identity among the population of the entire continent: it would inject idealism that would serve as the instrument for survival. This puzzling aphorism becomes clearer when one takes the neutron bomb into account and the fact that the document's entire "philosophy" rests on the postulate that war is natural to mankind. On this basis they have programmed a shock, an atomic cleansing of the planet, its conversion into a Realm of the Dead. The Santa Fé group cultivates the strategy of Herostratus, but instead of razing the temple to Artemis of Ephesus they are out to incinerate the globe in the nuclear furnace of a third world war. What role are they contemplating for intellectuals in

this project? Nothing less than the performers of a funeral march!

The Santa Fé experts acknowledge that they will fail to dominate the thinking of Latin Americans if intellectuals do not serve their interests. And they suggest a sort of Faust-Mephistopheles pact far less eloquent and gracefully written than Goethe's original version.

What sort of intellectual is wanted by the U.S. experts? Such a one as can write and speak but lacks a personal opinion. Or even better — a mute from a country of mutes. A person riddled by corruption and demoralization, convinced that the world is doomed, and incapable of being anything else. A person with a fossilized mind like the hard rock of a lunar world, rejecting any idea of development and progress as totally useless. In other words, they want a type who would accept a putrid existence, to quote Hegel, having in mind everything beyond dialectical development.

What sort of intellectual do they not want? Such as has a sense of moral responsibility; pays no homage to the neutron bomb; does not succumb to imperialism's ideological subterfuges; does not slump into despair like Calderon's Sigismund imprisoned in the Tower; does not walk along the obscure path of desertion; and does not profess the debilitating utopia of those who realize their own social impotence.

Through the millenia the celestial and imperial forces have feared the blunt-spoken intellectual. Zeus had no liking for Hephaestus, an unconventional deity impelled by curiosity and rebellion. According to Homer, he comported himself unseemingly on Olympus, breaking its traditional calm, and like Prometheus knew how to handle fire. Celestial and imperial forces do not trust this factory of imagination, the insatiable creator and experimenter, the seeker of profound truths.

The Santa Fé academics show a loathing for those who have dedicated themselves to the defense of humanism, for those who call for the liberation of peoples. They are afraid of free thought, of genuine literature and art that contain an inflammable charge of energy. They dread the storms that may be started by an honest book or other work of art. And they propose a doctrine of corruption along the principle that gods depart while capital remains. As they see it, the task is to win over or neutralize everybody they can, to erect a wall of silence, to organize a vacuum around those who refuse to bargain with Mephistopheles.

It is suggested that the hunt for the Latin

American intellectual should be conducted by plan and with account of all possibilities. It is important that he should renounce his own self, forget surrounding reality and his own role in history. This would be "freedom." The intellectual would be free to seek refuge in esoteric talk, but he must be of a mind favoring the "free" world, the father of which is imperialism.

Imperialism creates, inherits and reproduces fascism, borrowing from Nietzsche his man-hating idea that man is something that must be surmounted.

As the Hungarian philosopher Gyorgy Lukacs pointed out, fascism's creed lies in bellicose irrationalism (with a dose of specific practice) embodied in murder and bloodbaths. It cannot emerge on barren ground; it needs nourishment from violently reactionary pseudo-philosophy.

The starting point, say the Sante Fé advisers, *should be a campaign of flirtation with the Ibero-American intellectual elite by means of radio, television, books, articles and newsletters, as well as foundations, scholarships and prizes.* Faust sold his soul to prolong his youth; the present-day demons simply offer a purchase-and-sale contract. They see literature not as a means of reflecting life and creating cultural values but merely as an instrument of corruption.

The intention is to buy the intellectual in the market. Before the intelligentsia becomes a member of the crew or a passenger on the ship of mad subversives it must be "saved from perdition" with dollar injections and flattered in vanity fair. The latter-day demons are convinced that they know the stuff (cheap, in their view) the Latin American intelligentsia is made of. And cynically declare that *praise and recognition are what the intelligentsia thirst for, and this sort of program can attract it.* What they mean is a financial operation, payment for man's (in this case, the intellectual's) total alienation from himself and society, for his conversion into a commodity. The aim is to expropriate the intellectual, in other words, to divest him of his basic human values, to turn his soul into a monstrosity, as the French poet Arthur Rimbaud wrote.

The imperialist breviary underscores the significance of refinement. Bearing in mind the old (1914) admonition of the Peruvian statesman Francisco Garcia Calderon that Latin Americans are sensitive to form and that nothing jars more upon them than the uncouthness of the Washington politicians, the grey wolves of Santa Fé advise using the guiles of

diplomacy and abstractions of the beyond, not only lauding New York and Hollywood, but also speaking of convictions and philosophy. Dissembling and contradicting themselves, they allege there is no other way for the survival and prosperity of the two Americas than an embrace of the North and South.

Why are they looking for the support of the Latin American intelligentsia? With monumental cynicism the authors of the document speak of their intentions and aims. For instance, they assert: "War, not peace, is the norm in international affairs." Nothing can be clearer. During the cold war, three decades ago, the Chilean poetess Gabriela Mistral spoke against ideas of this kind, denouncing those who called the world "accursed." In present-day political vocabulary this kind of abuse is extended to the word "détente." "Détente is dead."

Hence, the dilemma: "America must seize the initiative or perish." And they endeavor to foist upon the world the belief that World War III has broken out.

In their bid to break the Latin American intelligentsia spiritually, the Santa Fé soothsayers have recourse to intimidation, stressing that "Latin America and Southern Asia are the scenes of strife of the third phase of World War III." This situation, they explain, is due neither to political nor socio-economic causes, nor to imperialism's drive for world supremacy. Its mainspring, they allege, is that the world is in a "metaphysical" crisis. An astounding deduction! The Sante Fé braintrust asserts that humankind is on the brink of an abyss on account of its inability to protect its basic values and beliefs, on account of indecision.

Consequently, we are reaping the fruits of the "metaphysical crisis." Among its components they identify the probable loss of the petroleum of the Middle East, the interdiction of the sea routes spanning the Indian Ocean, and uncertainty over the mineral resources of southern Africa, to say nothing of what is seen as the "Finlandization" of Western Europe and the exclusiveness of Japan.

The character of the "metaphysical crisis" is brought to light most distinctly in the reference to the Caribbean, which, the document anxiously notes, "is becoming a Marxist-Leninist lake." Here self-criticism translates into self-flagellation. Never, these hypocrites assert, has U.S. foreign policy "abused, abandoned and betrayed its allies to the south in Latin America" to such a degree. The word "allies" sounds like the soothing gurgle of a crystal-clear brook. But it is not hard to see who is

meant: Pinochet, Stroessner and their ilk.

At the top of its voice the Santa Fé Committee urges the Latin American intelligentsia to sound the tocsin. To frustrate cunning designs it is vital to resurrect the Monroe Doctrine,⁴ to be more exact, to refurbish it because the former variant had no aim other than to prevent the expansion of the Old World with its wars, alliances, and revolutions. More specifically, intellectuals are invited to act against Cuba, Nicaragua and the people of El Salvador for the sake of U.S. global domination, the foundation of which, according to Reagan's advisers, consists of the Caribbean and Latin America.

In the document allegorical language sometimes gives way to the brevity of bank checks or gunshots. Without the shadow of embarrassment it is maintained that "Latin America, like Western Europe and Japan, is part of America's power base."

The Committee of Santa Fé offers special recommendations for U.S. actions in Latin America in the 1980s, which it calls "the dangerous 1980s." Of these recommendations, the central is that all channels (peaceful and non-peaceful) bringing the people to power have to be closed in every country.

In the language of metaphors the authors of the memorandum write of an alliance that troubles them with special anxiety: they speak of Marxism's marriage to nationalism in unstable Latin America. They urge ethical realism with the purpose of sustaining U.S. domination in the Western Hemisphere; they write that the Western Hemisphere "is still one-half of the globe" and that the USA is one-half of the Americas.

One-half of the Americas is called upon to rule the other half. This idea is not new. Had not Herman Melville, author of *Moby Dick* and creator of the mythical White Whale, advanced the idea in the 19th century that Americans were a chosen people carrying the torch of freedom, the Israel of our epoch? Had not an American President, John Adams, said that the United States of America was created by Providence for the great mission of enlightening the rest of humankind? In the name of Manifest Destiny this "chosen nation," brandishing the so-called torch of freedom and "in obedience to the mandate of the Heavens," carried out 180 acts of aggression in the Caribbean, the "North American lake," in the period from 1800 through 1934.

It is no novelty for the imperialists to falsify history. They inscribe the names of outstanding Latin Americans in their roll of honor, thereby implying that they were advocates of Manifest

Destiny. In order to justify their recommendations and seeking to give them a moral foundation, the document's authors offer fatuous comparisons without a twinge of conscience: "The dreams of Simon Bolivar and Thomas Jefferson are as valid today as they were in 1826."

However, the intelligentsia should be under no illusion that it is the principal target in the plans of seduction drawn up by Reagan's experts. The armed forces are their rainbow and ideal in Latin America. The sword is valued more than the book. Not poetry, music, the ballet, nor philosophy, but the army will help to find a way out of the "metaphysical crisis." They recommend cultivating, above all, not cultural exchanges but "traditional military ties" by training and assisting Latin American militarists. Not surprisingly, the military theme inspires the Santa Fé advisers more. For them there is nothing better than a dictator with shoulder-straps, and no more profitable business than training officers in U.S. academies. This is stated without beating about the bush. The benefits are manifest.

However, not all Latin American military suit them. One is mentioned with obvious antipathy. He is, or to be more exact, was Omar Torrijos. His administration is characterized as having been a "left wing and brutally aggressive dictatorship." Is not the tragic death of this Panamanian general in an air crash linked to this characterization? Among other things, Reagan's court advisers cannot forgive Torrijos for having led the movement for the restoration of his country's sovereign rights to the Panama Canal. In Proposal 4 they advocate the annulment of the canal treaties and placing the canal under the control of the Inter-American Defense Board, a specialized agency of the Organization of American States.

The document does not pass over some ill-fated civilians in silence. One of them is Jaime Roldos, Ecuador's President only last year, who likewise died in an unexplained air disaster. In a section headed *Internal Subversion*, specifically Proposal 1, it is stated in black and white that the "Roldos Doctrine . . . must be condemned." Why? Roldos wanted human rights, preached by Carter, to be upgraded from the sphere of lyricism and theatrical spectacles to the realm of political reality. The top echelon of the State Department sees this as criminal. The dictatorships on the continent should not be irritated by even a hint of criticism. The White House now gives them its pontifical blessing.

From this follows a new conclusion: the people's struggle, the movement for national

liberation, anti-imperialist policy, and international terrorism are sides of one and the same coin. The struggle of the Salvadoran people for social justice and peace in their country is international terrorism. The label of brigandage is tagged to the actions of Latin American peoples suffering under the tyranny of dictatorships or repressive regimes and upholding their lawful right to sovereignty, self-determination, freedom and democracy. The same label is tagged to the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua. On the contrary, the Pinochet junta, which sent thugs to assassinate General Carlos Prats, the former commander-in-chief of the Chilean Army, in Buenos Aires, and Orlando Letelier, the former Chilean Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the USA, in Washington almost within sight of the White House and Capitol Hill, has nothing in common with international terrorism.

In the view of the Santa Fé pundits, there is danger in any proposal for socio-economic changes in countries of the Western Hemisphere. They claim that no distinct line can be drawn between reform, progress and a cataclysmic communist revolution. Anybody raising the question of changes, whether church-affiliated groups or "other so-called human rights lobbies," the memorandum declares in lucid language, contributes to "overthrowing authoritarian, but pro-U.S. governments."

The USA should define its foreign policy in accordance with a roll of denunciations drawn up in advance. One should be directed at the "liberation theology" used by some sections of the Latin American clergy. Another, against the Church disseminating ideas hindering the establishment of unchallenged rule by the transnationals.

The Santa Fé document recommends not only ways and means of saving Latin America from itself, from the horrible dangers lurking in its internal deficiencies. It contains admonitions addressed directly to the USA, recommending that it abandon its naive, chimerical, hopeless aspiration to implant in Latin America its own style as an alternative to authoritarian governments. Moreover, it should dissociate itself once and for all from the fixed ideas that changes are needed. It should take a different principle as its point of departure, namely, that in Latin America changes are not inevitable; more, they are undesirable and clash with the interests of the USA.

A flash-in-the-pan, like Carter's human rights campaign, is also anathematized. It, too, has been entered into the register of vile failings, for it affects stability and security in the region.

What we see is a steep turn toward the traditional cult of pragmatism with its iron fist slightly camouflaged with a mantle of moral admonition. It is pompously called a *policy of political and ethical realism*.

The supporting argument for this is that Argentines, Chileans and Brazilians find it repugnant that the United States exhibits moral outrage at the killing of a terrorist. For the Santa Fé group the drama of Latin America is that any Latin American "who picks up a Molotov cocktail in the name of human rights is human-righteous." Indeed, a rare enunciation of Latin American problems! But there is total silence about terrorism condoned by the state, about death sown by men in military uniforms, by the AAA and death squads⁵ that continue to hunt down people for covert but nonetheless known aims. Not a word is said about this terrorism.

People, it is said, should not lose hope for there would come a day, the Day of Judgment, when communism is wiped off the face of the continent. Then, and only then, "there will be ample opportunity to promote respect for concrete civil liberties and actual economic betterment for all the people of the Americas." But before the advent of the Day of Judgment (we repeat: on Marxism-Leninism) and in order to assure its advent, there are things to be done. For instance, to increase the nuclear arsenal on the territory of European friends and put a hand into the immensely rich oil pocket of Latin America. The philanthropist keeps his counting machine running while whispering flattering words to Mexico, Venezuela and Ecuador, which have the irresistible charm of being major oil producers. He thirsts for oil with an eye to profits today but does not, of course, forget the future. What future? He sees the future in war. If Latin America intends to assume its place in the defense of the West, it should modernize. Analogous modernization for the defense of the West should be started by an extra-continental country mentioned affectionately in the document, namely China.

They have not omitted mentioning food as yet another instrument of pressure. Thank God, say the Reagan experts, that four of the world's seven major food producers — Canada, the USA, Brazil and Argentina — are situated in the Western Hemisphere. Then follows a recommendation revealing the depth of the pious sentiments motivating the document. Agreement should be reached with Australia and New Zealand and then, by holding up supplies, the USA could pressure any unsubmitive nation. The idea is pushed that food may be used

as an instrument that can quickly compel an adversary to surrender.

And yet, man does not live by bread alone. He sometimes needs a breath of the fresh air of freedom controlled, of course, by a "free" trade union movement such as the North American AFL-CIO or, last but not least, free enterprise. The opportunities it holds out are so broad and generous that they can help to appease hunger and put a shirt on poverty — problems that are unsightly but acute in many American countries. To end hunger among the poor there is no better remedy than to make the rich richer. The Santa Fé medics therefore prescribe encouraging direct national and foreign investments in Latin American industry.

Matter and spirit are constantly fused. The continent must be monolithic. Consequently, the United States should promote private enterprise by bringing together the English and Spanish-speaking Americas.

And all this in the name of the glory and weal of the transnationals. However, why not make a token curtsy to the middle classes, assure them that the USA will help them survive by preventing their absorption by the big monopolies? The assurance of a cat guarding a butcher's shop!

When the situation requires the adoption of not very dainty measures, the Santa Fé textbook advises sweetening them with superlatives. For instance, it suggests a subtle interpretation of philosophy and history, of the special destiny of the New World or Western Hemisphere seen (even if only politically) as a highly unique region to be distinguished from the Old World. Why not say more perfect than Europe that has grown so senile that even Marxism rules a good half of its countries. In other words, we are advised to cherish a continental chimera, to accept as truth the blatant lie that there is hemispheric unity, to accept the centaur, the mythical half-man and half-horse, meaning Latin America, with U.S. imperialism as the man.

The imperialists make the allowance that this recommendation may be regarded sceptically. However, in this case it will be not the USA but Latin America which will be to blame for giving preference to base, specific interests. But understand the Santa Fé academics correctly. In itself, they believe, the national spirit is not a pathology; but it should be rejected if it conflicts with the highest idea — the idea of hemispheric unity. Under Washington's wise leadership this idea is, if not perfect, then at least practicable, provided, of course, the error made nearly two centuries ago in the war for the independence of Latin America, is rectified. It

has to be conceded that the concept of hemispheric unity has not attained the desired perfection. But this must be accepted philosophically, as a process, in other words, as an aspiration for what is always both unattainable and insuperable.

The appeal to the shadow of Simon Bolivar in "academic calculations" is futile. The liberator distinctly formulated the idea of unity as the need for a political federation of former Spanish America in the face of the threat of U.S. territorial expansion. Many historians have noted that Bolivar denounced Washington for denying support for the cause of Spanish American independence. In the famous "Letter from Jamaica"⁷ he wrote that the USA had adopted the stance of a silent onlooker of this most just struggle.

To top it all, an attempt is made to portray as of a like mind a personality who was the first to call for Latin America's intellectual independence. In a chronicle dedicated to the Venezuelan enlightener Andres Bello, the great Cuban José Martí wrote: "I see him as the tamer of the eagle, the teacher of Bolivar; and the disciple of the prophet, a pupil of Humboldt." Martí studied the experience of Europe in order to help America become itself, i.e., distinct from the Old World. Efforts are now being made to reverse the process begun by Bello — to deprive our culture of its originality.

On paper the Santa Fé pen-pushers are prepared to admit that the Americas are plural, that there are distinctions in political institutions, history and culture. But above these distinctions they set the integrating factor of geography, shared historical experience, similar aspirations, in other words, a community of interests, dangers and opportunities.

It would be more correct to say that the American nations, beginning with Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada, do not believe in geographical fatalism. Their culture, history, common needs and formidable dangers (almost always brought by the wind from the North) make it imperative to uphold sovereignty, independence and integration within the framework not of the hemisphere but of Latin America.

At a masquerade of forgeries it does not do to present pro-imperialist regimes unembellished. They have to be given a face-lift, portrayed as democratic and representative, whether they like it or not. But however these regimes are embellished, we know a continental alliance implies an alliance between repressive dictatorships and the Pentagon.

U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig has

declared that the new policy toward military regimes in South America, including Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay, is linked to the advances made by these regimes in the sphere of human rights. The Reagan administration has instructed its delegates in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Inter-American Bank for Development to vote for credits to these countries to the tune of more than \$400 million.

Actually, there has been no improvement in the human rights situation. In Chile repression has intensified compared with past years. A crime in Calama recently got publicity even in the North American press. It was commented on by the Colombian writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez in an article headed "In Chile as in Chicago," which attracted worldwide attention with its exposure of the junta's real face. What happened was the following. Pinochet's secret police informed the manager and cashier of a State Bank branch in northern Chile that an exercise imitating a bank hold-up would be staged. Fiction became reality. Pinochet's agents murdered the two officials, blowing up their bodies with dynamite, and stole more than a million dollars from the safe. The official version is that the robbery was an inside job. In fact it was orchestrated by high officials of the sinister DINA-CNI, which has put thousands of Chileans to death and tortured more than a hundred thousand persons. Two of these officials hold senior rank in the army.

Nevertheless, soon after the crime in Calama, General Pinochet declared that "this organization (DINA-CNI — V.T.) is clean." During these same days, with tears streaming out of his eyes, he decorated General Wallace Nutting, Commander of the U.S. Southern Army Group, with the "Grand Cross of Military Merit." He then received the U.S. Ambassador to the UN Jeanne Kirkpatrick, who in a burst of feeling called him the model and example for other rulers in the hemisphere. Indeed, with people like Pinochet imperialism can "sleep peacefully." For its part, imperialism sets great store by Pinochet.

It is therefore hardly surprising that there is an intimate alliance between Washington and reactionary dictatorships in Latin America. And this despite the fact that the relevant committees of the U.S. Congress are in possession of information that political repression is on the upgrade in Chile and other Latin American states, where more and more people are being arrested, tortured or harassed.

There is now no need for the Reagan administration to stand on ceremony where

human rights or liberal democratic concepts are concerned. It prefers brute force. A military dictatorship as such is seen as legitimate because it best of all fits into the global plans of the Santa Fé experts. As far as they are concerned the ideal is a regime that makes a cult of repression and militarizes power. In other words, they want the model of latter-day dependent neofascism based on abuse of authority, aggressive nationalism and militarism (for instance, war against its own people), and living off the myth of a Creole fuehrer. In turn, the USA is the principal external mainstay of local neofascism in vast zones of Latin America, especially the south. The role that under German and Italian fascism was played by the nazi or fascist party is here played by the armed forces. Persecution, corruption and assaults on culture alternate, widen and complement each other. The banks and monopoly capital offer themselves for the role of patron of the "arts" servile to them.

Pinochet is continuing his ritual of arrests, tortures and exiles, invoking his own concept of "national security." But he can hardly claim the copyright. Washington has been using this bugbear decade after decade. In June of last year the U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger held one of his conferences on "national security." In his interpretation it spells out *world hegemony* attainable by nuclear war. Somebody called this stupendous but unfeasible. Yes, it is stupendous but in the sense that it can become a horrible nightmare for billions of people. It is unreal, for in a nuclear war there will be no victor. Pinochet and other Latin American puppets likewise want to be seen as philosophers. Repression is their tribute to their patron, who "plays a game of missiles."

The concluding part of the Santa Fé document has the ring of an epic. "Certainly, in war," it specifies, "there is no substitute for victory; and the United States is engaged in World War III . . . Latin America is vital to the United States: America's global power projection has always rested upon a cooperative Caribbean and a supportive South America." For a refrain it repeats the virulent words: "Détente is dead." Nothing has been omitted in the diabolic plans. Thus, in addition to falsifying the idea of a Panama congress,⁷ which was advanced long ago by Bolivar, the schemers advise moving the headquarters of the Organization of American States from Washington to Panama. What is the motivation? It shines through the nebulous wording of this recommendation: to "inter-Americanize the Panama Canal," or, to be more precise, to return

it to full U.S. control and set up so-called defense and cover forces.

The USA poses as the ally and patron of Latin American nations and, what is even more touching, declares condescendingly that it alone can "help preserve Hispanic-American culture from sterilization by international Marxist materialism."

Hispanic-American intellectuals have thus been served notice. The intentions are clear, and the plan is exhaustive. The response must be similarly clear, as must be the protest by the intelligentsia of Latin America and the Caribbean, the intelligentsia that is part and parcel of the people. Our actions can be directly proportionate to the dimensions of the threat, the seriousness of the plan itself, and the actions being taken in accordance with the Santa Fé recommendations underlying Reagan's Latin American policy. Humankind has been given life not for self-destruction but to learn to live in peace. We protest against universal death.

True, literature has never had the last word. But the time has come for it to say no, to whisper or exclaim like Neruda: "This must not happen. Awake, wood-cutter!"

We are on the threshold of the year 2000. It would probably not be superfluous to glance at Latin America's future across the borders of the visible. To do so means to show a sense of responsibility and far-sightedness. Despite the scepticism of the French writer Jean de la Bruyere, let us prove that this ability is less rare than diamonds and pearls and is motivated by conscious need in the face of something appalling.

A host of facts indicate that what we have before us is not a revolting, to be more exact, diabolical experiment but a coldly-conceived political plan turned over for realization into the sinister hands of the strongest capitalist power.

Within the scope of our possibilities we should understand what is taking place. And we should do so not as futurologists; but as ordinary people we should point out the terrible threat harbored in the Santa Fé project. The answer cannot, of course, be given by a symposium of intellectuals. It must be based on the unity of thought and common actions of all Latin American peoples. But already today we should react, for example, to that section of the document which speaks in allegorical, pontifical and moralistic language of the purchase and sale of intellectuals.

The continent stretching from Mexico to the Antarctic must think today not only of current but also of tomorrow's problems, of the 21st century. It will not resolve them if it hides behind the back of the rest of the world, and much less in isolation from the revolutionary movements in other latitudes.

In the 20th century, revolution has spread across a large part of the planet. It lives and matures in countries of our hemisphere. This process cannot be stopped. It will develop in the remaining two decades of this century, and will continue in the future. It is precisely revolution that the neutron chemists of Santa Fé are seeking to check.

In 1992 it will be 500 years since the discovery of America. In all these years our region has been an anvil on which the hammer of local and foreign oppressors descended hourly. Half a millenium. Isn't that a bit too much?

The people of Cuba decided that it is, and said: "Enough!" Their example is being followed by other peoples of the continent. One way or another, they have entered upon the complex and difficult road to freedom, to sovereignty. To stop Ulysses, Circe the sorceress of the island of Aea turned his companions into swine. The majority of Latin-American intellectuals are rejecting the attempts of the Santa Fé seducers to force this shameful destiny upon them. They are marching with their peoples honorably, consciously, shoulder to shoulder.

1. Chairman of the FRG Bundestag's Armaments Control and Reduction Subcommittee, and member of the SDPG Presidium. — Ed.

2. *A new Inter-American Policy for the Eighties* prepared for the Council for Inter-American Security, Inc., Washington, 1980. The quotations are from the journal *Estudios* of the Uruguayan communists, which was the first to publish this document (in a Spanish translation) in its issue No. 78, 1981, pp. 20-43. Drawn up by the Committee of Santa Fé, it was offered to the Reagan administration as a new doctrine of Latin American policy.

3. Rodney Arismendi, "Global madness once more," *WMR*, July 1981.

4. The Monroe Doctrine and the efforts to revitalize it are discussed in *WMR*, October 1981. — Ed.

5. A reference to right-extremist organizations, notably the AAA, the acronym of the Argentinian Anti-Communist Alliance. — Ed.

6. This letter became the program document of the war of liberation fought by the Latin American peoples against Spanish colonial rule. — Ed.

7. It was convened in 1826 with the purpose of consolidating the independence of the then new Latin American nations. The congress did not achieve its aim because the treaties and agreements drawn up while it was in session were not ratified by the participating states. — Ed.

Let 1982 be a year of peace

Pavel Auersperg
CPCz Central Committee Member,
WMR Executive Secretary

COMMENT

In terms of human life a year is both short and long. Time is measured differently by an astronomer who has discovered a new star, a young mother sitting at the cradle of her baby, a jet aircraft pilot, an archivist, a surgeon in the operating theater, or a shepherd with a slowly moving flock. In terms of history, too, time may be significant or unremarkable. There are years that leave nothing in human memory, not even a line in chronicles, while some years, even hours, change the make-up of an epoch, the destiny of individuals, or the destiny of all humankind.

As always when we cross a time frontier, as we enter the new year of 1982, each of us is asking what this year will be like. What will it bring? Fulfillment of hopes? Successes? Setbacks? And the cardinal question — war or peace? Indeed, war or peace is most crucial, for peace is the indispensable condition for the realization of all aspirations of nations and individuals, the decisive prerequisite of progress in all areas of life. In war humankind may lose everything, including its future.

These are all the more pressing questions because the world is entering the year 1982 in an atmosphere of anxiety. At the special UN General Assembly session on disarmament in June 1978 it was stated that today, more than ever, humankind is facing the threat of self-annihilation on account of the continuing contest in the enormous stockpiling of the most destructive armaments ever produced.¹ Since then there has been a further upturn of tension.

What are the reasons for this aggravation? Why have the hopes that had only recently been linked to the successes of the policy of détente been dispersed or, at best, pushed back, and why does one often hear that this policy has failed? Let us try to sort this out.

Let us begin by noting that in championing peace the Marxists have never drawn rosy pictures of a straight and obstacle-free path to this aim. In the present epoch of transition the system of international relations is extraordinarily complex and contradictory. On the world scene we observe a confrontation of diverse

foreign policy trends that express the substance of actually coexisting socio-economic systems. The international working class and its victorious contingent, the socialist community, are conscious of their responsibility for the planet's future and give the struggle for peace priority among their political aims. Acting on this lofty sense of historical responsibility, the 26th congress of the CPSU, the 16th congress of the CPCz, and the congresses of other fraternal parties of socialist countries reaffirmed the general line of socialist foreign policy, namely, the course toward the preservation of peace, the continuation and deepening of détente, and the bridling of the arms race. The socialist nations are consistently and purposefully coming forward with initiatives to avert a world nuclear conflict.

Central to their proposals are steps to end the nuclear arms race, prevent the proliferation of nuclear armaments, ban all tests of these weapons, cease their production, reduce their stockpiles, and prohibit all types of weapons of mass destruction.

Before this key, cardinal aim is achieved, efforts should be made to ensure:

- the adoption of a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons;

- the achievement of an accord to regard such use as a crime against mankind, and as criminals those states and political leaders who resort to such use, and a declaration that nuclear first-strike doctrines are incompatible with the laws of human morals and with the lofty ideals of the United Nations;

- the extension in Europe of the zone of confidence-building in the military sphere and talks on confidence-building in the Far East;

- the continuation of strategic arms limitation talks between the USSR and the USA; talks on the limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe; the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. It is common knowledge that the USSR has declared its readiness to refrain from using nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries that deny their territory for the deployment of such weapons;

— the convocation of a special session of the UN Security Council with the participation of the top leaders of the Council's member-states and leaders of other nations in order to look for ways and means of improving the international situation and preventing war;

— the allocation of the funds that could be released by disarmament for development and for the fight against hunger, poverty and backwardness, which are the tragic consequences of the colonialist and neocolonialist policies of imperialist powers.

Existing socialism is entering the new year of 1982 with a concrete action program, a peace program for the 1980s, whose point of departure is "not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace — that is the clue to the future."²

In opposition to this consistent line of action there is a line expressing even not so much the class interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole as the narrow corporate aims of extreme imperialist reaction and the military-industrial complex determined to maintain their profits and influence. The motto of these bellicose imperialist circles is: "There are more important things than peace." It is they who are attacking détente and inflaming international tension. Hence the fact that international relations are not developing smoothly: steps toward détente give way time and again to backsliding traceable to imperialism's aggressive character.

There was such a shift at the turn of the 1980s, when in the USA, the principal imperialist power, the helm was taken by a reactionary group representing the interests of the military-industrial complex to a larger extent than any previous group. The Reagan administration has begun the practical implementation of the plans and recommendations for increasing arms stockpiles and fanning tension which the brain-trusts of this complex had been contemplating for many years. The hallmarks of its actions are, in particular:

— unprecedented militarist preparations. In the 1981 fiscal year these amounted to \$178 billion; in 1982 they are to exceed \$200 billion, while for a five-year period it is planned to allocate the astronomical sum of more than \$1.5 trillion for the Pentagon's requirements;

— the slashing, in this connection, of social insurance programs, an offensive against the positions of the working class and all other working people, and steps to reinforce the neocolonialist dependence of newly-free nations on imperialist domination;

— the preservation of existing and the creation of new flashpoints of tension; a large U.S. military presence in different parts of the world arbitrarily proclaimed "zones of vital interest" to the USA; greater imperialist interference in the internal affairs of other nations — in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia and Central America; demonstrative and undisguised support, including weapons supplies, to reactionary regimes and counter-revolutionary elements in different countries;

— an intense and carefully coordinated propaganda against the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community and also against other countries opposed to imperialism.

Essentially speaking, we are having to do with a profoundly reactionary, all-embracing imperialist strategy, which counters the objective course of world development and impinges not only on the fundamental historical gains of the socialist community but also on the vital interests of all countries, of all nations. Its aim, that of stemming imminent socio-economic changes by force, poses the global threat of a nuclear war.

However, I feel that it would be wrong to say that détente has failed. What has failed is the understanding that some imperialist circles sought to inject into the concept of détente. What has failed is the view that détente spells out the conservation of capitalist orders, the preservation of spheres of domination and influence, that it is an indulgence permitting imperialism to interfere in the internal affairs of nations and use military force on the pretext of safeguarding its "vital interests." From this angle, naturally, any progressive social change is portrayed by the imperialists as "subverting peace," "undermining détente," "shaking the foundations of world order," and any actions by revolutionary forces and the struggle of peoples for liberation are given the label of "international terrorism."

However, the collapse of imperialist notions about détente by no means spells out the failure of détente. This process, which began in the latter half of the 1960s and reached its highest point in the 1970s, led to such impressive positive changes on the international scene that there is nothing the militarists can do to eradicate its results. The fact that the policy of peace pursued by socialist countries and other forces of progress has, to put it metaphorically, proved to be "stronger than military forces," the fact that many problems, including the acute issue of formalizing the postwar realities in Europe, have been settled by negotiation has

been brought home to the peoples. That is precisely why Washington was unable to coerce its European partners into repudiating the benefits of compliance with the Helsinki accords. The embargo policy failed. The economic links of the socialist community countries with the capitalist countries of Western Europe, Latin America, Japan, Canada and Australia are expanding, though not as rapidly as we should like. Cultural and scientific contacts are developing.

A growing number of people are coming around to the realization that the reasonable way to resolve humankind's main problem, the problem of war and peace, is not through the rattling of sabers and threats but through negotiations on the basis of equality and equal security. It would be fair to say that in this context there has been a very significant change in the mass consciousness of the population of Western Europe and in the posture of spokesmen of influential European political forces. The demonstrations that have taken place in Bonn, Paris, Brussels, London, Rome, Madrid and other cities with the participation of millions of people opposed to Europe being made a U.S. nuclear hostage have shown how deep the gulf is that separates the interests of peoples from the interests and aims of imperialist reaction.

The essentially anti-war, anti-imperialist mass actions that began in Europe sparked a sort of chain reaction throughout the world. A powerful movement with "Three Nots" as its motto is gathering momentum in Japan. Its proponents are demanding that nuclear weapons should not be produced, imported or deployed in Japan. After a period of decline there has been a revitalization of the anti-war struggle in the USA and Canada. Anti-war slogans fuse with protests against the slicing of spending on socio-economic needs. The population of Latin America, Asia and Africa is joining the peace movement more and more actively.

The anti-war movement of the 1980s is characterized not only by its unprecedented breadth and proportions. Its socio-political composition is phenomenal, for it includes not only communists, mass democratic organizations, and progressive personalities in science and culture, but also various youth, women's, religious, and pacifist trends and groups, political parties of the most diverse ideological orientations, their local organizations, and municipal councils. The situation now is that there is in fact a war faction and a peace faction in every influential bourgeois political party. In the struggle against the threat of war a growing role is beginning to be played by some prom-

inent military men, who in the recent past held important posts in their armies and in the NATO system. Many have retired because they refused to accept the decision to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe. Prompted by their professional knowledge, these military men are saying that if nuclear war breaks out, even if only tactical weapons are used, the densely populated West European countries would not survive and therefore the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe is no more than yet another step toward universal destruction.

A visible change is taking place also in the attitude of social democratic parties. The mass disaffection of the rank and file of socialist and social democratic parties with the escalation of armaments and their countries' involvement in the Pentagon and NATO war plans is impelling realistically-thinking and responsibility-motivated leaders of parties affiliated to the Socialist International to reconsider their stand on the question of war and peace and look for points of view in common with the communists.

Of course, this is far from being a simple process. The social democratic movement has never been homogeneous; it remains heterogeneous to this day. A segment of socialist parties' politicians, for instance, articulate support for the peace initiatives of the socialist community countries, but studiously avoid cooperation with the communists in their own countries. Others, on the contrary, are prepared to cooperate with "their own" communists within certain limits, but on the question of preserving peace are still captive to the "Soviet threat" myth.

We should like to hope that in the new year the anti-imperialist wing in the social democratic movement will continue to gather strength. It should always be borne in mind that differences in the working-class movement on questions of war and peace have always benefited imperialist forces inestimably. It may be recalled that these forces were able to unleash the first and second world wars largely because the working-class movement was divided. Yet the working class, the main proponent of socialist ideas, is the sole class in history whose purpose is to rule out wars.

Alarmed by the scale and power of the anti-war actions at the close of the past year, the imperialist circles were quick to impute this to a "conspiracy of the communists," the "hand of Moscow," and so on. However, developments swiftly gave the lie to these allegations. Even many of imperialism's advocates have been compelled to acknowledge that these were

spontaneous actions and that the shocking pronouncements of the U.S. President and his aides about a "limited" nuclear war in Europe and a "demonstrative" use of nuclear weapons have done more to spur the growth of anti-war feeling than 20 years of pacifist propaganda.

The communists are one of the contingents of this extraordinarily broad, pluralistic movement united by the desire to avert the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

It is not accidental that the keynote at the meeting of representatives of fraternal parties held last year to discuss the work of our journal was the participation of the communists in the struggle against imperialism's aggressive policies, for the elimination of the threat of war and the cessation of the feverish arms race.

As many of the speakers at the meeting noted, the communists face some difficult problems as the peace movement is joined by more and more groups of people, many of whom had only recently held aloof from politics altogether or had even been pro-imperialist. The common success of the anti-war struggle depends to a considerable extent on a successful quest for an answer to these problems. It is highly important that all the other participating public and political trends and organizations should make their own contribution to the common struggle. This is a condition for broad voluntary cooperation among the forces of peace and progress, the need for which is insistently dictated by the course of developments in the closing decades of this century.

The ranks of peace fighters are now growing much faster than the ranks of those who have come to the full realization that by virtue of its imperialist and neocolonialist politics precisely capitalism is the most serious and constant threat to peace and the security of nations.³ Brought into the peace movement, into these or those of its trends by representatives of various groups of peace forces, the inertia of views, habits, social behavior patterns and delusions is typical and inevitable.

As a rule, there are differences in views even within a class, a nation, while the anti-war movement ranges far beyond the boundaries of classes and nations. Imperialist propaganda strives to use this to disunite the individual contingents of anti-war fighters, incite them against each other, and foist specious stereotypes and view patterns on the anti-war movement. In this situation the communists cannot be indifferent. We believe that the more the participants in the struggle against the threat of war understand where the threat is coming

from, who acts as its vehicle, and how it can be stopped and averted the greater will be the success of it. In this connection we cannot but feel concerned over the attempts to bracket NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, to equate the imperialist policy of the USA to the policy of peace pursued by the USSR and the entire socialist community, to identify support for peoples fighting reaction and oppression with support for reactionary, anti-people regimes. These attempts only play into the hands of exponents of nuclear annihilation, who, as was aptly put in the open letter of Czechoslovak writers to the writers of Western Europe, want "the destruction of the ancient culture of Europe, of everything created in the course of history, as the price for the realization of their inhuman interests and intentions."⁴

The Czechoslovak communists emphatically reject the view that both "superpowers," the USA and the Soviet Union, are responsible for international tension, that the threat of war emanates in equal measure from NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. This view has nothing in common with the facts. Take the talks between the Soviet Union and the USA on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The USSR proposed that for the duration of the talks there should be no deployment of new and modernization of existing medium-range nuclear armaments on the continent. This proposal was repeated by Leonid Brezhnev during his visit to the FRG last November. Moreover, he said that provided the USA agreed to such a moratorium the Soviet Union would be prepared, as an act of good will, to reduce the number of its weapons of this class unilaterally. The Soviet Union expressed its readiness to come to an agreement on a mutual reduction of such armaments by hundreds of units and, more, on a total rejection by both sides of all medium-range nuclear weapons targeted on objectives in Europe. The USSR wants the European continent to be ultimately free altogether of nuclear weapons, of both medium-range and tactical.

In his answer to a question put by a Pravda correspondent⁵ and in the interview given to the West German journal *Der Spiegel*,⁶ in which he substantively enunciated the stand of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev reiterated that the thoughts and efforts of the Soviet leadership and of the entire people are directed toward preventing nuclear war, toward removing the threat of it breaking out. He repeated his unconditional condemnation of plans for unleashing a nuclear war and called for a clear-cut delineation of attitudes on the "not to be the

first to use nuclear weapons" question.

How did the USA react? It would be hard not to see that the U.S. proposals, made before the talks commenced, are evocative of a speculative attempt to change a cent for a dollar. According to these proposals the USSR would have to disarm unilaterally, while the nuclear weapons of the USA and other NATO members stationed in the area of Europe and targeted on the Soviet Union and its allies, including Czechoslovakia, would remain intact.

How can one speak of equal responsibility for the situation in Europe and the world when one side offers to reduce this tension while the other, seeking a unilateral benefit, offers to escalate it?

Of course, criticism of imperialism is not enough to uphold and consolidate peace. Life demands that we soberly assess the situation, devise our own strategy and our own concepts and act in accordance with them. Naturally, each fraternal party acts in its own way in carrying out the concrete tasks of disrupting imperialism's aggressive designs. In Czechoslovakia, for instance, this way is to mobilize the people for the fulfillment of the plans for peaceful socio-economic development mapped out by the 16th congress of the CPCz, and support for and solidarity with all the forces fighting for peace, democracy and social progress. In countries of the non-socialist world these may be actions against U.S. military bases and nuclear weapons on their territory, against the inflation of military budgets and cutbacks in social programs, against the subordination of national interests to imperialist dictation. However, experience teaches that when the communists chart and popularize tasks of this nature on a national scale they cannot isolate them from international aims, from the definition of the common aims whose attainment would spell out major advances in removing the threat of war. We believe that here it is of particularly great significance to work out international platforms of joint action, on the basis of which the diverse peace groups and movements could act while retaining full independence and which would make it possible to unite and mobilize the peoples, to sustain, invigorate and rally all opponents of aggression and adventurism in world politics.

What concrete ways of defending peace in the present tense situation help to coordinate the actions of people against imperialism's aggressive policies? I believe that the main orientations and principal spheres of such cooperation are:

— first, the struggle against the threat of a

world war implicit in imperialism's political strategy;

— second, actions to settle specific region military conflicts and prevent new conflicts in the interests of world peace, national liberation and social progress. For us who live in the center of Europe the main tasks in 1982 will naturally be to carry on the fight against the threat of war, the arms race and the stationing of U.S. medium-range missiles on the continent;

— third, the struggle to consolidate the positions and international prestige of socialist countries and a resolute rebuff to anti-socialist propaganda;

— fourth, giving the peoples of the world a clear idea of the threat from U.S. imperialism and NATO. Although, the spearhead of aggression is directed against the social community, imperialism is undermining the foundations of the life of all peoples.

The world is not confronted by a fatally inevitable global nuclear catastrophe. It can and must be prevented. There is a steadily growing counter-weight to the militarist aggressive policies of imperialism. This is chiefly the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries, their increasing economic and defense potential, and their consistent policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. World reaction's plans of conquest are opposed by most of the newly-free countries, the national liberation forces, and the non-aligned movement. These plans are opposed by the international working class, the communists and all other progressive peace forces.

The forces of peace and progress can arrest imperialism's adventurist, militarist policies and defend the independence and security of nations. The communists have always been in the vanguard of the movement against the threat of war. In 1982, as well, they will do everything to promote the growth, unity and strength of the ranks of the fighters for peace, détente, disarmament, peaceful coexistence and cooperation among countries and peoples.

1. *New Times*, July 7, 1978, p. 37.

2. L.I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, Moscow, Novosti Press Agency, 1981, p. 54.

3. For us, communists, the cause of peace and the cause of socialism ultimately coincide. We need peace for the same considerations that we need socialism: we hold that peace and socialism are the cardinal prerequisites for the welfare, happiness and freedom of people. For it is the living who need well-being, freedom and happiness. Some people are apprehensive that by acting together with the communists in the struggle for peace they are increasing socialism's strength and will contribute to its triumph.

These apprehensions show nothing more than that those who articulate them are themselves uncertain of the stability of the social system to which they have given their preference. For our part, in upholding peace we are not afraid to act against war together with proponents of capitalism; we do not fear that by doing so we are

strengthening that system, in the same way that while we are atheists we are not afraid of uniting with religious peace fighters.

4. *Rude pravo*, November 14, 1981.

5. *Pravda*, October 21, 1981.

6. *Der Spiegel*, November 2, 1981, pp. 34-63.



Loyalty to Leninist principles

Semy Pathe Gueye
CC Member, Independence and
Labor Party of Senegal

Organized and sustained communist activity is the principal political reality setting the situation in Senegal apart from the situation in other French-speaking countries of Tropical Africa that have taken a capitalist road. This activity enjoys prestige among Senegal's democrats, for the communist movement has demonstrated its vitality and its ability to withstand trials, which have been many.

The African Independence Party of Senegal (AIPS), founded in 1957, was banned for more than 15 years, during which it was persecuted and subjected to brutal repression. When, in the mid-70s, after the collapse of their repressive policy, the country's ruling quarters had to yield to the pressure of an increased democratic movement and to make concessions to it, the AIPS remained an object of reactionary schemes. The regime under Leopold Senghor, then President, set out to publicize plans for a pluralistic system but made their execution conditional on Draconian rules denying a number of authoritative political organizations the right to operate legally. It wanted to isolate and weaken our party by discrediting it through involvement in that frankly anti-democratic measure. Having made a deal with Senghor, Majemouth Diop, a renegade (AIPS General Secretary till 1967), arrogated the party's name to his divisive group officially recognized as the legal spokesman of the "communist trend." In these circumstances the AIPS decided to continue its underground activity. Along with other patriotic alignments which the authorities refused to recognize, our party went on mobilizing the masses to fight for the restoration of flouted freedoms. Our principled stand made it evident that the communists' interests are inseparable from the common

interests of the national democratic movement. This earned the AIPS still greater prestige among its allies and helped consolidate the progressive forces.

In 1981 the Presidency was taken over by Abdou Diouf. The neocolonialists had planned the replacement of the chief executive as a ploy designed to ease the effects of the crisis caused by Senghor's rule and encompassing every public sphere, to paralyze the increased activity of democratic forces and mislead a discontented nation seeking change. This is also the purpose of the new President's policy of "lessening" inner political tensions, in particular by introducing an "unlimited multi-party system."

As for us communists, the authorities confronted us with a choice between changing the party's name and staying illegal. The 18th plenum of the CC AIPS condemned Diop's usurpation of the name of the AIPS and resolved to rename our organization the Independence and Labor Party of Senegal (ILPS). The founding congress of the ILPS (Dakar, August 1981), announced the birth of the continuer and guardian of the finest traditions of the Senegalese communists' patriotic and internationalist struggle.

"It is fair to affirm," says the Central Committee report to the congress, "that in the 1957-1974 period, when no political force could hold its own against neocolonialist pressure, ours was the only party to withstand trials. . . . None but our party put up resistance to brute force, treachery, violations of the constitution, the dangerous policy of whip and carrot — methods used by Senghor for nearly two decades running, in an attempt to abolish the personal and social freedoms of the Senegalese.

This is the sad reality. Credit is due to our party for carrying Prometheus' torch high."

In the past two-odd decades, the communists have taken deep root among the people. This is only natural, for they were the first to advance the slogan of national independence as a pressing political objective. The communists remained the most consistent champions of the Senegalese people's freedom and exponents of their patriotic traditions, and never discredited themselves by making a deal with the neo-colonial regime.

True, we made many mistakes and serious miscalculations for which we had to pay dearly. But neither subversion by foreign imperialist forces, nor the activity of capitulationists in our own ranks could make us renounce Marxist-Leninist principles, take a road alien to the party's character and betray its vanguard mission.

We owe it to the prestige won by the communists in a quarter-century of heroic struggle inspired by patriotic ideals that even our political opponents consider it good form to pride themselves on their one-time membership in our party. For the same reason, certain groups posing as "Marxist" which have broken away from us over deep ideological differences lay claim to the party's patrimony. Those who echoed official falsehoods by describing our party as a handful of intellectuals lacking social leverage, isolated from the masses, taking their cue from "Moscow" and adhering to an ideology that was "antiquated" and, in any case, "out of keeping with Senegal's cultural tradition" are given the lie. Other "experts" in Marxism took advantage of the objective difficulties encountered by the party in conditions of illegality to attack it again and again. They prophesied the failure of the AIPS and insisted that the communists' work be recognized as useless, and that they should desist from it. What we came up against was, in effect, a brazen political campaign of provocation camouflaged as an ideological controversy and financed primarily by the neocolonial regime.

A special role in this offensive was assigned to one-time members of the AIPS who had surrendered to the class enemy in the most difficult period of the revolutionary struggle. Unable to make us repudiate Marxism in favor of the cheap ideological substitute they wanted to impose on the party and realizing the futility of their effort to deceive the party into renouncing a fraternal, internationalist approach to the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, the renegades directly placed

themselves and their concepts in the service of reaction.

The communists firmly beat off the attacks of Maoist groups which had long made themselves out to be advocates of "genuine Marxism" but afterward resented being called "Marxists." Indeed, Maoism has nothing to do with Marxism. What would have become of the party had it been fettered by ideas reducing the immense legacy of our struggle to the meager crumbs which Maoist upstarts pretentiously call "personal experience"? The Maoists' aim was to spread doubts among party members, demoralize the party and lead it astray.

Slanderers of every description were defeated by the communists themselves, Senegalese men and women differing in age and social standing, modest people who often remain obscure yet sacrifice their health and their very lives in fighting against imperialism and neocolonialism. The communists' victory found expression in the legalization of our party as a result of struggle and in the convocation of the founding congress of the ILPS.

What made the congress a success was the fruitful democratic discussion of the draft rules and main resolution preceding it, as well as the representative character of the congress itself. In spite of the shortage of funds, which made it necessary to reduce the number of participants, the 500 congress delegates represented the whole country and all working people. For two days workers, peasants, fishermen, stockbreeders and intellectuals discussed CC proposals concerning the main lines of party activity. Speeches delivered in the diverse languages of Senegal analyzed and exposed the disastrous consequences of the regime's neocolonial policy. The congress debate showed that the policy line chosen by us meets the fundamental interests of the masses and that the party has become a force representing the whole nation. The delegates unanimously approved the documents submitted to them. The course and results of the congress demonstrated the indestructible ideological and political unity of Senegal's communists.

The congress defined the party's main line of activity: mobilizing the people to defend and consolidate the democratic gains of the current period and fight for their extension, against attempts to do away with them.

Our concept of democracy is perfectly clear. Communists never regard it as a finely wrought trinket to be admired. While we have won freedom of speech at a high cost, we do not reduce the issue of democracy to the opportunity to state our political views. In terms of the dialectic

tics of present-day revolutionary activity, democracy won through struggle is both a goal and a means as we see it. We intend to use it as a powerful lever in making new gains and winning new positions in the struggle for the people's national and social liberation. Operating in alliance with those who really have a stake in change and leaning on what has been achieved, we work to bring about greater prospects of the working people coming to really direct every aspect of the nation's life on democratic principles.

Needless to say, the party's guidelines tempt the reactionary forces to fall back on repressive measures against the communists. The growing influence of the ILPS disturbs these forces and they have begun to talk about forming an "anti-Marxist alliance."* Imperialism is anything but happy about the existence of a growing Marxist-Leninist party solidly established in a country which holds an important strategic position on the western littoral of Africa and enjoys influence on the political scene of the continent. The imperialists consider our party's activity particularly dangerous in view of the role which they assign to Senegal in line with the strategy they are implementing in common with the social democrats to curb Africa's revolutionary forces ideologically and politically. A cynical illustration of this role was the Senegalese government's recent brutal intervention in Gambia designed to crush the progressive movement under way there. In that connection President Diouf levelled threats at Senegal's democrats who condemned the intervention. The founding congress of the ILPS pointed out with a keen sense of responsibility the serious danger threatening all true patriots of Senegal. "Our choice is clear," the CC report says. "We have no reason to fear political and democratic forms of struggle. At the same time, we will never renounce the search for the most suitable means of assuring respect for democracy and extending it. . . ."

The struggle for democracy fuses with the party's invariable policy of furthering *patriotic and democratic unity*. Speakers at the congress stressed that this policy is particularly important now that the country's socio-economic crisis is deepening, the people's standard of living is declining, national independence and civil freedoms are in danger and the govern-

ment betrays a tendency for conquest.

The policy for the unity of progressive forces is gaining ground, as our congress showed. Present at the congress as guests were noted trade unionists, spokesmen of democratic public opinion and, more important still, delegations from the main opposition parties: the Democratic Popular Movement led by ex-premier Mamadou Dia, Abdoulaye Wade's Senegalese Democratic Party and Sheikh Anta Diop's National Democratic Alignment. Fraternal messages of greetings to the congress pointed out our party's contribution to the process of change and its continuous effort for patriotic unity. A speaker from the Democratic Popular Movement, for one, pointed out the sincerity of the communists' effort toward cooperation and exposed reactionary portrayals of them as "politically homeless, godless, amoral people."

Thus the authorities are powerless to isolate the communists in spite of a hostile ideological campaign representing our party as something "extraneous" on the political scene of Senegal, and in spite of pressure and intimidation applied to the party's allies. The opposition parties regard the ILPS as an indispensable participant in the policy of change for all the differences that may arise between us. No initiative in favor of unity can be put into practice without the ILPS if that initiative is to enjoy the confidence of the masses. It is becoming more and more obvious that the attitude to the communists is an indication of the degree of independence of this or that Senegalese organization in the atmosphere of imperialist pressure and neocolonialist maneuvering.

The experience of recent years also suggests that progressives and democrats cannot achieve unity unless our party becomes stronger. The congress urged all ILPS organizations and members to build a *strong, influential communist party, a party firm of purpose, a militant party showing initiative and equal to resisting every injustice on the part of the authorities and employers and to leading the working people's struggle.*

A decisive source of strength for the communists is strict adherence to the principles and standards of party life which make theirs a party of the new type. The validity of these principles formulated by the great Lenin has invariably been confirmed by the successes of the communist movement.

Now that some people tamper with Leninism on the most preposterous pretexts or even with the mere aim of demonstrating their "flexibility" and "respectability" to the bourgeoisie,

*This is the purport of, for example, Senghor's recent interview to *Jeune Afrique*. The ex-president of Senegal, now the Socialist International's trusted man in Africa, assailed the government for returning to the multi-party system and called for an alliance of "democratic forces" against Marxists.

we consider it opportune to make a point, in particular on the strength of our own experience. We wish to stress that a revolutionary party of the working class ceases to be one if it fails to respect the principles of democratic centralism, criticism and self-criticism, loses its organizational and ideological independence and proletarian character and becomes disunited. More than once, our party was on the brink of catastrophe when a "liberal" spirit gained the upper hand in it under the pressure of petty-bourgeois elements still influential in its ranks.

There is something else. The class opponent has lately made attacks on communist organizational norms an important part of his propaganda. He describes parties loyal to Leninist principles as "intellectual prisons" and their members, as people of a "past" epoch. Some give in to this propaganda and demand "unlimited democracy," which would actually weaken the party and turn it into a debating club of intellectuals who like to talk and are no longer bound by discipline or policy line, a club where everybody would boil his own pot, paralyzing all common effort. Political nihilism and ideological "omnivorousness" inevitably result sooner or later in misleading the working class, bringing its political vanguard under the ruinous influence of the dominant bourgeois ideology, shaking its class positions and ultimately stripping it of its revolutionary character.

The congress, which adopted party rules, reaffirmed the Senegalese Communists' loyalty to Leninist organizational principles and pointed to the importance of applying them competently in the specific context of struggle. It stressed the need to steadfastly foster in every sphere of party life the profound democracy inherent in these principles. Internal democracy today is a requisite of party life. Collectivism is coupled with personal responsibility, the communists' opinions are fully taken into account and all members take part in decision-making. Communist discipline that is accepted of one's own free will becomes a norm.

We want to extend the social basis of the ILPS among proletarians and other working people, which would strengthen the party and help safeguard it against alien influences inevitable in today's Senegalese society with its petty-bourgeois spontaneity. We plan to create opportunities as speedily as possible to promote workers and peasants to key party posts.

The influx of workers and peasants into our ranks confronts the ILPS leadership with certain problems. "Newcomers" are strongly in-

fluenced by the ideology dominant in the country and the nefarious obscurantist policy which the neocolonialist regime has been pursuing for decades to maintain its power. It is important therefore to see to it that young members assimilate the organizational norms of our activity and communist ideology. Marxist-Leninist theoretical schooling should play a big role in this. Positions won by the party cannot be held unless it sets up an education system meeting our requirements. The purpose of this system is to train ideologically staunch communist fighters understanding the party's policy and its general theoretical principles, fully realizing their national and international duty and capable of resisting the society's dominant ideology and tearing off its propaganda cover.

Special responsibility in this respect must be borne by communist intellectuals. The founding congress called on them to join more actively "in the ideological struggle which the party is carrying on, in the communist schooling of its members and the dissemination of the ideals and scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism among the masses."

What we see as a great victory is the fact that in spite of the spate of slander coming from the bourgeois media, we have preserved the explicit class trend of our chosen policy and strengthened the party's ideological and political cohesion, which the outcome of the congress showed very clearly. A factor for this was the effectiveness of the Leninist principles of party organization adopted by us and the strong appeal of existing socialism, its achievements in the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. Of course, there was also the important fact that we realized what the people expected of us and pursued accordingly a policy of effective resistance to provocations on the part of imperialism's ideological mercenaries. Invariably loyal to the people's fundamental aspirations and needs, we mobilize them to fight against the disastrous policy of the neocolonial regime. This approach enables the party to abide by a class position and see clear in home and foreign policy problems in any contingency.

We have every reason to put the founding congress of the ILPS on record as a milestone in the Senegalese patriots' struggle for the national and social liberation of the people. Thoughtful work to carry out the decisions of the congress will contribute to the further Leninist training of the ILPS; it will help increase the party's influence, primarily among the workers, and heighten its role in the common struggle of the communists and other pro-

gressives for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. The effort to build up the Independence and Labor Party of Senegal as the proletarian core of a broad pa-

triotic alliance shaping the country's destiny will undoubtedly give the entire national democratic movement of Senegal a new powerful spur.

The nature of a communist organization

Today, communists face an unprecedented diversity of circumstances in their work. This covers the national peculiarities and the position held by a given party, ranging from the leading role in the socialist countries and participation in government in some capitalist countries to a semi-legal and even illegal status. Parties face problems that are in many respects dissimilar. As Lenin put it, "the character of any organization is naturally and inevitably determined by the content of its activity" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 440). The make-up of the new type of party founded by Lenin harmonized with conditions obtaining at the time and the revolutionary tasks it had to address. But what is the make-up of a party organization today, under present-day conditions? How is the vast experience accumulated by the communists to be used, developed and amplified while taking into account, to the fullest extent possible, the specific circumstances in which a party works and the novelty of the tasks confronting it? What has to be done to keep the nature of a communist organization always in accord with the conditions and tasks it faces? Many communists are pondering these questions. They are discussed in the following two letters published under a new general heading.

THE PARTY: UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

Bohumil Nemec
Secretary, CPCz Prague City Committee

I once talked to a communist from a country where a revolution had just triumphed. He said, now things would be easier for them. No, I said, things would be harder. I thought at the time that the comrade's reasoning was that all problems and dangers were now past. It was as though that party had taken a position in the design office of a huge construction project. All it had to do was to design the project well and organize the working people properly — and socialist construction would get under way. I wanted very much to convince him that while

the general laws of socialist construction were known, it could not be compared to blue-printed construction. Socialism is not a project designed in detail beforehand; it is not, as Engels put it, anything immutable, it should be conceived in a state of constant flux and change.¹ The shaping of the new society, both at the initial and subsequent, higher stages, is a complex process with unforeseen and sometimes even dangerous turns. It spells out living, creative endeavor, in which the party plays the leading role and for which it bears an immense responsibility before the people. The demands this places on the party as a whole and on each communist are very exacting. I will now discuss some of them.

A salient feature of the Marxist-Leninist party today is that it is armed with an advanced theory. Both the positive and negative aspects of the experience of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia make it abundantly clear that Marxism-Leninism is the only sure compass in the sea of complex problems arising in the course of building a new society. But success comes only when revolutionary theory is wedded to the efforts of socially active masses. For that reason, as the CPCz Central Committee said in its report to the 16th congress, "the Central Committee focused mainly on promoting Marxism-Leninism's influence in our society, on furthering the socialist consciousness of the people, on getting the principles underlying our party's policy correctly understood and actively supported by each citizen."² This means not merely educational work but militant and vigorous propaganda and struggle for our ideas. Proceeding from the lessons of the crisis development in the party and society after the 13th congress,³ we have been fighting an ideology that is alien to socialist society, showing the people its corrupting effect.

However, Marxism-Leninism is not a religion requiring simple faith. It is a science that helps to improve the life of all society consciously, and people must see this. That is precisely the way we see Marxism-Leninism — as a science guiding the practical work of the

party and the people. We hold that there neither is nor can be a barrier between the elaboration and implementation of ideas: theory and practice mutually intertwine, complement and enrich each other. It is impossible to develop revolutionary theory without constantly analyzing the experience of the revolutionary movement, the processes taking place in building the new society. Revolutionary theory cannot be invented; it is the natural product of the people's aggregate historical creative effort; it is the expression of "actual relations springing from an existing class struggle."⁴ As to the party's concrete activities, they will not be successful if pursued in isolation from the achievements of Marxist-Leninist thought, for then practice inevitably degenerates into futile practicism, hidebound tradition, and improvisation; it becomes unprincipled and opportunist, helpless in the face of problems created by life.

But from this it also follows that to master Marxism-Leninism does not mean merely to learn the general laws of social progress, to drill ready-made formulas "by rote." The communists must learn to apply theory in practice. This concerns the party rank and file, for the development of socialist society requires that each person who sees himself or herself a member of the working-class vanguard should display enterprising and independent thinking in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. In order to fulfil practical tasks consistent with the party's overall line, it is not enough to have merely a general idea of the resolutions adopted at congresses or know only some of the guidelines — although, of course, that is also important. A conscientious study must be made of all aspects of the specific conditions in each sphere of party work — in other words, where party policy takes practical shape — and knowledge of theory must be used for solving the problems posed by day-to-day practical work. Besides, it would be a mistake to lose sight of the fact that Marxist-Leninist theory cannot be mastered once and for all, for theory itself develops constantly and the party reinvigorates itself constantly by enlisting young people into its ranks.

We speak of this because all these truths were not drawn simply from books. They were learned by trial and error, in struggle, and tested during socialism's advance and at critical moments.

The 14th CPCz congress has described one of the mistakes we made after 1960 as failing to see that the class struggle has many dimensions, as failing to understand the fundamental Marxist-Leninist proposition that none of its

aspects — economic, political or ideological — can be ignored with impunity. Experience has taught us a striking lesson in dialectics: distortions in theory led (this is inevitable sooner or later) to distortions in the party's day-to-day work, to violations of its organizational principles, the relations in it, and, as a result, to imbalances in socialist society. On the other hand, transgressions of the Leninist norms of party life adversely affected the party both as the vanguard of the working class and as an entity engaged in creatively developing Marxism-Leninism.

In the 1960s theoretical work was divorced from practice, from the practical work of the communists. Abstract patterns and not realities were analyzed. The system of party information not only lacked a scientific basis but went so far as to twist facts deliberately, adjusting them to the conclusions drawn by higher bodies. We thus often got a situation where although communists joined in the various deliberations of party policy, they influenced policy-making only marginally. Much was said about the role of the people — both in and outside the party — but little attention was paid to the opinion of the party rank and file, and their very valuable experience was often ignored.

The inability of the leadership of those years to make a scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of social development gave rise to all kinds of improvisations in tackling economic, political and ideological problems and, ultimately, confused the party. To all intents and purposes, the method of scientific generalization was ignored; the view became widespread that the personal experience of this or that comrade was a sufficient guarantee of his infallibility. References to isolated, arbitrarily selected examples were regarded as cogent arguments in favor of this or that decision. Little attention was paid to statistics and research.⁵ All that was adroitly used by the revisionists and right-wing opportunists, who gradually built up their influence in party organizations behind a screen of criticizing shortcomings.

Thus, one of the causes of the crisis in the party and society lay in the underestimation of the need for a principled political course in day-to-day practice, a course having a solid scientific foundation and based on a skilful application of the general laws of socialist construction brought to light by Marxism-Leninism.

On the other hand, violations of Leninist norms of party life, non-observance of the team spirit in the work of party bodies, formalism,

and suppression of criticism gave rise to subjectivism and aggravated the processes that were harming the party. We now know that opportunism in practice inevitably leads to a misinterpretation of scientific principles, and that this, in turn, creates fertile soil for tackling vital issues not in the party, i.e., not on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, but outside, it, meaning outside revolutionary Marxism.

Although the crisis that hit our society in 1968-1969 cannot be seen simply as the consequence of a crisis in the CPCz, it is indisputable that had the party not been weakened from within in that period, disintegration would not have gone that far in society.

Any disparity between theory and practice or, more precisely, the isolation of theory from practice breeds dangerous illusions. One of these, quite widespread in the past, is that socialism can quickly rid itself of all the birthmarks and survivals of capitalism and transform itself into an ideal communist society. This illusion underlay not only various subjectivist slogans but, in some cases, even legislation which ran counter to social and economic reality. At that time, upon comparing social processes under capitalism and socialism, many comrades believed that we had already "entered the realm of freedom" where spontaneous processes were no longer important. In the party the upper hand began to be gained by the misguided belief that the transition to socialism had simplified all social and economic development to the extent that from then on it would be relatively easy to manage. That approach confused two different things. There is no doubt that the removal of class antagonisms and the creation of greater scope for the development of the productive forces and the individual had produced general conditions for shaping the moral and political unity of the people, purposefully managing social production and exercising a definite influence on social processes. But a possibility is not reality. Objective conditions can be utilized only with the help of far-ranging theoretical, political-organizational, cultural and educational work,⁶ which directs the conscious historical creative activity of the people and makes it possible to advance confidently. To rely on favorable conditions acting automatically is to expose the entire cause of the party to the threat of serious setbacks, and society to the threat of regression.

Socialism, which signifies the all-round development of the creative strength of the individual and the entire people, is a qualitatively higher type of society as compared to previous types — not only because it has abolished ex-

ploitation of man by man, ensured a just distribution of goods and a rapid advance of production, but also because its substance and structure predicate highly democratic principles of social management. The difficulty of political leadership and management under socialism is that both these processes should combine a truly scientific and highly competent approach with the broadest possible participation by the people. To maintain that socialism can be built without vigorous and conscious participation by the people is as wrong as to hold that it can be built only by the enthusiasm of the masses, without experts or a theoretical basis.

From this it follows that as the leading force of socialist construction, the party must be able to influence spontaneous processes, and, within realistic limits, regulate and channel them in the needed direction; in any case, it should not confine itself to pragmatic conformism. A hallmark of a Marxist-Leninist party is that it draws up scientifically sound program documents, which determine economic and social development. But even that is not enough. Experience tells us that even the most profound theoretical analysis of social realities and a practical course based on it and approved by a congress cannot guarantee success if the party fails to convince the working class and other working strata that it is their program, their policy. Party decisions are an appeal to the people, an appeal which must be heard and understood. Besides, the people must be given to see from their own day-to-day practical activity that there is no discrepancy between the party's words and actions.

A scientific understanding of the unity of theory and practice underlies the Leninist approach to the problem of the party's ideological cohesion. This approach takes a realistic account of the entire complexity of the process of cognition and the influence of the socio-political environment in which the party's members live and work. In other words, it must, above all, reckon with the level of consciousness and training attained by the communists, with the fact that each looks for the truth out of his or her own experience and does not find it immediately, and, lastly, that it would be a delusion to believe that party members are totally immune to external influences, specifically to the petty-bourgeois element.

Party unity cannot be reduced merely to a common acceptance of Marxism-Leninism or be regarded as something that has emerged once and for all. It, too, is a process in which the general theoretical principles and practice of

each party organization, of each communist interact constantly. Generalization of the experience of building the new society (or the struggle of revolutionary forces against capitalism) is a process of unceasing self-critical evaluation of the party's activities. Lenin never saw unity as a uniformity of views on every question, and the record of the party of Lenin is evidence that true unity takes shape in the course of discussing specific realities on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, with maximum attention to all opinions. A passive acceptance by party members of general principles or individual decisions, a unity achieved by a formal "show of hands" and not based on the profound inner commitment of each is fraught with a crisis that breaks out in a party when difficulties arise in society. Even when conditions are normal, it undermines the ability of party organizations to act vigorously.

Besides, experience teaches us to regard the party's ideological unity as a process of continuously resolving contradictions between the general, the specific, and the unique. And this can only be possible in the course of meaningful work by the communists, by party organizations, on the basis of the norms and principles elaborated by the Marxist-Leninist theory of organizing party building, which generalizes practical experience. Foremost among these is the principle of democratic centralism, which should be applied consistently and correctly.

The formal approach to the party's ideological cohesion once evident in the CPCz stemmed directly from incomprehension of the complexity and diversity inherent in the socialist way of life and, above all, of the party's role under socialism. A misinterpretation of democratic centralism and the Leninist norms of party life, and the rupture of the dialectical relationship between democracy and centralism in practical activity led to abnormal developments and undermined the basis of genuine unity.

Formalism, the obscuring of the contradictions arising in society, and the suppression of justified criticism are as dangerous for party unity as indiscipline. Our party maintains that deviations in either direction are inadmissible. Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CPCz Central Committee, observed at the 14th congress: "As well as strengthening democratic centralism as a prerequisite for unity of action, the development of the party's inner life at the present stage makes it both possible and necessary to concentrate our efforts on another aspect — furthering democracy in the party. We are now convinced that democratic centralism and

democracy in the party cannot be separated from or opposed to each other. Bureaucratic centralism is as harmful to the party as anarchy and chaos; it must not be tolerated. To ensure unity, discipline and efficiency of the party, all communists must participate in shaping and implementing the party's policy, all must have and make use of equal rights and perform their duties. That is why we must go on strengthening the democratic principles underlying the elaboration, implementation and monitoring of the party's policy."

The 14th congress of the CPCz justifiably censured sporadic campaigns that were once widespread in our country. There is no doubt — and our own experience bears this out — that such campaigns are justified under certain conditions, at decisive moments in the class struggle, when the central issue should be singled out, but they cannot solve the complex current problems concerning the management of socialist society. Having advanced the slogan of improving the style of work at the party congress, Gustav Husak stressed that it was necessary "to go over from sporadic campaigns, which circumstances often forced on us in the past, to a more planned and systematic approach, to use the method of gradually analyzing and solving problems with the participation of a large body of activists, the methods of searching for better solutions amid open and critical comradely discussion."

Ideological unity grows stronger in the party as antagonistic contradictions reflecting the struggle of Marxist views against the opinions spread in the party by our class enemies are overcome and as non-antagonistic contradictions are gradually surmounted in the party itself. Different ways and means are used in such cases.

Uncompromising criticism of ideological deviations from the party's general line and intolerance in the party of active exponents of hostile ideas are an effective and mandatory weapon of struggle against antagonistic contradictions brought into the party from without. The record of the international working-class movement shows that determined resistance to all forms of opportunism and revisionism is, as it has always been, an immutable law and condition of a revolutionary party's self-protection. The experience of the CPCz, which paid so dearly for its unprincipled and conciliatory attitude to spokesmen of bourgeois ideology, revisionists and right-wing opportunists in the 1960s, is likewise instructive. Ideological "compromise" and opportunism not only had a cer-

tain social base in our party,⁷ but were also linked to some "traditions" which underrated the importance of revolutionary theory for the party's ideological unity and revolutionary character. In countering such trends, we act consistently in keeping with the documents of the December 1970 plenary meeting of the CPCz Central Committee, *Lessons of the Crisis Development in the Communist Party and Society of Czechoslovakia After the 13th CPCz Congress and the Resolution on Topical Aspects of Party Unity*, which defined the struggle against right-wing opportunism and revisionism as the prime task in strengthening party unity. We have had occasion to learn that in the party there can be no "peaceful co-existence" of bourgeois and socialist ideologies.

Moreover, we believe that no party organization should tolerate those who are passive, who never voice their views or display initiative, who do not join in solving problems. Indifference is one of the greatest dangers to the party and its unity.

Naturally, in this struggle we must draw a clear distinction between our ideological enemies and comrades whose erroneous views are rooted in purely epistemological causes and distinctive personal features. The party, while being the vanguard of the working class, is not comprised of people who possess equal political awareness, theoretical knowledge or practical experience. Even those party members who have attained an approximately equal level of practical and theoretical knowledge have acquired it in different circumstances, in spheres distinctive for each; that explains why they sometimes approach the same problem differently. But there is another important factor: the greater the sum total of the practical and theoretical views that clash at party discussions, the wiser the decisions which are adopted collectively.

In implementing the party's general course and decisions, we shall probably, in the future as well, be unable to avoid differences in assessments of the political situation, the methods of giving effect to the political line and specific cadre policy. Differences of opinion of this nature give rise to temporary non-antagonistic contradictions. These are overcome in accordance with the party rules, by comradely discussion. That allows the gradual attainment of a higher level of ideological unity. Criticism and self-criticism are crucial to resolving non-antagonistic contradictions.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia at-

taches great significance to Marxist-Leninist theory, its application and enrichment with the practical experience of building developed socialism in our country, consistently fights against misguided views, subjectivism and shortcomings in the work of party bodies, and orients the communists on creating the conditions for steadfastly strengthening party unity and discipline and heightening the responsibility of each communist for the the common cause. Although we have unquestionably done much in this respect, especially over the past decade, much remains to be done. "We have every reason for saying," Gustav Husak declared at the 16th CPCz congress, "that the party, the communists and the party organizations have been the motive force of the social advance. However, this by no means implies that this is true of each party organization, of all party members, that they have all with equal consistency and dedication worked to implement party decisions and countered negative phenomena which sap our strength, such as swimming with the current, formalism, indolence, indifference, shortcomings in leadership and survivals of the past in people's thought pattern."⁸

The Communist Party is a living and constantly developing socio-political organism, whose normal operation depends on how well its organic "parameters" are maintained. Of these, one of the most important — as we have tried to demonstrate here — is combining revolutionary theory and practice, ensuring unity of the communists' ideology and action. Compliance with this requirement is indispensable for fulfilling the party's tasks and attaining its objectives, for enhancing its leading role in society as the true vanguard of the working class and of the widest sections of the people.

1. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works in Three Volumes*, Vol. 3, p. 485.

2. *Sbornik hlavnich dokumentu XVI sjezdu KSC*. Prague, 1981, p. 15.

3. *Poucení z krizového vyvoje ve strane a spolecnosti po XIII sjezdu KSC*. Prague, 1970.

4. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 498.

5. Let me give one example. Shortly before the October 1967 plenary meeting of the CPCz Central Committee research was made which revealed an obvious disparity between theory and practice. The communists and entire party organizations questioned in the course of this research justly criticized the leadership, pointing out its mistakes and omissions. But that valuable material was left virtually unused, although it might have benefited the party and society to no little extent.

6. At the 16th CPCz congress it was noted that in the 1980s greater demands would be made on the quality of personnel, on their political and professional training, on

their ability to manage, with maximum efficiency, not only social production but also the entire spectrum of socio-political processes.

7. Speaking at the June 1970 plenary meeting of the CPCz Central Committee, Gustav Husak noted past shortcomings in admitting people to membership of the party: "After February 1948 many people joined the party without a clear idea of what a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party or socialism meant. . . . Many of those who had joined the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as a result of the merger with the social democratic and other political parties were under the influence of holdovers of bourgeois ideology, social democratic ways, Masarykism and petty-bourgeois vacillation. . . . We even had districts and villages where practically all adults were party members. And even in the years that followed two membership reviews, when 900,000 persons had been expelled from the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, its social composition failed to improve." That, Gustav Husak added, was one of the reasons why "fertile soil developed for the shaping of right-wing opportunist and anti-socialist forces in 1968" (*Rude Pravo*, June 27, 1970).

8. *Sbornik hlavnich dokumentu XVI sjezdu KSC*, 1981, p. 16.

VANGUARD WITH A CLARITY OF PURPOSE

Clement Rohee

Central Executive Committee member,
People's Progressive Party of Guyana

When asked to write about the character of our party, I should decide whether I want to deal with the political, ideological or organizational character of the party or whether I should deal with the issue comprehensively and in this way explain the class character of the organization. It seems to me that the latter approach would be more suitable since from that angle I shall be able to cover a wide range of questions relating to the organization's ideological stand, its social composition, organizational basis, as well as its forms and methods of work among the different social strata in the country.

To begin with, our party is guided by the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism. It is organized on the basis of democratic centralism and is, by virtue of its day-to-day activities, the political vanguard of the working class and all Guyanese people. Our party is a voluntary alliance of people with a common aim and unites in its ranks those of them who are most advanced and active.

The PPP, insofar as topical international issues are concerned, formulates its stand not on the basis of directives issued from a given center or party, as our ideological opponents would have people believe, but on the basis of its own evaluations and experience, as well as those of other fraternal parties and the communist movement as a whole. In conducting its international activities, our party is guided by

the principles of proletarian internationalism, through which fraternal relations are strengthened with and solidarity extended to fraternal communist and workers' parties both in the socialist and non-socialist world. At the same time, vigorous support is extended to the national liberation movements as well as to the peace, democratic and progressive forces.

Even this brief outline, as you will notice, shows that the PPP is clearly a class organization and, as far as its more important, decisive aspects are concerned, that it functions as a Leninist party of a new type. Our conditions, we believe, call for precisely that type of a communist organization. Since the salient features of our era — that of transition from capitalism to socialism — are still with us, a revolutionary party must necessarily retain its salient features too.

Of course, all these features are not inborn to a party. It acquires them in the course of the mounting class struggle, in which it has to take part as it emerges, develops and expands its activities. At any rate, such was the case with our party which remained a rather loose and shapeless mass organization with a motley composition until 1969. I think it is appropriate at this point to briefly trace the history of the PPP and the socio-political circumstances in which it emerged.

As you probably know, our party was established in 1950. At that time its objectives were struggle against colonialism, for national independence and socialism. The movement arose out of the Political Affairs Committee, which was formed by a small group of Marxists in 1946 and took on the tasks of articulating the aspirations of the oppressed and mobilizing for struggle the workers, indentured laborers, and others oppressed by colonialism. By the time the PPP was set up, the narrow framework of the Committee had already become obsolete; the need was obvious for creating a political party. Many people wanted to have a mass organization which they could join and which could lead them to political struggle. The PPP united representatives of the national liberation forces, the working class, farmers, the emerging national bourgeoisie and intellectuals. The leadership of the party was composed of Marxists and revolutionary democrats.

Still, even with this heterogeneous composition, the party won its first election victory. That happened in 1953. The PPP government held power for only 133 days — it ceased to exist as a result of armed intervention by the British colonialist rulers. That same year the British Parliament suspended the constitution

in order to prevent, as one of the then British ministers put it, "the emergence of a communist regime within the Commonwealth."

I am recalling those developments because they revealed the division that was already under way in our party. The conclusion made by a special commission of enquiry set up by the British government to examine the situation in the country was that the PPP leadership was divided into two wings: a communist one under Cheddi Jagan and a socialist one under Forbes Burnham.* Both domestic and foreign reactionaries decided to split and eliminate the PPP. The socialist wing, acting on the advice of the colonialist rulers, declared its intention to pursue "better tactics." That wing actually established a party of its own which came to be known as the People's National Congress.

Notwithstanding these machinations, our party still commanded the support of the overwhelming majority of Guyanese. This was mirrored in its victory in the national elections held in 1957. As a result of the split the movement automatically rid itself of elements and social strata opposed to the ideas of scientific socialism. The communists came to play the dominant role in the leadership of our party. The split would have occurred sooner or later anyway. Experience — and not only Guyanese — clearly shows that trends so opposed cannot coexist within a party, and not because communists are "impossible to live with" but because such is the logic of the struggle. A time comes when all kinds of right-wing opportunists, revisionists, "leftist" dogmatists and factionalists oppose the revolutionary struggle and, in the final analysis, all rally around the banner of anti-communism.

Here is one example. Of the Guyanese "ultra-leftists" who had at one time called for "revolution here and now" and branded Burnham as a traitor, one became Burnham's minister of information and another headed a government trading corporation.

After Guyana was granted formal political independence in 1966, a completely new situation emerged and the class struggle took a qualitatively new turn in terms of its scale and depth. I would even say it became more conscious socially. The reasons are as follows.

Workers were no longer oppressed by British overlords. The country was ruled by a group of local businessmen and opportunist politicians unable to overcome Guyana's economic backwardness. That reflected a typical petty-bourgeois trait (and the PNC government has

always been petty-bourgeois): at some stage the petty bourgeoisie accepts the leadership of the working class and plays a progressive role, taking an anti-imperialist stand (that was the way it acted at first after the establishment of the PPP), but, having won state power, it puts its vested interests before everything else. And that must be taken into account while working to expand party membership.

Now, returning to the case of Guyana, let me repeat that the situation had changed and placed new challenges before the PPP. A completely new programmatic and political line had to be formulated to correspond to the historical stage of the country's development. It became imperative for the organization to raise to a much higher level the working people's ideological and political consciousness in order to expose neo-colonialism for what it is and to press the ruling coalition to realize genuine independence, democracy and social progress. At that time, in 1969, the decision was taken at a specially convened party conference to transform the organization from a loose mass party into a Leninist-type party. This bold initiative, unanimously supported by all delegates to the conference, proved that the party and its membership had indeed reached new heights both ideologically and politically.

Gradually, the party developed new forms, methods and style of work better suited to the task of invigorating the class struggle. Leninist principles and norms of party life, conditions and regulations for membership acceptance as well as the rights and duties of members were drawn up and put into effect, not without problems or errors arising from time to time. But eventually we attained the most important goal — we restructured our work both as concerns life within the party and among the masses, first and foremost among the working class. But we cannot say that we have accomplished everything. The questions of how one can ensure still greater prestige for the party and strengthen the people's confidence in it are being discussed by party leaders and at all levels of the party structure.

Having learned much from our experience during the 1957-1964 period, when we controlled the government, we are doing everything possible to forestall any damage to the party's image. We are fighting against such negative facts as indiscipline, abuse of power for self-interest, greed, immodesty, living beyond one's means and arbitrary interpretation of rules and regulations. This is not a random list: such tendencies used to surface in the lives of some leading party members and function-

*Currently Guyana's President. — Ed.

aries, and that undermined confidence in the party and distorted its image.

Returning now to the process of the PPP's transformation, to which I referred earlier, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that one important feature that contributed quite significantly to this process was the all-out effort made by the organization to gain a firm foothold among the working class.

The struggle for the masses means, in practical terms, that communists conduct regular, daily house-to-house campaigns in urban and rural areas, distribute party literature and talk to the families, discussing the problems of a given area, citing figures to explain what the rising cost of living implies, and so on. Communists offer explanations of the situation at factory gates. Frequently, public meetings are organized to discuss the problems of workers at the factories where they work or residents in the neighborhoods where they live. This helps in the drawing up of specific demands, which are subsequently voiced either by trade unions or by party representatives in petitions to the local authorities. These forms of work help win prestige for the party and enable it to act as the political vanguard of the Guyanese working class, of all the oppressed working people.

A look at any party's social composition gives a clearer picture of which class interests that party represents. The composition of the PPP is as follows: workers employed chiefly in the sugar industry (cane cutters and factory workers) and workers in the rural rice factories constitute 68 per cent of its members; poor farmers, including Amerindians, account for 20 per cent; the rest is made up of office workers, teachers, professionals and others.

While we strive to improve our membership we do not place unnecessary obstacles in the way of the party's numerical growth. In other words, the PPP never sacrifices quality for quantity or vice versa. We believe that a skilful combination of the two is highly important and that it enables the organization to represent the most revolutionary class in society and to exercise greater influence on the working masses.

In order to ensure a constant, firm and mature working-class core inside our party, we formulate the procedure for accepting new members accordingly. Article three of the PPP constitution, adopted at the 20th party congress held in 1979, states: "Every party member shall belong to a group in or nearest to the area in which he or she resides, or at his or her place of work or study and attend regularly its meetings. In special circumstances, the Central Committee may waive these requirements." The constitution

goes on to state that all members must belong to their respective trade union, peasant or other mass organizations. Members are duty-bound to observe party discipline, carry out instructions at all levels, set an example in their political activities and personal life, work at all times to safeguard and protect the unity of the organization and to strengthen its ties with the working class and other oppressed sections of the people.

To fulfil these tasks, it means that our comrades must be properly trained ideologically and possess comprehensive knowledge. The party uses various forms of work to this end: regular one-month or two-week political-ideological courses at our party's College of Social Sciences; seminars, lectures and courses on the basis of scientific socialism. This helps to develop a reservoir of cadre armed with the scientific doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, cadre who understand the need to combine scientific theory and revolutionary practice, who comprehend objective social realities and are ready to selflessly defend the vital interests of the working people.

It will soon be 13 years since our organization took the historic step forward to transform itself into a party of a new type. We have already made considerable progress which testifies to the validity and vitality of Lenin's theory of the party as the highest form of class organization with the mission of leading all the other organizations of the proletariat. As a result of patient and consistent work over the years, the PPP has been able to wield, create and extend its influence among industrial and rural workers, in educational institutions, localities and villages, to win the support and respect of the masses.

However, we do not intend to sit back and relax. The transformation of our organization into a Leninist-type party is not yet complete; it is a painstaking, multifaceted process which calls for considerable effort. In the course of this process, our party is learning from its mistakes and from the experience of other fraternal parties in both the socialist and non-socialist countries. We Guyanese communists continue to pay close attention to the purity of our ranks and to rid the organization of those elements who have lost their credibility and are unable to contribute to the fulfillment of the party's great historical mission.

We are inspired by the fact that the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin concerning the proletarian organization have finally prevailed in our country. Today, as in the past, the abbreviation "PPP" remains the symbol of the people's

pride, a living reality and part of Guyanese society. The party has become a major political force of national importance. Its existence can-

not be simply wished away and, as we say in Guyana, "parties will come and go, but the PPP will always remain."

The French communists in a new situation

Roger Bourderon
Editorial Board member of
the Journal *Cahiers d'histoire*,
Institute of Marxist Studies (Paris)

ON THE PATHS OF CHANGE

The presidential elections of May 10, 1981, the parliamentary elections in June, and the appointment of four communists to ministerial posts in the second Mauroy Cabinet have created a new and unprecedented situation in France. It clears the way for a considerable advance toward important socio-economic, political and cultural changes. Without claiming to give an exhaustive analysis, I shall consider only some of the problems vital to understanding this situation.

During Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's seven-year presidency the crisis of French society grew steadily more acute, especially during the last years. This seriously affected all aspects of the nation's life, notably, the condition of the poorest sections of the population, the unemployed and young people. This was not only a socio-economic degradation: it affected ideology, morals and many aspects of the life and work of the people. Reflecting the ambitions and requirements of big capital, Giscard d'Estaing's policy harmonized with imperialism's overall international strategy. Austerity measures followed one another in quick succession and there was encouragement for the growth of unemployment and a halt to the development of the national production apparatus. Use was made of increasingly authoritarian methods of administration, which restricted all freedoms — individual, political and social. Lastly, having exclusive access to the mass media, the authorities sought broad social concord to bring the French people "to reason," so as to remove all obstacles to an internal policy that was hurting the nation's interests in all respects and to a foreign policy characterized by an ever more accentuated leaning toward Atlanticism and towards taking the cue from the USA.

The elections were a massive rejection of Giscard d'Estaing's personality and policy, a

condemnation of the disastrous effects of that policy for the working people and the country. The French people had to choose definitively. And today their hopes for change are as great as the defeat inflicted on the right and its 23-year undivided rule (on May 10 Mitterand polled 52 per cent of the votes, while at the parliamentary elections the left forces received 56 per cent of the ballot or more than they ever received before). Let me emphasize that the demand for change made by the majority of the population was in large measure the result of the struggle that has been conducted by the French Communist party since the establishment of the Fifth Republic in 1958.

"Effective voting"

However, the highly positive fact of the defeat of the right and the success of the left should not blind us to other elements of present-day French reality, notably the following extremely significant circumstance that the decisive factor was the desire of the people for changes and to be rid of Giscard d'Estaing at all costs.

For that reason the content of such changes receded into the background for many French people, who reasoned approximately as follows: "We'll take care of Giscard, and then we'll see." This feeling mounted under the impact of the situation in which the presidential election campaign unfolded: all the big mass media and political parties, with the exception of the FCP, side-stepped the fundamental issue and evaded a broad, nationwide discussion of the terms of the actual changes on which the communists were insisting. Thus, although most of the French people declared for changes, they were actuated by various motivations. By no means did everybody have the same understanding of the realities and roots of the crisis, and of the need for a new policy to break out of it. At its 23rd congress in 1979 the FCP noted that "the crisis and its consequences do not in

themselves bring the masses to an understanding of the conditions of change and to a struggle to achieve these conditions. Not only do they generate a striving for the new but also contain elements that induce fear of innovation and fuel resistance to necessary changes."¹

These considerations help to understand the substance of the political situation in which the left emerged triumphant, Georges Marchais, the communist presidential candidate, campaigned around the fundamental issue of the elections: while explaining the striving of the communists to do everything to defeat Giscard d'Estaing, he accentuated key questions concerning the conditions of change, the ways and means of moving out of the crisis, and the radical reforms that could put an end to exclusive domination by big capital. The FCP's role as a revolutionary party was seen strikingly in the formulation of these questions assembled in Georges Marchais' 131-point program.

However, as I have already noted, the diversity of the motivations behind the popular actions, the striving for change at all costs, facilitated to no little extent by the mechanism of the presidential elections through universal voting, was of decisive significance. This procedure was the greatest obstacle to the Communist Party's election campaign. The ruling that leaves only two candidates with the largest number of votes to contest the second round contributes to the bipolarization of political life and the ousting of all the political forces that do not, in the first round, win the positions that look favorable to the electorate for participation in the second round and winning the presidency. This sentiment was fanned by the mass media mirroring the efforts of all other political groups to undermine the position of the French Communist Party by portraying the elections as a duel between the outgoing president and the candidate of the Socialist Party.

Under these conditions the socialist candidate was seen by electors, including many supporters of the communists, as the sole candidate who could defeat the right. This gave rise to the idea of "effective voting," which allowed breaking with Giscard d'Estaing and, in accordance with the logic of the electoral mechanism, continued to make itself felt in the parliamentary elections. This polarized electors, drawing their votes to the "President's party" or to the political forces that found themselves in a more favorable position for defeating the right. By and large, the FCP preserved or extended its influence in departments where it held that position.

Intricate balance of strength

Of the sum of the extremely complex factors I have mentioned not one can be ignored, but the dissatisfaction with Giscard d'Estaing's policy, which had exasperated the majority of the French people, was decisive. This allows us to understand what led to the setback for the FCP at the elections and to the even more unfavorable tendency in the balance of the electoral forces between our party (16.2 per cent of the votes) and the Socialist Party (37 per cent of the votes). But in no measure does this obviate the need for a critical examination of the Communist Party's record in the recent past and also in the preceding periods. On the contrary, this is now one of the key dimensions of the preparations for the party's 24th congress.

However, the present alignment of sociopolitical forces in France should not be assessed exclusively through the prism of election campaigns. Such an assessment would entail the risk of overlooking the actual state of affairs in all its complexity.

The first point, and it is a very significant one, is that despite the extraordinarily difficult situation in which the presidential elections were held, 4,500,000 voters cast their ballots for the communist candidate. This is very significant, demonstrating the high level of consciousness, an understanding of the need for attaining economic, social and democratic aims in the interests of the working people and the country as a whole. It mirrors the striving to act in that direction. On the other hand, the ideas and proposals advanced during the presidential contest exercised and continue to exercise a strong influence on the evolution of the situation in the country: many of the communist proposals won the appreciation of the people, and they are being discussed, paving the way for themselves and taking root in public opinion, thereby constituting a tangible factor of the present situation. The feeling of a large majority of those who voted "for the left" is that the FCP is a vital element of the left forces and that without it there can be no genuine and lasting changes.

This feeling is reinforced by France's historical experience. With it is linked the view, which became widespread immediately after the presidential elections, that the presence of communist ministers in the government is both natural and logical. This view, shared by many people who voted for left parties, has grown more conspicuous since the elections; opinion polls indicate that most of the French people approve such participation. Let me add that the

votes of communist supporters were decisive in the full sense of the word in the election of Francois Mitterand and then in the formation of the new majority in the National Assembly: without this contribution from communist supporters to the victory of the left, Giscard d'Estaing would have remained in the office of President. And, lastly, let me note the influence enjoyed by the FCP among the people throughout the country, its strong position at the factories, its weight in the municipal councils, and its militancy and innovatory spirit.

During the past few months France has thus shown that the people can associate a specific political force with the process of change for which they strive, regard it as the decisive participant of this process and, at the same time, accord it, from the angle of political representation, only a limited place, while the operation of the constitutional mechanism can aid and amplify this phenomenon.

However, an analysis, a definitive assessment of the influence of the revolutionary current and the revolutionary party in French society gives grounds for stating that despite the victory of the socialists, who won an absolute majority in the new National Assembly, the recent elections by no means signify that France has necessarily entered an era of social-democracy. In its strategy of struggle for power the Socialist Party had to reckon with the existence of a large and influential Communist Party and see to it that in the eyes of millions of French people it, the Socialist Party, was a force that held a place in the left segment of the political spectrum. It had to rely on the striving for changes by a significant section of society and advance proposals partially projected toward such changes even if, with power in its grasp and seeking to enlarge its electoral base, it has, at the same time, blunted their content. These contradictory factors reaffirm that France is by no means bound to go through a social-democratic experience. On the contrary, they show that there is a base on which, in the situation created in May and June 1981, it is possible to rely in the struggle for genuine changes, in the struggle to open an original way to real democratic changes in all areas of national life.

This attaches tremendous importance to the orientation of the Communist Party's strategy, to this strategy's harmony with the vital requirements of French society. The FCP Central Committee has noted that the "actual problem confronting us is the marked discrepancy between the high level of the decisions needed to extricate the country from the crisis and the real level of these changes over which it is possible

to unite the masses in the present political situation."² The French Communist Party failed to win the understanding of millions of victims of the crisis and Giscard d'Estaing's rule: the latter were prepared to support political changes, expecting that this would better their lot, but remained unclear about how this improvement could be achieved. In this lies the contradiction which confronts the FCP with the important problem of working out the ways and means of moving forward toward aims of a transformative character that can take the country out of the crisis, of putting forward and upholding a political alternative and uniting large sections of society around that alternative.

The fact that the victory of the left forces was accompanied by a serious electoral setback of the revolutionary party raises issues that affect not only the communists but the entire democratic movement. In order to analyze the present paradoxical situation comprehensively the FCP critically examines the results of the battles in the course of the presidential elections and the methods of its own struggle after its 23rd congress. But, above all, it seeks to make a more profound study of the general development of national history over the past decades and thereby to have a vantage point from which to see how the communists responded to the imperatives of the day.

Dramatic changes

There have indeed been dramatic changes in France since the mid-1950s. There have been political changes springing from the Fifth Republic, the establishment of the presidential regime in 1958, and its reinforcement in 1962 by transition to the election of the President of the Republic by universal voting, which has become a powerful factor of the bipolarization of political life. And there have been socio-economic changes expressed in the development of state-monopoly capitalism accompanied by a convulsion of French society in the 1960s. The principal causes of this convulsion were the rapid growth of wage labor and the attempts of the big bourgeoisie to reshape France entirely in accordance with its class interests. This destabilized the whole of society and triggered a nationwide crisis at the outset of the 1970s. Moreover, crisis processes inspired a growing aspiration, albeit in vague forms, of the masses for drastic changes in social relations. The events of May and June 1968 were the first major manifestation of this mood.

In short, capitalism has out-lived its day in France, and socialism has come onto the agenda as a concrete reply to French society's pressing

problems, and not as a remote prospect. It should be borne in mind that the processes I am speaking about are unfolding against the background of a turbulently developing world, in which fundamental changes are taking place that are giving embattled peoples new opportunities for preventing wars and advancing toward socialism in accordance with the original ways chosen by them.

In the course of these decades the FCP has, by its political struggle and theoretical analysis, made a diversified and significant contribution to the fight for social progress, for freedom and democracy, for national independence and internationalism. It has advanced many new ideas, and it is precisely due to its efforts that the striving for changes has become ever broader in France: its struggle for a new policy in France was the decisive factor in the defeat of Giscard d'Estaing.

However, our party very belatedly started studying the ways to and outlines of socialism suitable for present-day France. In particular, it did not opportunely draw the conclusions and bring to light the potentialities that emerged in connection with the resolutions of the 20th congress of the CPSU, notably those concerning the ways to socialism and the fact that socialism had now come on the agenda in many countries. Thus, although the changes in French society had awakened among new forces a vague gravitation toward a different social system, the party proved unable to show early and lucidly that socialism was vital to France and explain the kind of socialism it was suggesting.

This was due to the fact that for various complex historical reasons the party remained captive for a long time to general views that indefinitely postponed the basic aim — socialism, which, in its turn, was modelled on references to existing socialism. Moreover, priority was given to the concept of a necessary intermediate stage that could only be attained on the basis of a preliminary alliance with the Socialist Party, in accordance with notions influenced largely by the experience of the Popular Front. These were effective guidelines in their time, but could no longer dovetail with French society's present-day requirements. For that reason many of the FCP's advances in the 1960s, notably in the field of theory, proved ineffective to some extent because they were not an inalienable part of a coherent strategy that could show their full significance.

Such was the French Communist Party's lag in strategy beginning in 1956, despite the possibilities for an analysis at the time. This lag

was made good only at the 22nd and 23rd congresses of the FCP (1976 and 1979). In addition to abandoning the concept of dictatorship of the proletariat, the aim was clearly defined, namely, socialism in the colors of France and the process by which it could be attained — the way of democracy.

The deepening of all these propositions and analysis of their actual significance are in the focus of the present preparations for the 24th congress of the FCP. Alongside the growth of communist influence, the consistent implementation of the strategy adopted by the party is an important condition of the changes, the desire for which was shown, even if loosely, by the majority of the French people in May and June 1981.

This strategy, worked out by the 22nd and 23rd congresses of the FCP as a result of a long and complex process, allows charting the basic orientations of the FCP's influence on the nation's social development. An analysis of the situation clearly shows that to secure genuine changes there must be profoundly democratic reforms that could break the undivided domination of capital in the economy, in public activity and in the whole of national life. Social, economic and political democracy is vital to France. "In addition to reshaping property and state power," says the resolution of the 23rd congress, "resolute and consistent efforts must be made to recast social relations, to go over from subordination to participation, from command to initiative in all areas."³

Such is the democratic way to democratic, self-administering socialism that eliminates the idea of a preliminary authoritarian and centralized stage. This way allows going over at enterprises "from monarchy to a new life established by the working people themselves," "to communal self-administration, to true regional power," "from administration from afar and above in the interests of a minority to ever-widening administration of society by the working people themselves, by the citizens themselves. Full self-administration and democracy in every sphere of social life will open unprecedented opportunities for one and all. Such is the democratic, self-administering socialism that is needed by France and for which we are striving."⁴

The proposed way is a way of struggle, of social and election battles making it possible to attain new democratic gains, to win new positions, new heights, to change the alignment of social and political forces step by step. This can only be done on the basis of steadfast and ever-broadening unity of the masses. That is why the

democratic way advocated by the FCP envisages uniting all the popular, all the left forces. It is seen as a movement of the majority, as actions of the working strata of the population, a stable and lasting grassroots alliance formed in struggle in all spheres by all interested participants around aims set by themselves. On this basis political organizations may conclude agreements conducive to this alliance and not restraining it, agreements consistent with the actual movement and not preceding it. This new concept of unity springs from the historical experience of the masses, from the experience of successes and setbacks that accompanied big unitary movements from the Popular Front to Liberation and the Joint Government Program of the left forces.

This new approach requires that at each given moment everything possible should be achieved so as to encourage every realistic step toward democracy, and the party should indicate the limitations of what has been achieved. Moreover, this means that we cannot decide in advance what the entire movement, the content and level of the demands, and the forms of struggle will be. Lastly, this means that the communists should be more militant than ever and active in all areas of the struggle.

Such is the concept of progress toward socialism as a process of democratic changes in which every new advance is a strongpoint from which to continue moving on. This is the only way the French Communist Party can resolve the problem, generated by the wide gulf between the objective need for remaking society and the political consciousness of the masses, as it stands in the given historical situation. Further, nobody should labor under the delusion that many of the difficulties, barriers and contradictions can be surmounted by ideological discussions: in this area, as in others, consciousness can be reshaped only by practice, only by experience. This, too, will be a concrete manifestation of the strategy of advancing step by step, by way of ever more significant democratic gains.

Effective approach

The political decisions adopted by the French Communist Party since the victory of the left forces and, in particular, since its participation in the government are linked directly to this strategy. Far-reaching reforms are needed to take the country out of the crisis: the FCP has said and repeated this and it has not changed its view. But national voting has passed its verdict. The policy for which the majority of the electorate voted is the policy of the Republic's

new President. If one wants the success of any political program one cannot ignore the nation's hopes and expectations. Expectations can be justified only by real steps capable of leading to positive changes. For that reason the only effective approach giving the communists new opportunities in the struggle is to accept the challenge, to rely on the striving for changes. The forces represented by the FCP possess no little weight (despite the serious obstacle created by the weakening at the elections). They are capable of achieving social and democratic progress. In this way is the experience acquired of government with the participation of communists, a government led and dominated by the socialists, a government to which the nation has set the task of giving positive answers to the problems that have been raised. Where is this way leading to? Only the future can answer this but, in any case, being an effective and innovatory force the FCP is always prepared to advance in accordance with the evolution of the people's consciousness.

To date, the accord signed on June 23 by the Socialist and Communist Parties on the basis of the policy supported by the majority of the French people, as well as the proposals for participation in the government, have made it possible to identify quite a few points of view in common and ensure for the communists a fitting place in the government. This was the first positive step meeting the nation's aspirations. The full implementation of the aims charted in the joint statement of the Communist and Socialist Parties will usher in a significant change compared with the practice of past years and will spell out undisputed social and democratic progress.

Even a simple listing of the planned steps is indicative of this. They include establishing social fairness — an increase of the incomes of the poorest sections of the population; the drawing up, as speedily as possible, of legislation on shortening working time; an enlargement of the public sector of the economy, thereby making planning effective and democratic; and adoption of a two-year plan of economic development to create the conditions for new economic growth and an effective fight against unemployment; a policy of reducing social inequality; guarantees for and an extension of freedoms, and also the rights of the working people and the democratization of national life; support, in a spirit of respect for its alliances, for France's foreign policy aimed at ensuring peace, achieving gradual disarmament and the simultaneous disbandment of

military blocs, which would maintain the balance of strength in Europe and the rest of the world and safeguard the security of each country; the earliest commencement of international talks on limiting and reducing armaments in Europe; respect for the right of nations to decide their destiny themselves, and observance of the sovereignty of states, non-interference in their internal affairs and the right of each nation to security.

The FCP is effectively a part of the majority and takes into account — this is its fundamental stand — the results of general voting to determine the rate of advance toward the changes needed by France. With all the means at its disposal our party is helping to ensure a positive response to the striving for changes expressed by the nation. At the same time, the party is developing its own initiatives, asserting its identity, and rejecting presumption and defeatist feeling; needless to say, it is abandoning neither its ideas nor its proposals for the future. Since June 1981, acting in keeping with this attitude, the Central Committee orients the party's entire work at the factories and in residential areas, as well as the work of the communist deputies in five directions:

- progressive solution of the social problems encountered by working people and their families, the problem of employment in the first place;

- the safeguarding and more efficient use of the nation's economic, technical, scientific and cultural potential;

- the protection and extension of the democratic rights and freedoms of the working people, of all citizens, thereby enabling them to take a more effective part in decision-making in diverse areas of public life;

- democratization of the state, its institutions and political life, and the decentralization of power, presupposing, in particular, the introduction of proportional representation in elections at all levels, the election of regional assemblies on the basis of universal and direct ballot, and the extension of the powers and opportunities of communes and departments;

- the struggle for peace and disarmament.

These are the positions from which the communist deputies conduct parliamentary debates. These are the guidelines of the communist Ministers, chiefly in the area of their terms of reference. These are the positions from which the communists act throughout the country, knowing that effective compliance with commitments and also the possibilities for progress in the future depend largely on the

determination and militancy of the working people, of all citizens.

The key task today is to fulfil election promises. We are doing all in our power to ensure the promised advance (which we consider inadequate — but the French people have made their choice and we abide by it). In the National Assembly this means, among other things, the full and consistent implementation of constitutional powers — the right to submit bills and amendments, and to control and criticize. This means pursuing a constructive and positive course with the purpose of translating the promised changes into reality, carrying out commitments, and fulfilling the agreement between the Socialist and Communist Parties. Moreover, this means the further development of the FCP's ideas of self-administration, struggle against the tendency, firmly entrenched in French parliamentary traditions, of transferring all powers to deputies, and explanatory work among citizens on how they have to act to secure changes. This defines the work of the communists at the factories, in residential neighborhoods and the innumerable public organizations. This dictates the need for implementing the strategy of advancing step by step to ensure the consolidation of what has been achieved, create the conditions for new achievements, and give a further impetus to the work of the communists among the people. This dictates the need for a more effective defense of the interests of all categories of workers by brain and by hand, for a more profound understanding of the realities of French society, for an enhancement of the FCP's militancy, and for justifying the hopes of the people.

Decisive factor

The new majority, the new government has been in power for half a year. It is still too early to sum up results. But some conclusions may be drawn. First and foremost, note must be made of the significant fact that an end has been put to the 23-year-long undivided rule by the right. The presence of communist Ministers in the government after the FCP had been denied participation in administering the nation's affairs for 34 years, marks a turning point in French political life. The most conspicuous dimension is the aspiration for changes expressed by the electorate in the May and June elections. True, it is limited by the underestimation of the significance of the corresponding means and conditions and by the weakening of the election potential of the FCP, which is, nevertheless, recognized by the people as a force indispensable for such changes.

Noteworthy, albeit partial, steps have been taken in the right direction, in the direction of democratic and social progress. Most of the legislative measures and decisions adopted by the National Assembly (which has begun to play an effective role for the first time since 1958) represent the beginning of consistent quests for a new course differing from the policy of Giscard d'Estaing. The first measures — in the social sphere, in the sphere of democratic freedoms (including the rights of working people at factories), in the sphere of management decentralization, in jurisprudence, agriculture and so on — were followed by the exceedingly important decisions to nationalize the banks and five big industrial groups. The budget has been approved: despite its shortcomings, it breaks with the former logic favoring the big proprietors and thereby reflects concern for the development of a number of major social services. This is also a new element. However, many obstacles still remain, not the least of which is the fierce resistance of the patronage and the right forces. They seek concessions (sometimes successfully) and do not stop at attempts at direct sabotage. We must get rid of the disastrous legacy left by the 23 years of right-wing rule (especially of the seven years of Giscardian administration that plunged the country into the mire of crisis), of which the two million unemployed are the symbol. Although the nationalization measures, on tax on large fortunes and the blocking of prices are approved by the masses, they do not clearly see the burden of the legacy of the past and the significance of the steps that have to be taken to surmount it. Nevertheless, the way has been opened for the working people's active intervention in the nation's affairs, and more and more of them are joining the ranks of those who, in the face of resistance from the capitalists, enter into struggle for the satisfac-

tion of their grievances.

As regards the FCP, it realistically assesses its difficulties stemming, in particular, from the results of the recent elections. In keeping with the strategy mapped out at its 22nd and 23rd congresses — democratic way of struggle for self-administering, democratic socialism — our party is working tirelessly to ensure the success of the changes. It is fostering a more profound understanding among the workers, farmers and intellectuals — on the basis of their own experience — of the complexity of the present situation, of its contradictory character, of the dimensions of possible changes and of the nature of the forces opposing them.

The people must come round to the conclusion that changes are their affair in the first place. They can be realized only if the people come forward as the main motive force in all spheres of public, economic, political and cultural life. The communists are mobilizing all strata of working people to secure their tangible intervention in the nation's affairs and their more active influence on the adoption of decisions affecting everybody. A new and extremely difficult and pressing task is to unite the masses as closely as possible and, while moving forward step by step, ensure concrete results, enhance the people's consciousness, and indicate the way and means out of the crisis. This will be of cardinal significance. Individual and collective experience of struggle and every new advance help to identify the potentialities for advance along the course of democracy and changes, and open up the prospects for increasingly dramatic transformations.

1. *Cahiers du communisme*, June-July 1979, p. 355.
2. *L'Humanité*, June 27, 1981.
3. *Cahiers du communisme*, June-July 1979, p. 370.
4. *Ibid.*

New experience

OUR INTERVIEWS

TOGETHER WITH THE PEOPLE — AGAINST THE THREAT OF WAR

Joseph Turf
Deputy Chairman,
Communist Party of Belgium

Q. What has been the part played by the communists in the preparations and conduct of the peace demonstration held in Brussels on October 25 of last year?

The role of the communists working in the National Organizing Committee was to contribute loyally to the success of this demonstration while respecting its pluralist character. The demonstration demanded the non-deployment of nuclear weapons in Belgium and Europe, the prohibition of Pershing and Cruise missiles and neutron bombs, the dismantling of SS-20 missiles, the destruction of all existing nuclear armaments, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and an independent and

active Belgian policy of peace.

In this context the communists were active in the explanatory work among the people through various publications and their own press, participation in innumerable debates and a petition campaign.

The various forces represented on the National Committee and accepting its platform analyze the state of affairs in their own way. For instance, the consultative body of the Catholic Church in Flanders accentuates unilateral disarmament. Some Maoist groups are endeavoring — without any success — to spread the NATO views that draw attention exclusively to SS-20 missiles.

As regards the Communist Party, it, like large sections of the people, stresses that a grave danger emanates from the USA's escalation of its arms buildup concretely spelled out in pressure for the deployment of Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles.

Consequently, we welcome the Soviet Union's statement that it is ready to reduce the number of its medium-range missiles provided no new U.S. missiles are stationed in Belgium. In stating our stand, we steadfastly underscore the fundamental difference between Soviet and U.S. policies on this question. This distinction is also seen in government platform. Moreover, we see the Soviet proposals as a significant step toward a subsequent controlled and simultaneous reduction of nuclear weapons.

We demand that our government and the governments of other West European nations should actively contribute to the success of the talks and oppose the Reagan administration's attempts to obstruct the attainment of positive results that would meet our peoples' desire for disarmament.

Q. How has the CPB acted with other political parties in the struggle for disarmament, against the deployment of missiles in Belgium?

It has cooperated actively on a basis of equality with other parties, trade unions, various public and cultural organizations, and the peace movement, who have combined their efforts on common platform. The mobilization of the masses for struggle was facilitated largely by cooperation on the level of grassroot committees.

Q. What is your assessment of the demonstration's significance and of its place in the overall peace movement?

Its significance is, in the first place, that it now seems possible to prevent Cruise missiles from being stationed in our country. It is quite

feasible to expect that the powerful peace movement, which embraces 85 per cent of the Belgian public, will offset U.S. pressure in NATO to secure the deployment of missiles in Belgium. We see the attainment of this aim as vital to the resumption of the détente process through negotiation.

HUNDREDS OF TITLES, MILLIONS OF COPIES

Hector Blanco

Official of the CC

National Publicity Commission,
Communist Party of Argentina

Q. It is common knowledge that the ruling military junta is resisting the democratization of public life and attempting to muzzle the opposition. How does your party carry forward its publishing work in this situation and what has it achieved in this area?

During the past quarter of a century, the party functioned legally for only eight years but it did not for a moment cease its struggle and the dissemination of its ideas. On the one hand, this has helped to enhance its prestige and influence among the people and, on the other, it has evoked the fury of the reactionaries. Suffice it to say that within five years of military rule (from 1976) 3,000 communists were killed, 25,000 were imprisoned, and 12,000 disappeared without trace. Among them were activists of the party press and its publishing facility. Of course, these blows made our work difficult but did not paralyze it. And today, despite countless obstacles, the people hear the voice of the party and of other forces calling for the restoration of constitutional rights, for democratic reforms.

Thanks to the efforts of our press there was a wide response in the country to the 9th National Conference of the CPA.* Of congress significance, this conference took place at a time when the military regime had suspended the activities of political parties. Nonetheless, we were able to inform the people of the resolutions passed by the conference, of the platform adopted by it for the struggle for lasting democracy and peace, and of the action line of the communists to achieve agreement among all the democratic forces in Argentina.

The progressive press does much to popularize and organize joint actions against the reign of terror. By printing statements and petitions of political parties and democratic opinion and carrying information on the development of

*WMR, December 1981.

unitary processes (for instance, the formation of national and local committees coordinating the action of diverse forces) and on the many forms of protest, the various legal and underground publications help to mold public opinion and rally the people in the struggle for democracy.

The CPA, too, which combines legal and underground forms in its publishing work, is making a considerable contribution to these efforts. We have a weekly newspaper with a circulation of 27,000 copies. During the past five years we have brought out nearly 450 newsletters and books with an aggregate printing of 2,500,000 copies. The subjects dealt with in these publications cover a wide spectrum: fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, pressing issues of the international situation, analyses of capitalism's economic crisis, information about socialist countries, and our party's resolutions and decisions. The Marxist Studies Center publishes the journal *Anales* once in six months: every issue is devoted to one subject. The July 1981 issue, for example, printed materials of a seminar, "Renewed Democracy," sponsored by the Center.

Last year alone, the CPA was joined by 12,000 people. Of these 67 per cent are wage workers, with 29 per cent employed at industrial enterprises. The social composition is taken into account in our propaganda. At the big factories our cells print newspapers, usually on a rotary press. These are of a small format and have up to four pages. It must be noted that workers display enviable journalistic abilities, a sense of humor, and incisive political irony. For instance, at the SUDAM-TEX factory, they call their newspaper *Sudan-todos*, literally meaning "everybody sweats." These newspapers, of which there are more than a hundred, discuss chiefly the specific problems of the given factory, but also carry material on the domestic and international situation, and report on various aspects of trade union work. Working-class problems are dealt with, naturally, in the central party press as well.

There is a big demand among the people for books in the *Marxist-Leninist Library* series, of which 127 titles have already been brought out. The total printing of this series now exceeds two million copies. There have been several printings of works by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* has had nine printings with a total of 136,000 copies. A series of brochures on the history of the revolutionary movement and the role of trade unions has been well received by readers. Socio-political and technical literature, and also works of

fiction brought out by foreign publishers have a wide circulation in our country.

In short, we attach great importance to publishing, to improving our work in that area because we are aware that today it is a key channel for party propaganda and links with the people.

FROM DOCUMENTS

CANADA: THE COMMUNISTS ON CULTURAL POLICY

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada has submitted to the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee a memorandum stating its proposals for the nation's policy on culture.

The communists are of the opinion that this should be a binational policy in form (in other words, it should take Canada's binational character into account) and democratic in content, enabling all of the ethnic groups to contribute to the nation's cultural development. Moreover, a narrow nationalistic approach should be avoided.

The Canadian communists want to see a substantial increase in material assistance from the government to writers, artists, musicians, playwrights, film workers, theatrical and dance groups, folk ensembles, publishing houses, picture galleries, libraries, and museums of natural history, and concern for amateur groups and individual performers. More attention should be given to art and literature for workers, farmers and other working people. One of the requisites for the attainment of this aim is to build new theaters and concert halls for the public, with tickets sold at prices working people can afford.

For cultural policy, the CPC stresses, publishing (the printing of textbooks and periodicals) as well as the character of the work of the mass media are of the utmost significance. The communists suggest ending U.S. control over the publication and sale of textbooks, books and periodicals, and strict conformity with operating federal laws; the adoption of similar measures relative to the mass media and placing them under democratic control; assistance for the promotion of the state-run film industry, the Canadianization of the radio network, and the democratization of the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission.

In demanding democratic control of Canadian-owned and foreign radio and television networks, the CPC believes that to this

end the state should get a definite percentage of the turnover of all private corporations running radio, television, cable and video-sound networks, and, where necessary, these corporations should be nationalized.

An analysis of the situation in the film industry, the communists point out, shows that the National Film Board could serve as the foundation of a viable Canadian film industry producing a diversity of films. The practice must be stopped of confining the NFB to the production of documentaries and short films (even if they are splendid) while leaving the profitable market for feature films in the hands of private, notably U.S. corporations.

In its memorandum the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada welcomes the formation of a Federal Committee and the latter's decision to sponsor public debates over questions related to federal cultural policy. These debates, the communists stress, are crucial today in view of the acute crisis in Canadian culture.

FRANCE: CONCERN FOR THE PARTY PRESS

The Central Committee of the French Communist Party has passed a resolution under the heading "National Campaign for Donations to the Communist Press." The aim is to collect 15 million francs for the party press fund. The new situation in the country is making it imperative to circulate the FCP's newspapers and journals more widely and to deepen and broaden the work of these media.

The communist press, the resolution states, functions in the very center of the popular movement that in the spring of 1981 led to political changes and is advancing steadfastly along the path of progress and struggle for the satisfaction of the French people's aspirations. The FCP press is encountering serious difficulties: among these are inflation and the discrimination, which deprives it of advertisement revenue. The publication of every issue of a newspaper or a journal, the resolution notes, is always a major victory.

The significance of the FCP's efforts to win more readers and thereby have a larger circulation of its press is to give party members more opportunities for constructively articulating and discussing their stand. This is particularly necessary on the eve of the 24th congress of the FCP. In the pre-congress debates a central place is accorded to a column featured by *L'Humanité* under the heading "Debate Rostum." The FCP Central Committee has formed

a special commission that is studying the views of communists published in this column and the suggestions concerning amendments in the congress draft resolution.

In view of the great significance attached to winning a larger readership for the FCP's central newspaper and the weekly *Humanité Dimanche*, it is planned to increase the printing, in particular, of the weekly to half a million copies. Also, the plan provides for more sales of individual, particularly important issues of these newspapers, and for a subscription campaign during the *L'Humanité* festival and the *Humanité Dimanche* subscription distribution campaign month in the party cells. Every day *L'Humanité* prints the names of primary organizations and individuals who have donated to the communist press fund and also a communiqué on how the campaign is progressing and on the sum of money that has been collected. Also, the newspaper carries reports on the experience of party cells that have distinguished themselves.

The results that have been achieved so far, the resolution says, indicate the feasibility of the aims of the nation-wide campaign.

QUESTION-ANSWER

HOW WORKERS KEPT A FACTORY GOING

"In Panama, state-owned factories are often objects of encroachment by the right. The Panamanian working people are strongly resisting the attempts to return factories to private capital. Moreover, I have been told of cases of workers having to use firearms to defend the factories. Regrettably, I was unable to find information on this count. Would it be possible for WMR to ask the Panamanian comrades to cite instances of this, if they are authentic of course."

Ramon Rodriguez,
Caracas, Venezuela

This question is answered by Anastacio Rodriguez Batista, member of the CC Political Bureau of the People's Party of Panama.

There have, indeed, been such instances. I will relate one of them.

The government has steered a course toward the parallel development of the public and private sectors of the economy. Some bourgeois parties see the successful running of state enterprises as placing private capital under the threat of losing its economic positions. The forces vehemently opposed to the line pursued by the government include the Christian

Democrats. Elated by their election success in one of the provinces, they decided that they could now mount a political offensive and selected the state-run Cobapa factory as their target. They began with an attempt to take over control of the trade union and provoke a strike. The splitters managed to lure some of the working people to their side, but the rest of the workers did not succumb to the glib talk and rose to defend the factory. As a matter of fact, such self-defense is envisaged in the collective bargaining contract signed by the government with trade union and public organizations.

The Christian Democrats did not confine themselves to political pressure: to intimidate the opposition they handed out weapons to their supporters without making a secret of it. We responded by forming self-defense groups.

The struggle to settle the conflict may be divided into several stages. The first envisaged talks between the participants and representatives of local public organizations. But these talks were cut short by the Christian Democrats. They declared a strike with the purpose of "ousting" the communists and defeating those who urged the preservation of state ownership of the factory. The delegates who went to them to discuss the dispute were perfidiously seized and held incommunicado for several days. One of those to whom this happened was Julio Bermudez, General Secretary of the Peasant Communities of Panama.

Developments compelled us to organize a rebuff to the "strike" orchestrated by the Christian Democrats. At this stage we had to place the most zealous supporters of the "strike" idea under special control and then take over the management of the factory and organize its defense.

At the concluding stage we had to prevent the infiltration of Christian Democrats into the factory. These had been called in from other districts in order to foment chaos and create an atmosphere of coercion benefiting the enemy. Armed men attempting to break into the factory were repulsed. There was some shooting during which several people were wounded, despite our efforts to avoid bloodshed. We won the clash, militarily and politically. It had wide repercussions — amazed by the unprecedented instance of armed defense of a factory, public opinion could see for itself that the workers were highly organized.

It is noteworthy that local peasants and workers from banana plantations — altogether nearly 700 persons — took part in the defense of the Cobapa factory. No external forces acted on our side, while the Christian Democrats, who

regarded the seizure of the factory as merely the first stage of a wide-ranging plan, had active support from without, including a supply of weapons from Costa Rica. Exposure of these actions of the Christian Democrats was a strong argument that we used to persuade some doubters.

There were doubters, of course; some people went so far as to suggest that our tactics could not be tolerated since they opposed workers to workers. We had to do much to get people to understand that the conflict was sparked by subversive activities on the part of the Christian Democrats, who were trying to use others to return the factory to the private sector. Meetings were held at which more was said about the benefits that state-run enterprises hold out for working people. We pointed out that private owners were doing nothing to improve the life and working conditions of the people and inhibiting the trade unions in every possible way. This work yielded good results — the ranks of our supporters grew rapidly and we had even to restrain the growth of our self-defense units. As I have already said, considerable assistance was given to us by peasants, especially those who had been wage workers and had experience of participation in strikes and other forms of protest.

The authorities regarded our struggle with understanding, refraining from interfering in it, and sent their representatives to the factory to settle the conflict after the way had been paved by us.

The Panamanian press gave this event no coverage, concealing from the people an instance of how workers protected a factory from encroachment by the private sector.

Workers in Society

T. Timofeyev

Polemical essays on the various interpretations of the historical mission of the working class.

cloth 320 pp \$6.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6



Development trends in the liberated countries of the East

AN ANALYSIS BY THE INSTITUTE
OF ORIENTAL STUDIES OF THE
USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Among those who took part in preparing this paper were Academician Evgeny Primakov (head of group), Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Georgy Kim, Ruben Andreasyan, Cand. Sc. (Econ.), Anatoly Dinkevich, Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Erik Komarov, Cand. Sc. (Hist.), Robert Landa, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), Vladimir Lubchenko, Cand. Sc. (Tech.), Victor Rastyannikov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Nodari Simoniya, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), Aleksandr Chicherov, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), and Glery Shirokov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.).

A characteristic feature of our day is the further growth of the role of the anti-imperialist movement of the peoples of the East in the world revolutionary process, in the struggle against neocolonialism, for a new place for the liberated countries within the system of the global division of labor and in international relations. The role of these countries and their weight in the world economy and the population of the globe have grown substantially. At the same time, despite the retention of some common features by all the liberated countries, the growing unevenness of these countries' development, their increasing socio-economic and socio-political differentiation are an exceptionally important feature of the present situation. The CC Report delivered by Leonid Brezhnev to the 26th congress of the CPSU said: "These countries are very different. After liberation, some of them have been following the revolutionary-democratic path. In others, capitalist relations have taken root. Some of them are following a truly independent policy, while others are today taking their lead from imperialist policy."

Economic problems

By the beginning of the present decade, the economic condition of the developing countries revealed a number of new aspects. First, the pace of their economic growth was, as a

whole, somewhat faster, and this was paralleled by a growth of its instability. Second, the diversification of economic structures, above all in the course of the further build-up of industry, electric power facilities, etc., has proceeded more intensely. The efforts of the developing countries themselves, and also the transnational corporations' policy of locating labor-intensive, energy-intensive and ecologically "dirty" lines of production in these countries have led to an increase in their exports of semi-finished and finished products. Third, in the 1970s, these countries not only managed to halt the decline of their share of world trade, but also to some extent to increase it mainly through intensive exports of raw materials, notably oil, to the capitalist countries.

The developing countries' role in the international division of labor has increased. Their importance in the reproduction mechanism of the world capitalist economy has grown. The energy and raw material crisis has clearly brought out the crucial role of Asia, Africa and Latin America,¹ as suppliers of the key mineral resources for the centers of world capitalism. Under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution, some types of these resources, oil above all, are being converted into universal primary raw materials for many industries. On the one hand, this means a growing raw-material dependence of the centers of world capitalism on a relatively small number of producers of unique raw materials, and, on the other, a generation of fresh impulses tending to deepen the unevenness of the liberated countries' development.

With the establishment of national control over the oil economy and the sharp rise in the price of oil, the OPEC countries' earnings (almost \$300 billion in 1980) were in excess of the outflow of profits, which is itself a consequence of neocolonial exploitation. For the first time in history, there has been a re-distribution of the surplus-value being created in the capitalist world in favor of this group of liberated countries. Some of them have become major exporters of capital to Western Europe and the

United States (about \$50 billion in 1980).² A new international financial center of the capitalist world with operations extending to many areas of Africa and Asia has emerged in the Persian Gulf area.

With the economic development of the liberated countries there has been some expansion of their markets, which are regarded in the industrial center of capitalism as an ever more important factor behind the functioning of their economy. Meanwhile, far from being overcome, the economic, scientific and technical gap between the center and the periphery of the world capitalist economy has, in effect, widened. In 1980, the aggregate Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the capitalist center was 4.5 times greater than that of the periphery, and 12.4 times greater when reckoned per head of the population.³ These countries continue to be dependent on the centers of world capitalism. The neocolonialist strategy of the international division of labor effected by the transnationals makes the African and Asian countries pay for their economic growth with the emergence of new forms of dependence on imperialism: technological, financial and nutritional. These countries remain tied to the markets of the former metropolitan countries, bound by their standards and practices, and dependent on the means of transport and communications, something that forces these countries to give up additionally a part of their export earnings. Their total debt now exceeds \$500 billion, which is more than double their annual exports.

The peculiar economic growth of the centers of capitalism is now such that the struggle to eliminate economic backwardness tends to become more complicated for an absolute majority of developing countries. Its advance is also being hampered by the purposeful policy of the imperialist powers and the transnational corporations. The relatively low rate of GDP growth projected for the industrial capitalist countries for the 1980s, together with runaway inflation, tend to reduce the growth rate in the liberated countries as well. Many processes and trends will have a negative effect on their economic growth, among them the relative narrowing of marketing outlets because of growing protectionism with respect to the semi-finished and finished products coming in from the Afro-Asian region; measures to reduce the dependence on raw material sources through economies of fuel and the development of alternative energy sources; development of material-and-energy saving technologies, development of synthetic materials

production, and the massive introduction of micro-processors. This is paralleled by direct pressure from the international monopolies on these states, notably through a policy of building up strategic raw material stockpiles, one of the causes of the recent forced reduction of oil prices by some producers. The overall worsening of the terms of trade, which is characteristic for the group of developing countries as a whole has also affected the oil producers.

Contradictory processes were under way in the economy of the countries of the East taking the capitalist road. There has been much more intensified concentration of production and capital in a relatively narrow sector of the economy based on the industrial system of productive forces. Meanwhile, pre-capitalist sub-sectors of the economy, with their tremendous concentration of people and the prevalence of pre-industrial forms of labor remained in a state of semi-stagnation. With the advance of the "green revolution," enclaves of industrial productive forces, initially taking shape only on an urban basis, also began to emerge in the countryside.

However, in the course of subsequent development and consolidation of the industrial stage of capital, requiring the concentration of a large part of the financial and material resources in relatively narrow sectors of the national economies, there was no adequate inclusion of living labor into production, while the sharply intensified erosion of the traditional economic forms in the 1970s was not paralleled by a corresponding formation of new economic structures. As a result, there was a growth of the "surplus" population and, accordingly, of the "sphere of poverty." The pauperism of the vast masses with its extreme manifestation — mass declassing — is one of the striking indications of the crisis of capitalism as a social system in the periphery of the world capitalist economy (according to IBRD estimates, "the absolutely poor" totalled almost 800 million in 1973, and over 900 million in 1978). Today, over one-fifth of the population in the developing world (450 million)⁴ has a food consumption that is below the critical subsistence minimum. Another disproportion that is most acute for the developing world has been further deepened: in countries which are most badly in need of the creation of the workers meeting the requirements of modern forms of labor, the reproduction of labor power of the bulk of the population is still in a "tripled state,"⁵ which means that it hampers progress.

The "peripheral" variant of capitalist development has brought out new structural

breaks in the reproduction mechanism of the liberated countries. Whereas in the past, at the stage of import-substitution industrialization, the growth of industrial productive forces was based on the existing "narrow" internal market, today, by contrast, the further progress of industrialization most directly depends on the expansion of the domestic market and the increase of supply. That is precisely what is hampered by the mass pauperism, which here and there tends to produce actual stagnation of demand for consumer goods. Today, in many developing countries it is not only accumulation but also the conditions of realization (the volume of the market) that tend to become the key factors of economic growth.

The intrusion of the transnational into these countries' economic structure, hand in hand with the orientation toward satisfaction of the demand of rich groups in local societies, generates strong impulses toward an ever greater separation of reproduction of these groups' personal consumption fund from national production. By fostering a consumer who is locked upon the whole of the world capitalist economy, the transnationals hamper the integration of the developing countries' economy and create new forms of their dependence on the centers of world capitalism. These processes are most pronounced in the oil-extracting countries.

All these phenomena help to keep the developing countries in the condition of an economically backward, unequal and dependent part of the world capitalist economy. Such is the insoluble contradiction within capitalism itself as a social system. It is natural, therefore, that the developing countries are ever more actively fighting for economic independence, something that ultimately tends to deepen the general crisis of capitalism.

The growth of crisis phenomena in economic and social development caused by the combined impact of internal and external factors is a source of alarm among the ruling circles of liberated countries taking the capitalist road and also among the imperialist powers. Whereas the latter seek to block the crisis trends through a massive export of capital, expansion of the sphere of the transnationals' operations and methods of capitalist modernization, the developing countries would like to overcome the crisis phenomena through a complex approach to the solution of internal and external problems. It is a relatively short while ago that ruling groups in Asian and African countries have mostly come to accept that neither forced industrialization, nor the "green revolution,"

nor even the fight against neocolonialism in international economic relations can of themselves help to solve all the problems in overcoming socio-economic backwardness. The national development strategies framed for the 1980s are mainly aimed to stimulate relatively simultaneous growth in all the sectors of material production. Parallel to this, efforts are to be made to limit social tensions through a creation of new jobs, some reduction of inequality in the distribution of incomes (as a rule, through an increase in the share of the product made available to the poorest part of the population along the channels of the state sector,⁶ instead of effecting deep transformations of the existing structure of property relations).

In the external sphere, there is to be a combination of the struggle against neocolonialism and of "collective self-sufficiency," that is, economic cooperation on a regional basis. At the same time, the experience of the 1970s has shed light on the many difficulties along this road which spring from the similar type of raw-material orientation of most countries of the East, their economic dependence on the imperialist powers and the attempts by the capitalistically more developed states to use regional cooperation for their own benefit in the first place.

The growing effect of the law of uneven development has become an important feature of the developing countries' socio-economic evolution. From 1970 to 1979, the national income gap between the groups of the most and the least developed of these countries widened between 1 to 5 and 1 to 10.8.⁷ This process reflected the differing pace in the formation of the productive forces, in the growth of labor productivity, the change in these countries' role in the international division of labor and so on.

The growth of this unevenness has also been manifested in the socio-economic sphere. At the one pole, there was a growth in the number of states, above all, Asian and Latin American states, where capitalist production became dominant in terms of the scale on which the key material resources of the nation were subordinated to the power of capital, and in terms of the share of the GDP created. Alongside of them is a group of countries, mostly African and some Asian, where only the beginnings of capitalism are making headway.

At the same time, in the 1970s, there was a wave of national democratic revolutions. At the other pole, there emerged a new group of states setting themselves the goal of development toward socialism, among them Ethiopia, Angola,

Mozambique and Afghanistan. As a result, the sphere in which capitalist production relations operate has been steadily narrowing down. This process is closely connected with the changing balance of forces between the two world systems in favor of socialism.

The past decade was marked by a crisis of economic neocolonialism. In many liberated countries, foreign concessions and other direct instruments of monopoly control over the economy were eliminated. These countries put forward a program for a new international economic order. Although the countries involved in the struggle for a restructuring of international economic relations do not interpret the slogan at all similarly, this is a reflection of the urge on the part of most liberated countries to do away with the system of imperialist exploitation, dependence and inequality in economic ties with the capitalist world. These countries' struggle for a profound democratization of international economic relations and for their own economic independence brings about a weakening of the world capitalist system, and this creates more favorable objective conditions for advancing the revolutionary process.

Liberated countries in the world revolutionary process

The developing countries' role in the world revolutionary process has been steadily growing. The former colonies and semi-colonies continue to be a zone of revolution and steep socio-economic and political changes. The 1970s, in effect, saw the final dismantling of the colonial empires. At the same time, the processes of social evolution now tend to become immensely more complicated in view of the ever greater unevenness of development and socio-political differentiation in the former colonial world.

On the one hand, there has appeared a group of countries oriented toward socialism and close ties and a strengthening of all-round cooperation with the socialist community. On the other, there is an approximation with the imperialist powers of the ruling circles of African and Asian countries which in the 1970s markedly advanced along the road of capitalism, with some of them developing into new "sub-imperialist" centers of influence.

The accelerated development of national capitalism in some countries moving along the capitalist road became a marked feature of the past decade. National capital that directly or indirectly controls the instruments of state administration has a tendency to grow mainly

not as an antagonist of foreign capital and the transnationals, but rather as their satellite and frequently even as a willing partner. At the same time, the continued foreign domination of the economy and the key elements of economic dependence result in a constant reproduction of the contradictions between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, with some of its groups being capable of taking a patriotic, anti-imperialist stand.

In all the liberated countries, there is a painful transformation of the traditional social structures, while modern sectors, above all state capitalism and national capitalism, have not yet fully replaced the traditional sectors and have been unable to absorb the paupers and the lumpen proletariat, the product of their disintegration. Quantitative growth and increase in the overall share of the marginal strata of the population, which most keenly feel the instability of their condition, have led to a growth of social tensions within the Afro-Asian societies, and to the creation of more favorable prerequisites for revolutionary change.

The experience of the tragic failures and reverses of the revolutionary process in Asia and Africa indicates the danger of bourgeois potentialities of the petty bourgeoisie. In practice, these can be realized only by an extremely limited part of that class coming out against the working people, including the bulk of the petty bourgeoisie and its revolutionary wing. At the same time, the growth of the bourgeoisie out of the lower petty-bourgeois orders in town and country is an objectively inevitable process at the present stage, considering the conditions that exist in most liberated countries. Consistent struggle against neocolonialism on a patriotic basis and effective realization of progressive measures and reforms for the benefit of the masses tend to weaken and split the petty bourgeoisie, neutralizing its reactionary part and helping its most revolutionary part to side with the people.

From the standpoint of the direction of the liberation process, much importance is attached to some change in the social face of the working class of the East.

From 1970 to 1977, the number of wage workers in the developing countries of Asia alone went up from 135 million to 175 million, with the industrial and transport sectors having over 45 million regular industrial workers and employees. The proletariat in Asia and Africa is linked through a thousand bonds with the surrounding society, with traditional institutions, with the peasantry and with the

petty bourgeoisie — the sources from which it originates. There is an influx into the stratum of high-skilled workers of persons with a level of education which is still beyond the reach of most working people, and this stratum of the proletariat is increasingly filled with people of petty-bourgeois origin, who inevitably bring their own mentality and non-proletarian views and orientation into the midst of the workers. There is a growth in the mass of unskilled workers from marginal and semi-pauperized strata; the growth of their share also creates the conditions for the penetration of non-proletarian ideology, especially of political extremism, into the working class. That is why the problem of ideological purity and seasoning becomes an especially important one for the class struggle of the proletariat, and for the working class movement in the Afro-Asian world.

The communist parties of Asia and Africa have a major role to play in the liberation movement and struggle for social progress. By the end of the 1970s, Marxist-Leninist parties were active in more than 25 countries of the two continents. In the post-war decades, the communist movement there has travelled a complicated and contradictory way, marked both by major victories and serious defeats, with years of upswing and the bitterness of division, in some cases as a result of Peking's subversive action. In historical terms, the serious difficulties and many of the failures of the African and Asian communist parties in the past were directly connected with the overall level of their countries' socio-economic and political development.

The communists have always had the distinction of being able to learn not only from their victories but also from their defeats. In the light of the rich experience of the past decades, the communist movement in African and Asian countries has been gaining in strength and rising to a new level of ideological maturity and organizational cohesion. The most characteristic trends in the communist movement in Asia and Africa today consist in a growing consolidation of its ranks, the overcoming of factionalism and division, the final shedding of Maoist influences, and the winning of a vanguard role through the pursuit of the correct line and painstaking day-to-day work among broad masses of working people. The prospects for the further growth of the communist movement are even more impressive in the light of the ongoing socio-economic processes on these continents which are paralleled by a growth in the number of

industrial workers and employees, something that broadens its base.

There is a further deepening of the social content of liberation revolutions. Among the outstanding achievements were the victories of the people's democratic forces on the scale of the whole of Vietnam (April 1975), and also in Laos (December 1975) and Kampuchea (January 1979). The formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, a powerful outpost of world socialism with a population of over 50 million (along the eastern frontiers of the world socialist system) has become a factor of historical importance tremendously strengthening the international positions of the fighters for national liberation, social progress and peace in Southeast Asia.

The emergence of new countries in Africa and Asia which have opted for the socialist road and which are working to build a society free from oppression and exploitation — Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Mozambique, South Yemen and others — is a significant feature of the present stage of the liberation process. As a whole, it is marked by purposefulness and certainty of class positions, the adoption of the advanced scientific theory as the ideological platform, and the application of the key provisions of Marxism-Leninism in revolutionary practice. Today, many countries in the Afro-Asian region have set themselves the goal of developing toward socialism, and their number has been steadily growing. Some of them have already scored successes in the sphere of the economy, social relations and improvement of the working people's material well-being.

A characteristic feature of the 1970s is the revolutionaries' awareness of the vital importance of forming a vanguard party for consistent advance along the road to socialism. It emerges either with the advent to power or even in the course of the liberation struggle. What is more, when vanguard parties are established, Marxism-Leninism, instead of "original" socialism, is made the basis of their organizational structure, ideology and practical political activity. That does not mean, of course, that all the difficulties of transforming organizations which started out as revolutionary-democratic into communist parties have been surmounted (in his conversation with a Mongolian delegation in 1921, Lenin warned against haste and formalism in this matter). But this shows the lines on which their further transformation will run.

The socialist orientation has already been established as a definite line of socio-political

development in a sizable group of African and Asian countries. On a number of parameters the revolutionary-democratic power is rapidly moving toward the people's democratic power, in the course of which there is an actual development of the socialist orientation into a people's democratic type of process. However, the concrete historical experience gained over the past 15-20 years has brought out some dangers in "forestalling developments" and also contradictory aspects of development along this road.

First, most of these countries have a low level of social-class differentiation, with non-proletarian, including petty-bourgeois strata which are ill adapted to protracted and consistent struggle for radical social transformations having a tremendous role to play. Preparation of the objective and subjective prerequisites for subsequent socialist construction starts there in the absence of a proletarian power. The preservation of private-property relations on the level of the basis and their haphazard growth now and again result in the bourgeoisification of a part of the state and party apparatus, so inducing it to abandon the earlier proclaimed orientation.

Second, the economy of the countries opting for a progressive line of development largely continues to function within the framework of the world capitalist economy, and this has a painful effect on its condition. Add to this the fact that imperialism and neocolonialism as a rule direct their main blows precisely at the countries making the socialist choice. Hence, the often zigzag social evolution and the danger of regressive trends.

In subjective terms, some qualitative distinctions between the revolutionary-democratic regimes have a key role to play; these are distinctions in the concrete goals the leading vanguard sets itself at the given stage; distinctions in their attitude to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine; and finally, distinctions in terms of "elitism," fear of the people or genuine democracy, and in the capacity to overcome narrow nationalistic views and preconceptions. The experience of the recent period shows that the contradictions of social development under revolutionary democracy have now and again produced serious difficulties or have even led to an interruption of advance along the chosen progressive way. But the main thing — and this is something that can now be stated with very good ground — is that the socialist orientation makes headway through all the difficulties and obstacles, and that some of the countries which

have opted for it take a consistently anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist stand.

Contemporary revolutionary processes in liberated countries do not boil down to the phenomena examined above. The prospects for revolutionary transformations in countries advancing along the capitalist road are not simple and are largely determined by the level, forms and methods of capitalist modernization, and also by the depth and scale of the crises of social structures which spring from such modernization with objective inevitability.

The facets of the crisis of social structures are usually most pronounced in countries with reactionary monarchic regimes striving to put through so-called revolutions from above (with direct help from neocolonialism). The substance of such "revolutions" is two-fold: in political terms, the initiative is taken over by members of the counter-revolutionary forces (terroristic dictatorship), and in social terms, they amount to a sharp and leap-frogging acceleration of bourgeois socio-economic transformations. The especially contradictory nature of this model of social development is expressed, in particular, in the discrepancy between the rapid formation of elements of the state-monopoly sector within an exceptionally narrow, reactionary-bureaucratic framework, and its lack of adequate mass capitalist basis, between the increasingly authoritarian nature of the superstructure seeking self-preservation by means of terrorism and the need for bourgeois-democratic freedoms, however elementary. Iran's concrete historical experience shows that the crisis arising from these contradictions may develop into a people's anti-imperialist revolution.

There is yet another characteristic feature to the revolutionary processes in this group of countries, namely: the strong influence exerted on these processes by traditionalism, notably religion. At the 26th congress of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Of late, Islamic slogans are being actively put forward in some countries of the East. We communists have every respect for the religious convictions of people professing Islam or any other religion. The main thing is what aims are pursued by the forces proclaiming various slogans." Such an approach makes it possible to produce a truly objective assessment, on the one hand, for instance, of the experience of the Iranian revolution, where a powerful popular movement against neocolonialist oppression and exploitation has developed under the banner of Islam, and on the other, of events of a totally different kind, when religion is being used by reaction

mounting counter-revolutionary revolts. Everything depends on the trends which predominate in the social struggle being carried on under religious slogans, on whether these are liberation and progressive slogans, or obscurantist and conservative ones.

A peculiar pattern of class and political forces will be found in a group of countries with authoritarian military-bureaucratic regimes (Indonesia, Pakistan, Thailand and others). In some of these, the contradictions between the military-bureaucratic top layer and the democratic strata of the population have already led to revolutionary explosions (Thailand in October 1973), or to mass anti-government action by students and the lower urban orders (Indonesia in January 1974). In other countries, the military-bureaucratic dictatorship has not managed to secure even a temporary political stabilization and is forced continuously to wrestle with the coalescing bourgeois and petty-bourgeois opposition (Pakistan).

The crises of social structures in countries with parliamentary bourgeois-democratic regimes (India, Sri Lanka and Malaysia) have run a smoother, even if not entirely conflict-free course. In the 1970s there was some consolidation in these countries of the top layers of the propertied classes on a capitalist basis. The potentialities for state-capitalist regulation were increased, and repressive measures are combined with political maneuvering. However, reformist policies and state-capitalist regulation cannot prevent the general increase in social tensions engendered by capitalist development with a slow overcoming of the colonial and feudal legacy; there is also evidence of crisis symptoms in the operation of the bourgeois-parliamentary mechanism. In countries with such regimes, there is growing activity of the working masses. The strike struggle of workers and employees, which is frequently combined with action by the lower urban semi-proletarian orders and also by the middle strata, has come to play a substantial role in political life.

Historical experience provides incontrovertible evidence that the development of capitalist relations in some liberated countries does not at all signify a "rejuvenation" or strengthening of world capitalism. In the present conditions of the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism, the entry of capitalism as a system upon the epoch of chronic and deepening crisis, these countries, far from being a reserve of the last exploitive system, in effect tend to introduce new contradictions and to compli-

cate and sharpen the old ones. Meanwhile, the liberated countries' role in the international arena has been steadily growing.

Developing countries within the system of international relations

In the 1970s, the newly liberated countries' authority in the world arena continued to grow, together with their foreign policy activity and their involvement in the solution of global problems. This was expressed in the activity of international organizations of developing countries (among them the OAU and OPEC), of the United Nations and allied organizations, in the mounting struggle for a new international economic order, and in the growing influence of the nonaligned movement. But there is also evidence of a deeper differentiation among such states on foreign policy issues, revealing the following trends:

— On the level of regional and sub-regional structures there is a definite polarization of groups of states with a progressive and a conservative orientation (National Front for Steadfastness and Confrontation and the conservative Arab regimes in the Middle East, the countries of Indochina and ASEAN in Southeast Asia). Imperialism is now trying to foist on some large and influential countries of the Afro-Asian world the role of vehicles of its neocolonialist policy, exercising the functions of "regional gendarme" and using ties with the imperialists to carry out their own ambitious reactionary plans in concrete geographical areas (Egypt in the Middle East and in Africa, Pakistan in West Asia).

On the level of the nonaligned movement there is a growing differentiation caused both by objective differences in political systems and socio-economic development of the countries involved, and by direct subversive activity of imperialism and its Peking allies. There is evidence of compromise trends in the policy of the governments of some liberated countries on issues like cooperation within the transnationals, the imperialist military presence, and withdrawal from the united front of struggle for a new international economic order. Attempts are being made, in effect, to substitute for this struggle a "dialogue" with the capitalist powers whose purpose is to secure definite concessions and privileges, while keeping intact the existing inequitable system of economic ties between the two groups of states. Since the beginning of the 1980s, this trend is being intensively stimulated by the imperialist powers in an effort to seduce a majority of the nonaligned countries with the prospect of "co-

operation for development," so blunting the anti-imperialist edge of the movement.

On the UN level, there is growing activity and cohesion of the developing countries in the struggle against South African racism and Israeli Zionism, for a just solution of the problems of the resources of the World Ocean, etc., with evidence of a simultaneous differentiation and concessions on the part of some of these countries to imperialist pressure on issues like developments in Kampuchea and Afghanistan.

In the developing countries, there is ever wider comprehension of the fact that peace is indivisible, and that the concrete problems of their foreign policy are closely bound up with the general issues in international relations, among which the struggle for international détente and disarmament is of special importance. The imperialist-imposed arms race has a highly negative impact on the socio-economic development and socio-political life of the developing states. From 1965 to 1979, their share of world arms expenditures increased 150 per cent.⁸ Steadily expanding arms deliveries, the imperialist circles seek to bolster their positions in these countries, to stabilize reactionary regimes, to export counter-revolution and — last, but not least — to right their own balance of payments in a worsening world economic situation.

The spread of nuclear weapons poses a particular danger to the peoples of the East, as it does for the whole of mankind. The USSR and other socialist states actively supported the liberated countries' proposals for the establishment of nuclear-free zones and peace zones. It is believed in the socialist world that, on the one hand, there is a need to provide firm guarantees of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and that, on the other, the peoples should have the utmost use of the benefits of nuclear science and technology for peace. These purposes are served by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the relevant system of IAEA guarantees. However, nearly 40 countries, most of them developing, have yet to sign the treaty. Some circles claim that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons allegedly serves the purpose of the "nuclear imperialism" of the great powers, including the USSR. In actual fact, this kind of talk merely provides a convenient cover for the aggressive circles of Israel, South Africa and Pakistan, which are straining to obtain nuclear weapons and which could use them against their neighbors.

The new U.S. line of abandoning international détente, of gaining military superior-

ity over the Soviet Union, and coalescing with Peking hegemonism has an extremely negative influence on the situation in Asia and Africa. This line has very clear-cut regional aspects which seriously affect the interests of the liberated countries of the East, namely, the conception of "three strategic zones" — European, Far Eastern and Anterior Asian — an idea spun out by Zbigniew Brzezinski and being put through by the new Republican administration.

The U.S. aggressive circles have especially emphasized the establishment of the Anterior Asian "strategic zone" of global confrontation with the socialist community under the false pretext of defending the oil resources of the Persian Gulf area against "Soviet aggression." The United States has refused to negotiate on turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone, as all the littoral states insist, and has been building up a gigantic strike force in the form of the U.S. Fifth Fleet, the rapid deployment force and also troops to "guarantee" the Egyptian-Israeli border and air force units. With that end in view, the corresponding infrastructure is being built up in the form of a network of bases in the Middle East and in East Africa, politically backed up with a set of bilateral agreements between the United States and a number of pro-imperialist regimes. Particular importance is attached to the "strategic alliance" with Israel.

Simultaneously, Washington has tried to bolster the second "strategic zone" — the Far Eastern zone — and this is expressed in the alignment of the United States, China and Japan, which is developing into a military-political alliance, in the stepping up of tensions on the Korean Peninsula, and in the moves over the Taiwan problem. All these acts pose a threat not only to the socialist community, but also to the security of the countries of South and Southeast Asia. Peking, with U.S. commitments on deliveries of offensive weapons, has made no secret of its territorial claims in that region.

The United States and China have been pushing the ASEAN countries into a confrontation with Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea for the purpose of subordinating the foreign policy of ASEAN and its member-countries to the overall strategy of imperialism, and enlarging the second "strategic zone" by building a bridge across to the ANZUS bloc.

The peace-loving countries of Africa, above all, the "front-line states" view with alarm the U.S. line of open support of South Africa's racist regime. This policy encourages the aggres-

sor, who has been staging provocative sorties against the neighboring states, and blocking the process of a peaceful transfer of power to SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

The realization of the first phase of the Camp David accords — the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai Peninsula — is to be completed in the Middle East by April 1982. Even if this does occur (in Israel there is a growing clamor by extremist circles against the withdrawal of the troops) Egypt will not fully restore its sovereignty over the Sinai: U.S. troops and the troops of a number of NATO countries are to be stationed in a broad strip in the Sinai. It is now generally obvious that Camp David has brought the Middle East settlement into a dead end, giving the aggressor a free hand in the north, and helped the United States in its military penetration into the region. Far from being pushed back, the threat of another war in the Middle East has sharply increased in the recent period, in view of the events in the Lebanon caused by Israel's aggressive acts and by other acts of imperialist intervention.

With the slide toward a cold war and the growth of military-political tension, imperialism will continue to exert pressure on the developing countries, without stopping short of direct aggression for the purpose of taking over their natural resources, establishing new bridgeheads, bases, etc.

The newly liberated countries have a vital

stake in the success of the socialist community's struggle for international détente and peace. The Soviet Peace Program for the 1980s, formulated by the 26th congress of the CPSU, is of tremendous importance in improving the international situation on a global level and in the sphere of regional relations. The developing countries' multilateral and constantly growing cooperation with world socialism has now become a vivid expression of international solidarity. It not only helps to ward off the military-political aggression of imperialism and neocolonialism, but also to create basic socio-economic and cultural prerequisites for advancing to a society free from every form of exploitation, discrimination and oppression.

1. In the first section of this article, the Latin American countries are sometimes mentioned alongside the African and Asian countries because international economic statistics frequently give data for the three continents together. But the article deals mainly with the countries of the Afro-Asian region, above all those of the East (Asia and Northern Africa).

2. *First Chicago World Report*, June 1980, p. 2.

3. Calculated from: *World Bank Annual Report*, 1980, pp. 16, 17, 130, 131; *World Economy and International Relations*, No. 8, 1978, pp. 148-149; No. 5, 1979, pp. 147, 155 (in Russian).

4. *Financial Express*, Delhi, May 25, 1980.

5. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 173.

6. The establishment of "low price" shops, government subsidies for food and other prime necessities, etc.

7. Calculated from: *World Development Report*, 1980, p. 110-113.

8. "World Armaments and Disarmament," *SIPRI Year Book*, 1980, London, 1980, p. XVIII.

The crisis of state intervention in the economy and bourgeois science

On several occasions, the impact of the present economic crisis on bourgeois economic thinking has been considered on the pages of this journal. We continue the discussion of this problem.

"AUSTRO-KEYNESIANISM":
THE SHEET-ANCHOR?

Michael Graber

CC Political Bureau member, CP Austria

The crisis of state-monopoly regulation of the economy has been obvious since the 1974-1975 crisis of the world capitalist economy. Not only has confidence been lost in the traditional forms of this regulation based on Keynesianism, but doubt has been cast on the very capac-

ity of the capitalist state to govern economic life generally. Meanwhile, ultra-conservative and liberal economic conceptions covered by the concept of "monetarism" have been revived and bolstered.

Keynesian methods of regulation essentially involve the creation of deficits and debts under the state budget in order to stimulate additional demand for producer and consumer goods. That was the approach in many industrialized countries of the capitalist world from the 1940s to the 1960s, but its potentialities have now sharply diminished. Nowadays, balance of payments and state budget deficits largely stem from the raw materials and energy crises and the rapid increase in arms spending. That is why inflation defies management by budget

policies, while expenditure programs designed to increase employment turn out to be ever less capable of resisting the growing unemployment.

The methods now being used, above all in the United States and Britain, are not those which are designed to regulate demand but those of government economic policy aimed to regulate the money supply. This does not, of course, do away with the roots of inflation. It merely sends the bank rate sky high, and this results in more bankruptcies and a further growth of unemployment.

The high bank rate policy, which above all helps to strengthen the centers of finance capital in the United States, tends to destabilize the economy and reduce the potentialities available to the governments of small and medium capitalist countries to regulate economic life. This has put the social democratic parties ruling in some of these countries in a quandary. These parties' "government powers" are crucially based on their promises to use the state-monopoly mechanism to regulate the economy for the benefit of workers and employees. The impression used to be that Keynesianism provided the theoretical and practical means for doing so. The social democrats' promises were believed so long as the economic prerequisites for pursuing the Keynesian policy existed and state-monopoly regulation appeared, at first sight, to be effective. That is why the crisis of the state-monopoly regulation of the economy led to a crisis of the social democratic "policy of reforms," which eventually ousted the social democratic parties from the governments of several countries.

It is true that most of these parties' leaders have not drawn from their defeat the conclusion that the only way to make the economic process balanced and stable and to eliminate unemployment is by eradicating the monopoly roots of the current crisis phenomena. On the contrary, they have been trying to fall back on the old set of state-monopoly instruments as an alternative to monetarism and the "conservative experiments" of Reagan and Thatcher.

In this sense, Austria has a place apart among the small capitalist countries of Europe. Here, the social democrats have been in power for 11 years, and their positions have not been shaken by the 1974-1975 crisis. The strong position of the ruling social democratic party, which has an absolute majority in parliament, is due mainly to the fact that the crisis of state-monopoly regulation of the economy has not yet made itself felt in Austria to the same extent as

it has done in other countries. This is due partially to Austria's politico-economic peculiarities which have helped the country go through no more than some weakened effects of the cyclical and sharpened general crisis of capitalism. This has made it possible to continue using the methods of economic management closely connected with the specific form of domination of the state-monopoly system: a solidly institutionalized form of social partnership.

What are these peculiarities? First of all, there is the availability of relatively large raw-material and energy stocks and a strong nationalized industry sector. Then there is a fairly high level of trade with the socialist countries, in which not only geographical proximity but above all Austria's status as a consistently neutral country have a part to play. Finally, among the peculiarities are also the high earnings from foreign tourism, which until recently compensated the structural deficit of the foreign-trade balance caused by the dependence of the country's economy on the EEC and mainly on the FRG monopolies.

An important result of the relatively favorable politico-economic conditions was the absence of mass unemployment, whose level throughout the 1970s went up by slightly over two per cent. The SPA leadership claims the credit for this low rate of unemployment growth, and says that it is the result of advance along "the Austrian way." The social democratic leaders also declare that they have been leading the economy along the "social democratic" course which runs between conservative economic policy and the planned economy of the "communist dictatorships." Influential bourgeois economic theorists have produced a more "academic" definition — "Austro-Keynesianism" — to explain the specific politico-economic conditions that have taken shape in the country.

The main contours of "Austro-Keynesianism" were sketched out by Hans Seidel, State Secretary at the Ministry of Finance, in a speech before U.S. Congressmen in June 1981, when he said that in Austria an incomes policy has been introduced to ease the inflationary consequences of the full employment policy. It was believed that a fortunate combination of the incomes policy and the management of demand could help to achieve a high level of employment and price stability. Austria relied on a Keynesian-type employment policy and did not pursue any monetarist goals. Having characterized the incomes policy as the hard core of "Austro-Keynesianism," he

explained how it was being implemented in concrete terms. It is permanently used with an eye to long-term results, there are no publicly announced directives on wages, although there is the broadly accepted view that the demands of individual trade unions should not go beyond the framework of economic growth. The Austrian incomes policy is not designed to redistribute incomes. It is based on the notion that the shares of capital and labor in the national income should remain unchanged.

The final sentence here is an expression of the view of social justice which the advocates of social partnership want to spread among the working people. Actually, there is evidence not only of a respectful distance between wages and the value of labor-power in Austria, but there is a permanently maintained process of redistribution of the national income in favor of capital. Despite the fact that in 1980 economic growth came to 3.6 per cent, the working people's real wages in our country declined by an average of 0.5 per cent. While the total wages of workers and employees over the past two years went up by 14 per cent, the incomes of entrepreneurs and property-holders went up by 35 per cent. But the favorable employment situation caused by the peculiarities mentioned above is used as an argument to vindicate the incomes policy which is based on social partnership.

Fiscal policy is an important instrument in the redistribution of incomes in favor of capital. In 1968, 8 billion schillings was levied in the form of taxes respectively on workers' wages and company incomes. In 1981, the tax on incomes totalled 22 billion schillings, and the tax on wages — 70 billion. The Austrian fiscal system holds the world record in tax concessions to capital (60 per cent of joint-stock companies pay no corporation tax), but still has no trouble in increasing the total volume of taxes. The government says that over the past 10 years, indirect tax benefits and direct subsidies to capital came to roughly 200 billion schillings. Let us note, by way of comparison, that in the same period the annual amount of investments in Austrian industry fluctuated between 20 billion and 33 billion schillings.

The term "structural economy," which will be found in the SPA's economic program adopted at its last congress, signifies an even greater redistribution of funds to stimulate investments, thereby consolidating the positions of national and foreign capital. The idea is to offset the markedly worsened conditions for the use of capital in Austria and, above all, to create fresh opportunities for the investment of

private capital. This social-democratic program is in line with the politico-economic demands of the Austrian conservatives, who see no reason to abandon the "well-tried system of social partnership." Both the social democrats and the conservatives are now considering how long they can go on using the present methods of state-monopoly regulation of the economy as a basis for the social partnership policy.

It would, apparently, be premature to speak about a crisis of the whole system of state-monopoly economic regulation in Austria, but the weakest points are already in evidence.

The state budget deficit, for several years at 50 billion schillings, is expected to go up to 70 billion in 1982, so pushing up the state debt to 300 billion schillings. Here, one should also bear in mind the following process: a part of the deficit earmarked for stimulating additional demand — 21 billion schillings in 1978 — was cut back to 3 billion in 1981.

The tax privileges introduced to stimulate investments are proving to be less and less capable of bringing about structural changes in industry to ensure competitiveness in the international market.

Direct subsidies first go to foreign capital and transnational corporations and, to a lesser extent, to nationalized industries. Thus, in 1980, General Motors concluded a contract with the Austrian government, which undertook to provide one-third of the investments in building a plant to make engines and gear boxes, and also to cover all the costs of infrastructuring the plant for operation — a total of 3.5 billion schillings. But that same year, the government refused to make available to the nationalized Association of High Quality Steel Mills a roughly similar amount for the purpose of maintaining jobs at its enterprises. So, the world's biggest motor manufacturers received a subsidy to create 2,600 jobs, while a nationalized association is forced to eliminate 3,000 jobs because of a shortage of funds.

Consequently, the crisis has also hit the state-monopoly management policy, because the number of jobs being lost in the nationalized industry — the economic and industrial pivot of many traditional industries in Austria — is not being compensated even by the large-scale measures designed to stimulate private capital.

The communists of Austria stand for an anti-monopoly alternative to this economic policy and look to a line, which, in particular, gives preference to the state sector. This stand is substantiated in the draft of the CPA's new program, which says: "The preservation, ex-

pansion, financing and functioning of the nationalized economy are key issues in the struggle of the working-class movement, and not only of the working-class movement. On these depend the potentialities for regulating individual spheres of the economy, creating of jobs, restraining the penetration of foreign capital into national industry, trade and scientific research, even in capitalist conditions. In this sector, the state bears responsibility for all the questions of the wages policy and the social and structural policy. The state should take this into account depending on the level of organization and consciousness of the working class."*

The working people's consciousness was recently exemplified by the workers' action at the above-mentioned nationalized Association of High Quality Steel Mills. They staged the biggest demonstrations which Austria has seen over the past several years and prevented the closure of some of its subsidiaries and the lay-off of many steel workers.

In the face of the menacing aggravation of the crisis phenomena, the Austrian communists insist that the only way out of the situation is to pursue an economic policy meeting the social interests of the working class and the country's national interests.

CATERING FOR FINANCE CAPITAL

Samuel Behak

representative of the CP Uruguay on WMR

In the 1970s, some bourgeois economists reviewed their old notions about the nature of capitalist development. Serious doubts were cast, in particular, on the idea that in the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution countries with a high level of industrialization have matured to a state of self-sustained growth, interrupted only by partial, short-term recessions, which, however, lend themselves to state-monopoly control. Today, preference is given in the industrialized capitalist countries to variants of monetary economic policy which have a common feature, namely, the release of capital from government intervention, with the simultaneous use of the government machine by the monopolies for their own purposes. Does this signify the final collapse of differently formulated and interpreted Keynesian policy? After all, Latin American experience in the 1960s shows that monetarist policy can to some

extent be squared with patently Keynesian-type economic policy; however, the potentialities for so doing have now been narrowed down.

Professor Michael Hudson¹ was quite right in saying that there is an objective fact at the basis of the current upswing of monetarism: the consequences of the crisis which has shaken the industrialized capitalist countries over the past decade.

In the late 1950s, Uruguay was confronted with an inflation that went hand in hand with economic stagnation and growing unemployment, that is, something that later came to be known as "stagflation," or "structural crisis," as we call it. Bourgeois economists have been arguing over the theoretical explanation of stagflation and ways to overcome it. We must, of course, keep these academic debates within our field of vision, but the more important thing is to establish the gist of the sets of economic measures proposed by either of the trends in bourgeois political economy. For whose benefit have bourgeois economists been trying to solve the problems posed by the crisis before the industrial capitalist countries, on the one hand, and the dependent countries, on the other?

For a deeper understanding of monetarist policy it is worthwhile to consider, for instance, the activity of the International Monetary Fund and the consequences of its long intervention in the life of virtually all the Latin American countries. Life has shown that the IMF is in no sense a mere regulator of monetary relations, but has been converted, under the sponsorship of U.S. monopoly capital, into an instrument of coercion, an instrument "for the conduct of an ultra-liberal monetarist economic policy which in practice boils down to putting the countries' economy under the dictat of the transnational corporations, setting in motion relentless economic mechanisms serving to concentrate profit in the hands of privileged groups, sharply reducing official expenditures so as to bring about a so-called improvement of the economy, chiefly for the purpose of turning it into an appendage in service of big transnational capital."²

It is apparently wrong to regard as a mere coincidence the fact that monetarist theories emerged simultaneously with the start of IMF activity in Latin American countries in the 1950s.³ Uruguay signed the first "declaration of intent" foisted on it by the Fund in late 1959. Since then, the IMF has exercised virtual control of the country's economic life on a quarterly basis. Uruguay's commitments to the IMF are renewed at short intervals of time.

*Programm der KPO (Entwurf), p. 7; *Volksstimme*, January 31, 1981.

The IMF's strength does not lie only in its funds. It also lies in the fact that without its warranty it is impossible to obtain or re-schedule credits or loans in international financial outfits or private banks. It is true that here there are no relevant agreements, but that is precisely what happens when there is a need to "punish" a government and to "call it to order." The IMF's monetarist policy is not designed to resolve the crisis in our countries; its purpose is to perpetuate and expand the reproduction of imperialist finance capital, and to clamp even heavier financial fetters on the dependent countries.

With the signing of the initial commitments and the adoption of monetarist measures, processes tend to arise in developing countries which it is hard to stop without repudiating the Fund. Thus, the devaluation of the national currency in Uruguay in 1959 gave an impetus to inflation, which in some years rose to over 100 per cent, and which is still very high. Much damage has been done by Uruguay's commitments to the IMF to reduce appropriations for consumption and social needs, and to raise taxes on consumption in order to balance the state budget (meanwhile, spending on the maintenance of the repressive bureaucratic apparatus kept growing, the taxes on capital were reduced). Other commitments were also undertaken along the same lines.

Not all of these commitments could be realized at once and to the full extent, as this would have required social and political violence on an unprecedented scale. The IMF appeared to reckon with this, but still kept prod-ding the erosion of the structures of national-reformist capitalism, which the Uruguayan bourgeoisie had set up after the Second World War, opening up channels for the penetration into Uruguay of foreign capital for the purpose of subordinating the country to the transnational corporations.⁴ The persistent introduction of monetarist policy caused a chronic trade and balance of payments deficit and led to a growth of external indebtedness, which the succession of governments covered with fresh loans and credits obtained at the price of even more enslaving commitments. The authorities' timid attempts to change the situation in the 1960s failed because of sharp bouts of inflation and crisis phenomena in the economy. Its dependence on foreign capital has been growing, and its structure simultaneously undergoing a change.

The conduct of monetarist policy and the drive on wages and living standards, together with the harassment of working-class organ-

izations have brought about a sharpening of the class struggle in Uruguay. The working-class movement and progressive political forces have become aware of the consequences of the IMF's arbitrary activity and have exposed its policy, putting forward an alternative socio-economic program which provides for democratic solutions and national liberation.

Analysis shows that over the past 20 years, Uruguay's production and financial structures have been changed in favor of foreign capital, transnational banks and the big commercial and landed proprietors through the intervention of the IMF and with close collaboration of the national oligarchy. This is manifested in the fact that direct investments of foreign capital have increased and the number of the transnationals' subsidiaries in the country has grown. They now control enterprises which had once been national, land and, in particular, the banking system. The transnationals have been pumping more and more profits out of the country without any control. The lopsided orientation of foreign trade, the break-down of the system of protection for the country's economy on a world market distorted by the monetary and price crises, have enabled foreign capital to plunder the country's national resources frequently through exchanges between the transnationals and their subsidiaries. Finally, the external debt has a crucial effect on the socio-economic situation. Uruguay is now in debt not only to international organizations but also directly to the transnational banks. Let us note that a sizable part of the debt consists of direct investments in the transnationals' subsidiaries effected through banks, with a large part of the profits credited as interest.⁵ This has further increased the country's dependence.

Since the 1973 coup, everything that used to be a secret (with the exception of the most intimate secrets of big business) has been publicized and advertised under the protection of the dictatorship and fascist terrorism. The mass media have advertised the monetarist idea of the need to concentrate the national income in the hands of the most propertied elements, on the plea that they save and invest more than anyone else. There is an advertising campaign to popularize technological advantages and modernization which, the bourgeois press claims, the transnationals have brought to Uruguay, and also the benefits allegedly to be reaped by the country from its conversion into an open financial market.

Just now, there is a drive to popularize Milton Friedman's theories (which, let us note,

contain more ideology and demagoguery than science), theories which he expounded when he landed in March 1975 on Chile's soil that was drenched in blood and covered with concentration camps. Friedman recommended that the Pinochet clique should resort to the "shock" treatment (including the economic and social spheres), in order to contain inflation and to create a strong market economy. He proposed cut-backs in government spending and the abolition of laws protecting workers from dismissals. At the same time, he insisted that there should be no subsidies, no control of prices or wages, no "help" for the poor, because — he declared — it is not the poor and the ignorant that can spend their money most efficiently. It is the rich, the opulent, those who operate successfully in other spheres that can spend the money most efficiently.⁶

There is also a spread in Uruguay of the pro-imperialist and neocolonialist ideas of Friedrich Hayek, another herald of "ultra-liberalism." He says: "I would not give any loans to Third World governments. I would induce private capital to invest money in these countries, with guarantees of a recoupment of outlays and profits in the event of political disorders. I think, in particular, that it would be effective if we could make them understand that our aid is oriented toward countries prepared to choose the capitalist way."⁷

The advocates of big capital have gone a long way in the ideological campaign in support of monetarism. But there is more to it than the propounding of a theoretical conception. There is the reality which backs up this avalanche of demagoguery: the crisis rocking the capitalist world. Monetarist-minded politicians seek to derive from the crisis situation benefits above all for monopoly capital. The monetarist doctrine itself may, we feel, be regarded as a part of the ideology feeding the counter-revolution and expressing imperialist interests. There is good reason why the Reagan administration advertises and supports monetarism outside the United States.

While saying that monetarist views are prevalent, we should not forget the existence of other theoretical and political trends which meet the interests of non-monopoly groups and strata. These would like to conduct an economic policy reflecting their own interests, which frequently run counter to those of the monopolies. Some groups in capitalist society seek to continue a reformist policy. There are also other social forces, represented by the non-monopoly bourgeoisie or under its influence, which want to limit the power of the

monopolies and retain some state control. Such trends will not disappear, although monetarism has been actively attacking them, while in Uruguay the reactionary mass media have already announced their defeat. Such non-monopoly conceptions are viable because the interests of a sizable section of the bourgeoisie are at stake.

Powerful progressive popular movements and bourgeois-democratic trends can act together to resist fascist-type policies which in the economic sphere may assume the form of monetarism. The working class and its revolutionary vanguard take part in this resistance, fighting to realize their own program and striving to put an end to the dependence on big international finance capital. The communists urge the Latin American nations to protect and win back their own resources and to establish equitable, extensive and solid ties with other countries as a basis for putting through measures to solve vital social problems and pave the way for building a socialist society.

1. WMR, June 1981.

2. Declaration General del Segundo Congreso de la Asociación de Economistas del Tercer Mundo, Granma, May 4, 1981.

3. As epitomized by the better known Klein-Saks mission to Chile in 1956.

4. Finance capital and the transnationals do not, of course, operate only through the medium of the IMF; they also impose their will on dependent countries directly.

5. For some other aspects of external indebtedness see WMR July 1981, "Anatomy of monetary contradictions."

6. Busqueda, April 1976, p. 48.

7. Busqueda, March 1981, p. 48.

Whence the Threat to Peace

The Soviet answer to the Pentagon pamphlet — the true picture of East-West military strength, and the approach of the two sides to détente, peace and the arms race.

Color photos, maps and charts
78 pp paper \$2.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6



The political climate is changing

Eduardo Viera
Member, Executive Group Abroad,
Communist Party of Uruguay

The year 1981 was noteworthy for Uruguay on many accounts. There developed a new domestic situation more favorable to democratic change. This was made possible by the growing struggle of the working class and political parties, a widespread protest movement of democratic opinion against the dictatorship, and increasing popular resistance. Needless to say, the ruling circles did not desist from repression. They still resort to arbitrary practices and persecute left-wing organizations and trade unions; the prisons are overcrowded with political prisoners.

Lt.-Gen. Gregorio Alvarez became the new President of the Republic. The armed forces refused for the first time to govern through go-betweens or puppets. Alvarez's appointment to the office of head of state for a three-year term, which the military call "transitional," was unquestionably a mockery of the people's will expressed in the plebiscite on November 30, 1980.¹ The State Council and the government are still extremely reactionary in composition.

Even so, the dictatorship is compelled to make concessions. It had to enter into a dialogue with disgraced leaders of the traditional bourgeois parties and restore the political rights to most of these leaders, one-time legislators and cabinet ministers. (True, the main leaders of these parties and, of course, all representatives of the left were ignored). The traditional alignments were told that they could resume their political activity in 1982 but not until after putting on the straitjacket of the law on parties.

The new President is lavish in promising a return to constitutional government. This sets him apart from Gen. Ballestrino who was relieved of his post last March and who had urged stamping out all opposition with fire and sword. The nation's problems are now discussed more openly. More and more often, the press and radio discuss political means of coping with the situation, which also implies the need to legalize left-wing parties. In spite of a constant threat of being closed down, opposition weeklies sharply criticizing the regime are published. Intuition suggests to the masses that

a new political situation exists in the country and it is increasingly difficult for the military to hold power.

This climate and this state of affairs are a direct result of the victory achieved in the plebiscite, in which the people defeated the attempt to impose a fascist constitution. Neither repression, nor anti-communist slander profited the government. Physical and psychological terror failed to produce the results hoped for. Unprecedented mass protests and action by the majority of the nation against fascism struck the dictatorship a crushing blow.

The November 30 victory did not come automatically. The no said to the regime was as forceful as the people's protest against the hated tyrant in Lope de Vega's play *Fuente Ovejuna*. It was not a result of favorable circumstances but the culmination of an active resistance movement that has been going on for eight years, or ever since the 1973 general strike. It never stopped even after trade union activity came to be regulated.² Its strength was exemplified by the gains of democratic organizations in the 1973 university elections as well as by major strikes and other mass actions. Even stepped-up terror in 1975 failed to diminish the intensity of anti-dictatorial struggles. The people's resolve grew and the forms and methods of both underground and legal struggle became more varied. The working people won some of their economic demands.

The dictatorship's defeat in the plebiscite was due not only to the sustained struggle of democratic forces in recent years but to the impact of the "antibodies" rejecting fascism, "antibodies" which came into being in the two decades preceding the 1973 coup, the formative period of the social strength of the Uruguayan revolution. It was then that the National Convention of Workers (NCW), an organization grouping industrial and numerous agricultural workers, was founded. The NCW also won the support of other sectors, including university students and teachers. A Broad Front was formed; it is a coalition of progressive anti-imperialist groups and parties, the Communist

Party included. The CPU grew both numerically and qualitatively — it had tens of thousands of members, really led the masses and successfully pursued a policy for unity with progressive forces. Changes came about in the position of many social strata, and national reformist trends gained ground in the traditional bourgeois alignments.

After the reactionary coup the CPU preserved its structure, its leading center inside the country and its underground press (the newspaper *Carta* appears regularly), and established links with the masses. The Communist Youth League is active among workers and students. It publishes its own newspaper, *Liberarse*. The workers' struggle is led by the National Confederation of Labor (NCL), an illegal proletarian trade union center. The trade unions, operating mostly in conditions of illegality, publish newspapers and organize labor protests. The Federation of University Students is very active too. The Socialist Party brings out an illegal news bulletin. The regime's policy has compelled even the traditional bourgeois parties, primarily the National Party (NP), to join in the anti-dictatorial movement. Working-class and popular unity in exile has become closer.

The communists' efforts are aimed at extending opposition in the country by preserving and strengthening the Broad Front and fostering democratic sentiments, which do not always find public expression due to the atmosphere of fascist terror and brutal repression against the main resistance forces.

The rise of the group known as Democratic Convergence in Uruguay (DCU)³ was a development of tremendous importance to the progress of the struggle. The DCU became something of a connecting link between opposition to the regime at home and progressives abroad who identify themselves with our people.⁴ It advanced the idea of rallying together all forces opposed to the dictatorship. Its call for joint action brought ready response. "What arguments could one adduce against joining in the common effort?" Wilson Ferreira Aldunate, the NP leader now in exile, declared. "Some might say that the ideological contradictions separating people from one another are too deep and are irreconcilable. I'm a traditional adherent of the Blanco⁵ party and deeply sympathetic to it . . . But how can my membership in Blanco be an obstacle to my fighting along with communists, socialists and members of other organizations, with those who belong to no party but are on the same firing line as I and faced with the same enemy? Such a classification of compatriots according to their way

of thinking is contrary to the national tradition, to Uruguay's good traditions, at a time when it isn't a political doctrine or social gain that is threatened (this is not a mere phrase) but the country itself. We risk losing our own country."⁶

The mobilization of the people to resist the organizers of the plebiscite, and joint action by the Broad Front parties and the traditional bourgeois alignments demonstrated the fruitfulness of the idea of uniting the opposition.

The resistance is gaining strength, forcing the authorities into retreat. To avoid clashes with trade union organizations preparing to celebrate May Day, the regime revoked its decision to consider the day a work day. Workers take more vigorous action for higher wages, against unemployment. The university is a scene of recurrent demonstrations over restrictions on access to education. The students have collected tens of thousands of signatures to a document condemning the authorities' discriminatory measures. Prominent public figures speak out in support of these demands. Leaders of the traditional bourgeois alignments declare publicly for the re-establishment of democratic rights. They have rejected the idea of joining the State Council. Thousands of people went from Uruguay to the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre to greet Wilson Ferreira Aldunate, the NP leader.

The political isolation in which the dictatorship has been ever since its emergence is compounded by contradictions arising from a ruinous economic policy (its main lines were worked out according to the recommendations of theorists of the Chicago and Stanford schools). Trying to justify its policy, the government points to a certain increase in the gross domestic product (GDP) and the foreign-exchange reserves of the Central Bank. However, it deliberately says nothing about the balance of trade deficit, which in 1980 amounted to 55 per cent of the total value of exports, or about inflation, which exceeded 30 per cent last year. The external debt has tripled since the coup.

As regards the increase in GDP, it is a result of greater demand for Uruguayan products in neighboring Argentina and, on the other hand, of the continuing construction boom being supported by a new upturn in inflation.⁷ In fact when, in 1980 and 1981, favorable conditions ceased to exist, economic indices fell short of those of 1979, the most favorable year. As for reserves of international liquid assets, they owe their formation to foreign loans and the accumulation of foreign-exchange deposits.

These receipts are a result of speculative transfer of transnational and "migrant" Argentine capital, diverted to Uruguay to exploit the difference in interest rates. Financial operations have become the most profitable business in the country.

The regime maintains concentration and centralization of capital to meet the interests of financial groups and transnationals. It encourages big exporters while dooming whole national industries (primarily those supplying the home market) to extinction. As a result, the country is flooded with imported goods.

This policy evokes protests from the working people, whose real incomes are declining at a disastrous rate. The middle strata, peasants, large groups of industrialists and merchants (with the exception of big landed proprietors and employers as well as powerful importers) show serious discontent for their part. Agricultural producers held a congress in the middle of 1981. The congress expressed distrust of the group responsible for the country's economic development. The regime has made the economy a means of profit and speculation. This is a common accusation levelled at it and seconded even by those who cannot be suspected of leftist views. There is no concealing the enormous indebtedness of big landowners and employers to the state. Financial capital not only makes profit from high discount rates⁸ but is gaining ground in construction (although the boom in this industry is subsiding) and other fields promising maximum profit. This was the case in, say, August 1978 when financial magnates tried to gain control of trade in livestock by using the easy terms granted by the government. The current crisis in agriculture is largely a consequence of this deal.

Popular discontent tends to aggravate the sharp contradictions already existing among the top military. There is a growing understanding among high-ranking army officers that the regime is in a blind alley and that the miscarriage of its economic policy, torture and terror, and the corruption affecting numerous commanders have created an unbridgeable gulf between the nation and the armed forces. And this is fraught with serious social collisions. Indeed, it was during the exposure of crying facts of corruption that Gen. Ballestrino, a man known for his nazi convictions, was discharged from active service, and that Gen. Nunez, Minister of the Interior, and other high dignitaries had to resign. The crisis has not been overcome yet. Even the appointment of Alvarez to the Presidency came in an atmosphere of reciprocal incrimination by the military.

In these circumstances most of the top military men are becoming agreeable to the idea of slow and controlled advance toward "normalizing" the domestic situation. The opposition, in turn, is trying to widen as far as possible the breaches it has made in the dictatorial system. We cannot sit back with folded arms or cherish illusions about the vague promises of Alvarez and other generals. We must demand real changes, leaning on the struggle of the masses and parties. To return to democracy means ending all persecution, granting all political prisoners, exiles and dismissed persons, a general amnesty, lifting the ban on political activity, restoring trade union and democratic freedoms, convening a constituent assembly to decide on the country's future, and renouncing today's disastrous economic policy.

Democratization or normalization are unthinkable without restoring the rights of left-wing forces, the Broad Front and its member parties. To uphold the ban on the legal activity of political organizations defending the interests of the working class and other exploited population groups is contrary not only to democratic principles but the existing alignment of forces. It should be remembered that in the latest elections (1971) Gen. Liber Seregni, an authoritative progressive leader who was nominated by the Broad Front and who has been a prisoner of the dictatorship virtually ever since the coup, polled 20 per cent of votes against 22 per cent collected by the winner, President Bordaberry. The popularity of Seregni, known as the "people's general," goes on growing.

A recent editorial in the Uruguayan newspaper *Dia* (which would be very hard to accuse of leftist leanings) posed the problem very accurately by commenting that one cannot ignore nearly one-fourth of the electorate backing the Broad Front, which won firm popular support in the face of repression and played a notable role in national life. Only real activity by all political forces, *Dia* stressed, will help re-establish democracy and inspire respect for law and constitutional norms. Like the solution of growing socio-economic problems, this can only be achieved with the people's participation.⁹

In an effort to divide the opposition, the military command assails Marxism-Leninism (President Alvarez does as much). "It is well known," Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of our party's CC, said in reply to attacks, "that these ideas are used as a cover to attack all democrats whether they are Marxists or not... But anyone who says he is speaking on behalf

of the nation cannot declare an ideological crusade against trends that have legitimately taken root in national reality and are part of the democratic tradition. You cannot exclude communists, socialists and others without repudiating the announced principles of democracy."¹⁰

It is beyond question that in the new conditions our party, the Broad Front and the trade unions will actively use the legal opportunities that are offered while preserving their illegal structures.

However, it will be no easy task to have the rights of political organizations restored, not even in the case of the traditional bourgeois parties. Reactionaries among the military reject the very idea of serious concessions to opposition forces. The financial oligarchy exerts pressure on the government to maintain today's economic policy. The USA has redoubled its pressure on Uruguay. By delivering larger quantities of arms and continuously sending civil and military emissaries to Uruguay, the Reagan administration wants to tie it to Washington's imperialist policies more than ever.

Our country is at a difficult stage, for the dictatorship has no more chances of maintaining its rule in its present form while the opposition is still unable to strike it a decisive blow. Unless there comes a powerful action by the workers and the people or unless a military political crisis sets in leading to serious collisions that could bring about a marked change in the situation, the process will go on, in our

opinion, from little to more. In such a contingency the important thing is neither to try to immediately transform the "little" into "all," nor to stop at the "little" but to widen the breaches made in the system and pave the country's way for real democracy. Everything will depend on the militancy of the masses, the activity of parties, a stronger Broad Front and unity of the opposition. Every freedom will have to be fought for. The backers of the dictatorship will not down arms but will try to make its structures irreversible or at least to salvage some of them. The democratic forces will have to dismantle the dictatorial machinery gradually, without waiting for a new crisis of the regime.

1. WMR, June 1981.

2. A substantial number of workers rejected the trade union apparatus imposed by the authorities. Subsequently the regime had to abolish regulation.

3. DCU comprises members of diverse political parties who do not officially express the views of their parties. Its Chairman is Juan Ferreira, a noted NP figure, the son of the NP leader, Wilson Ferreira Aldunate.

4. International support was a factor for the November 1980 victory.

5. Historical name of the NP as distinct from that of another traditional bourgeois party, Colorado. — Ed.

6. *Boletín exterior del Partido Comunista de Uruguay*, No. 3, 1980, pp. 17-18.

7. With the inflationary process quickening, the bourgeoisie is beginning to "flee from money" by investing it in immovables unaffected by depreciation. — Ed.

8. They rose to 55 per cent in 1981. — Ed.

9. *Desde Uruguay*, No. 20, 1981, p. 7.

10. *Boletín exterior del Partido Comunista de Uruguay*, No. 9, 1981, p. 2.

"Cooperation" in torture camp

AGAINST REPRESSION AND PERSECUTION

Pakistan is being swept by a wave of repression. The reactionary military authorities have been arresting more and more people. The number of political prisoners is well in excess of 15,000. The prisoners are being brutally beaten and tortured. Inhuman treatment is meted out even to women, one of them the prominent leader of the Pakistan People's Party Benazir Bhutto, the daughter of the executed Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who is being kept in solitary confinement.

Communists, workers and democratically-minded people are the main victims of the persecution and torture. Despite the terrorism, they have issued a challenge to the tyranny, taking a bold stand in defense of democracy,

and condemning the military junta's anti-popular and repressive policy, its servitude to imperialism, and its military gambles, above all the aggression against revolutionary Afghanistan.

World opinion must know about another crying fact: at present, not only the CIA, but also the Chinese intelligence services are directly involved in interrogations of Pakistani political prisoners. Progressive political leaders Sher Ali Bacha of the Mazdoor Kissan Party (Pashtoonkhwa) and Imtiaz Alam of the Punjab Lok Party, who were arrested by the authorities in the summer of last year, have been subjected to such an interrogation in the torture camp at Bala Hissar Fort (Peshawar) by experts from the Chinese intelligence service. Such is the seamy

side of the "cooperation" between Islamabad and Peking.

The Communist Party of Pakistan stigmatizes the crimes of the authorities and demands an immediate end to the prison tortures and abuse, and for the release of the political prisoners. It resolutely opposes the gross violation of Pakistan's national sovereignty, and its conversion into a testing ground by U.S. and

Chinese intelligence services. The communists once again call on progressive and democratic circles in Pakistan to join efforts and unite in a patriotic front. This will pave the way for the overthrow of the externally supported military junta and for the country's liberation from imperialist and hegemonistic domination.

Rashid Afzal
Pakistan

A latter-day Cato from Washington

The ancient Roman Senator Cato was famous for his routine exclamation in the Senate: "Carthage must be destroyed!" Many politicians have since won notoriety by uttering similar calls. Some wanted the doctrines of Copernicus or Darwin abolished, others demanded that socialism and the Soviet Union, its mainstay, be destroyed and that capitalism rule the entire world, and so on and so forth. Prominent among today's Catos is General Alexander Haig, the U.S. Secretary of State. Forgetting that times have changed and using the language he grew accustomed to while commanding the U.S. invaders in Vietnam, he daily threatens socialist Cuba. The United States, he says, wants Cuba to understand that intervention in Latin America will entail risks greater than the possible gains.¹ No more, no less.

Before making such statements, the U.S. general should reread his geography and history. Then he would perhaps realize that Cuba is not some alien force in Latin America, but that it has always been and will always remain an integral part of it. Which, incidentally, is not so in the case of the United States. Besides, the chief U.S. diplomat is barking up the wrong tree. It is his country that has been constantly interfering in the affairs of Latin American countries over the past 150 years.

Our region continues to be plundered and exploited. This is borne out by the huge profits of the U.S. monopolies recorded by the banks of New York and Chicago. Washington's Latin American policy has always been one of invasion and terrorism. Suffice it to recall the more well-known facts — the economic blockade of Cuba, the overthrow of Salvador Allende, Chile's democratically elected President, support for the bloodthirsty dictatorships in Chile and Uruguay, Haiti and Paraguay, Guatemala and other countries, arms deliveries and financial aid to the junta in El Salvador, at-

tempts at destabilizing and overthrowing the governments of Nicaragua and Grenada, CIA involvement in the recent assassinations of Luis Hoyos Rubio, Chief of Staff of the Peruvian armed forces, President Jaime Roldos of Ecuador, and General Omar Torrijos of Panama. But Cuba never had transnational corporations or latifundia in Latin America. Nor does it have military bases or spy networks there.

The imperialist psychological attack of recent months differs from the threats the Cubans have grown used to over the years. It is clearly the initial stage of a far-reaching anti-Cuban program. General Haig has himself cynically admitted that. He said, quite openly, that the new policy toward Cuba was being actively drawn up, although he could not say anything about it until it was presented to President Reagan for consideration.² Nevertheless, reports have already appeared (again, in the U.S. press) about Pentagon and CIA-inspired scenarios of a complete naval blockade of the island and even a direct landing on Cuba's shores by armed forces of the United States and some Latin American military dictatorships — naturally, under an "inter-American" flag. The 14th conference of OAS army commanders discussed last November specific anti-Cuban action.

Exposing the slanderous campaign, the Cuban communist newspaper *Granma* directly addressed General Haig, the latter-day Cato: "Can he really prove that Cuba has landed 500 to 600 servicemen in Nicaragua? Is the United States in fact in possession of verifiable information? Has he in fact supplied that information to other governments, stressing that he has proof, or is it a deliberate lie which he accompanied with his customary blatant threats? Let him say when, on what date, at what hour and from what planes the people he claims are there disembarked." And the newspaper adds: "How does one interpret the state-

ment that the United States is about to respond? Obviously, Mr. Haig is threatening us. But no one can intimidate our people. Our people have openly and forthrightly told the imperialists that we do not fear them, that our decision to defend our country and revolution to the last man and woman is final, unanimous, and irreversible. Mr. Haig would do well to remember that."³

Progressive humankind is together with the Cuban people at this hour of trial. The socialist community, of which our country is a full-fledged member, has voiced its resolute support. Cuba's allies and friends demand that the

U.S. administration immediately stop playing with fire and threatening peace.

Hands off Cuba! — this international rallying cry is resounding with growing power.

Raul Valdes Vivo
Central Committee member,
Communist Party of Cuba,
Representative of the Communist Party of Cuba
on the journal

1. *International Herald Tribune*, October 31-November 1, 1981.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Granma*, October 30, 1981.

Obscurantism in law

More than half a century after the notorious trial of Charles Darwin's theories,¹ a new tide of monkey trials and legislation is rising in the USA. Let's look at some of the facts.

The states of Arkansas and Louisiana have recently passed laws placing the ideas of divine creation of all living creatures and man on a par with the evolutionary theory of the origin and development of species. In schools it is mandatory to give both subjects "equal time." In the states of Wisconsin, Missouri and South Dakota creationism has been included in the biology course. In the states of Iowa and Texas the doctrine of evolution may be taught with the lame excuse that it is only one of several possible explanations. In the states of Idaho, Georgia, Indiana and Mississippi texts with the biblical teaching on creation are included on the lists of books recommended for approval by local school boards. In Los Angeles, California, an effort has been made to hold the "trial of the century" over science in order to reshape its teaching in schools nation-wide to please fanatical zealots.

Thus, the proponents of creationism, driven from the field of biology in the battles of the 19th century (for scientists, this view is an anachronism, at best), have begun, one way or another, to once again crowd the theory of evolution out of the bourgeois school. Confronted by the religious world view, American science finds itself on the defensive in the battle for the education of the rising generation. Its adversaries have the backing of the courts and the law, which take obscurantism under their protection and encourage its dissemination among young people. It is not at all surprising that obscurantism is acquiring no smaller weight on the scales of bourgeois justice than

education. It is part and parcel of the Establishment. And this is, above all, the significance of the lesson that the ideological struggle has taught science in an American court.

The creationists are conducting their counter-offensive under the guise of "religious freedom" and defending the "theist form" of the American state, which is allegedly being eroded by atheism and "secular humanism." This campaign is orchestrated by a U.S. "religious Right" group calling itself the Moral Majority. (Incidentally, one of its founders Robert Billings is now in the Department of Education.)

The creationists refuse to recognize evolution as an established scientific fact, declaring that their views are an alternative "theory." "Darwin," a champion of creationism wrote in the *International Herald Tribune*, "may have been correct, but the biblical account of creation may also be correct. Let us also remember that today's science is tomorrow's folly."² The dispute with the evolutionary teaching is thus taking the shape of abuse levelled at science, of an effort to discredit knowledge generally.

The attack is directed, in the first place, against the entire world-view function of science, its objectively inherent property of shaping convictions based on authentic knowledge and ruling out belief in the supernatural. Richard Turner, attorney for the creationists at the Los Angeles trial and former legal aide to Ronald Reagan, thus defined his client's suit before the trial began in March 1981: "Don't tell my client's kids, in the classroom, that their religious beliefs are wrong," adding, "we just don't want them to say that the evolution is the only theory. That amounts to the exaltation of scientists into the God posture."³ The creation-

ists dispute evolutionary theory and want the court to give the Biblical myth the status of a "scientific theory." This farce is nothing less than taking the traditions of the medieval Inquisition to the American civil court: as though not experience and practice, but the verdict of a court can define what belongs in science and what has nothing to do with it.

What lies at the back of these absurd claims has been revealed by, among others, Peter Medawar, a British winner of the Nobel Prize in biology. He said that in modern biology the alternative to thinking in evolutionary terms is not to think at all.⁴ The same question is put on another plane by the winner of the Nobel Prize in medicine Jean Dausset of France. He believes that awareness of biology and evolution has become essential to survival of the human species, for only with science's help is it possible to increase the output of food, produce more energy that is less hazardous to the environment, and so forth.⁵

Donald C. Johanson, the American paleontologist who studies the origin of the human species, calls the creationist movement "anti-intellectual and anti-educational." He sees as absurd their demand that religion should be preached not in their own temples but where science is taught. "Do they think," he said, "we are going to try to put in another pulpit next to the pulpit in every Baptist church to demand equal time to answer their views of the Book of Genesis?"⁶

The political physiognomy of present-day anti-educationalism has been characterized by Athenagoras, a historian of the American church, in *Political Affairs*, the theoretical journal of the U.S. communists. He writes that the preaching of creationism in school by the Moral Majority group is only part of its attempts to bring the nation's cultural life under obscurantist censorship. The aspirations and activities of the Moral Majority, he notes, are aimed against civil rights and freedoms and are a reminder of the American "proto-fascists" of the early 1930s.⁷

The Moral Majority group doggedly drags creationism into politics. Matters do not stop at preaching in temples and on television or even at litigation. In the town of Caribou, Maine, it managed to conduct a poll in November 1981 on the desirability of studying the biblical version of creation in schools. So far the mechanism of democracy has not operated in favor of the creationists. The inhabitants of Caribou rejected the suggested bill, but the fact of the poll is evidence of the strength of the obscurantist offensive.

We should like to draw attention to one more characteristic detail. In their criticism of the evolutionary theory the creationists proceed not only from the Bible and its theological interpretations. Their ideology is based also on inventions about the nature of theoretical knowledge, inventions spread by present-day bourgeois philosophy of science. These include the assertion that any theorizing about the past is unscientific because such theorizing allegedly cannot be verified. As a matter of fact, even reactionary philosophers are evidently not very eager to acknowledge an ideological affinity with aggressive obscurantism that is attacking the natural sciences. One of them, Karl Popper, who was involved in the dissemination of such specious ideas in the fight against Marxism, had publicly to dissociate himself from the obscurantists who referred to him as a philosophical authority who had denied that the theory of evolution was scientific.

The present battle between evolutionists and creationists is affecting not only the destiny of teaching biology, the legal status of science, and its relationship with religion in the USA. It has gone beyond the bounds of an American court and the USA itself and become international. Scientists specializing in the most diverse fields are protesting against the efforts to curtail the freedom of science and education, to institutionalize obscurantism. The spotlight in this widening ideological contest is being taken by a problem affecting the social mission of science, the surmounting of the obstacles preventing it from defining and changing the make-up of modern civilization for the weal of humankind.

This problem is made more acute and topical by the fact that in capitalist countries one witnesses the spread of the dangerous belief that science has already discovered more than is useful to and needed by humankind. The threat of a global thermonuclear catastrophe, the ecological crisis, and the aggravation of the social hardships stemming from the misuse of scientific and technological advances are helping to spread many anti-scientific trends.⁹ Although creationism coalesces with them in calling for a return to the pre-scientific Golden Age of universal ignorance, far from all of them accept this irrationalism resting on centuries-long traditions of religious prejudices.

In many ways, fear of scientific knowledge is generated by the revolution in science itself, by its ability to command exceptionally powerful forces over which both science and society may lose control. But to prevent this from happening, it is clearly not enough to champion

science solely from the viewpoint of education, calling for an understanding that it is indispensable for resolving present-day problems. Such is one more lesson of the current ideological struggle for science, freedom of education. The imperative of our age is that knowledge of the unknown should be complemented with the awareness of the social risk of scientific discoveries, society's responsibility for their use exclusively for humanist purposes, and the guarantee that they will be so used.

As long as this demand is not met, science will remain in a vulnerable position under capitalism. This is exactly what its enemies, including the high priests of obscurantism, are taking advantage of. Of course, it is not within their power to stop the growth of human knowledge. But one should not ignore the danger of the intensifying attacks on it. These attacks are accompanied with the narrowing of science's influence and the undermining of its humanist traditions, with the growth of the fetters being put on it, and its increasing dependence on forces using scientific knowledge as a means of obtaining selfish benefits. That is why the present battle of the evolution-

ists and creationists attracts the attention of everybody defending science's humane mission.

Eugene Jorgen

1. A schoolteacher named John T. Scopes was sentenced in 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee, for teaching the Darwin theory of the natural-evolutionary origin of man. As a consequence of this monkey trial, the evolutionary theory was eliminated from American schools for nearly 40 years. It reappeared in official textbooks only in the early 1960s.

2. *International Herald Tribune*, November 25, 1981.

3. *International Herald Tribune*, March 3, 1981.

4. *The Economist*, May 2, 1981.

5. *International Herald Tribune*, October 20, 1981.

6. *International Herald Tribune*, April 7, 1981.

7. *Political Affairs*, August 1981, pp. 20-21. In noting an insistent new surge of belief in creationism, Flora Lewis of *The New York Times* finds the resurrection of the old debate with the evolutionists "strange" because "nothing has been discovered since to challenge Darwin's intuition, and an immense body of new evidence has been found to validate it." However, the causes of this reanimation of creationism lie outside science. As Athenagoras pointed out, they lie in the specifics of ideological and political life in the USA over the past two decades.

8. *U.S. News and World Report*, November 16, 1981, p. 28.

9. "Mass Ecological Protest in the Class Struggle," *WMR*, May 1981.



Socialist integration: what has been and what remains to be done

In 1971, the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance adopted their Comprehensive Program for Further Deepening and Improving Cooperation and Developing Social Economic Integration. What are the results of their efforts in fulfilling the program over the past decade? What still remains to be done within its framework? Below is a survey prepared on the strength of CMEA reports and items in the socialist countries' press by the Commission on Scientific Information and Documentation.

Purposes, principles, instruments

Let us recall, first of all, the basic principles, purposes and ways and means of socialist economic integration as defined in the Comprehensive Program. It says that the development

of cooperation between the CMEA countries proceeds in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist internationalism on the basis of entirely voluntary participation, respect for state sovereignty, independence and national interests, non-interference in domestic affairs, complete equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance.

The goals of cooperation involve the furthering of the:

— development of the productive forces, enhancement of the scientific and technical level and the economic efficiency of social production and social labor productivity growth;

— structural and technological improvement of production and increase of its scale in

accordance with the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution;

— assurance over the long term of the socialist community countries' growing requirements in the means of production, including fuel, energy, raw materials and consumer goods mainly from these countries' own resources;

— raising of living standards;

— gradual approximation and alignment of the CMEA countries' economic development levels;

— expansion of the world socialist market and consolidation of the socialist countries' positions in the world economy; and

— strengthening of these countries' defense capability.

Concerning the ways and means in developing economic integration, the Comprehensive Program envisaged mutual consultations on the basic aspects of economic policy; deepening of cooperation in the sphere of planning; extension of international specialization and cooperation in the sphere of production, science and technology; increase of the scale and enhancement of the efficiency of mutual trade, improvement of monetary and financial relations and the foreign-trade pricing system; development of direct ties between the corresponding economic, design and other organizations of the CMEA countries; and improvement of the juridical principles underlying their economic, scientific and technical cooperation.

All these provisions were expressed in concrete terms to make up an extensive program designed for phased realization over a period of 15-20 years.

Results of the first decade

A full account of the results of the first decade in realizing this program was given at the 35th session of the CMEA in July 1981 and in the socialist community countries' press. It was said at the session that, on a whole, the fulfillment of the Comprehensive Program was proceeding successfully. The fraternal countries' cooperation has entered upon a qualitatively new stage and is clearly oriented toward technical progress, specialization and cooperation of production, and joint development of natural resources.

The adoption and consistent realization of the Comprehensive Program marked the transition to a new and much higher stage of economic relations between the socialist states. *Cooperation in planning* (coordination of national-economic plans, consultations, reali-

zation of some elements of joint planning, etc.) has been established as the basic method in developing and deepening the international division of labor within the CMEA framework, a method that is organic to socialism.

Prognostication covering the key sectors of the economy, science and technology has become an aspect of this cooperation. Within the CMEA framework, over 300 projections and other similar projects have been prepared, including nearly 130 scientific and technical projections. Joint prognostications of the development of the raw material and energy sectors are to be prepared.

In the recent period, cooperation in planning has been enriched with new forms enlarging and concretizing the Comprehensive Program. This includes the international long-term (10-15 year) goal-oriented programs, drawn up in the second half of the 1970s, for cooperation in the key sectors of material production, and bilateral long-term programs for specialization and cooperation of production. They have provided the basis for the conclusion — by the spring of 1981 — of almost 120 multilateral and more than 1,000 bilateral agreements. The commitments under these agreements are written into the national economic plans for 1981-1985, as a pivot for their coordination.

In the course of this work, the main lines of economic, scientific and technological cooperation and the volume of mutual goods deliveries have been agreed and tied in with the realization of long-term programs. Plan coordination had made it possible to determine, in the main, for the next five-year period — and in some lines for an even longer perspective — the solution of problems in assuring the CMEA countries of raw materials, machinery, equipment and other goods, and that is the main outcome of the coordination.

Let us note the great attention being given in the integration measures to raising the economy of Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia. Considerable help and assistance are being given to fraternal Vietnam in developing industries which are of crucial importance for the national economy: electric power, coal, engineering, oil and gas, and transport. The CMEA countries are helping to build up a solid material and technical basis for socialism in Cuba, which is developing its power industry, non-ferrous metallurgy, agricultural engineering, electronics, pulp and paper, sugar and transport. Mongolia is being given assistance and help in virtually every sphere: electric power, coal, metal-working, non-ferrous metallurgy, struc-

tural materials, agriculture, foodstuffs, leather footwear, building, transport and other industries.

The realization of the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration has helped markedly to increase the socialist community countries' economic, scientific and technical potential and to raise their people's material and cultural standards. In 1980, the CMEA countries' aggregate national income was 66 per cent larger than it was a decade earlier, and the volume of capital investments — 72 per cent larger. Nearly 75 per cent of the investment resources went into the expansion, reconstruction and modernization of sectors of material production. Gross industrial output went up by 84 per cent, and engineering output by 140 per cent. Agricultural production has also increased: from 1976 to 1980, its annual average volume was 25 per cent up on the 1966-1970 level. In the 1970s, the CMEA countries' national income and industrial growth was nearly double that of the industrial capitalist countries.

As a whole, the fraternal socialist countries' economic potential is very much greater than that of the European Economic Community, and for some indicators, also that of the United States. The CMEA countries produce 40 per cent more energy than the EEC countries, 170 per cent more gas, 210 per cent more coal, 60 per cent more pig iron and steel, 190 per cent more pulp, and 40 per cent more woolen fabrics and footwear leather. The CMEA's industrial production comes to roughly two-thirds of that of the industrial capitalist countries.

The CMEA countries also have an impressive scientific and technical potential, which comes to nearly one-third of the world's. In 1980 alone, they issued nearly 100,000 authors' certificates and patents, more than one-half of the inventions being used in the economy and yielding a major economic effect. The socialist countries' joint efforts in research, development and engineering ensure their technical progress in the crucial fields.

Roughly 70 per cent of the multilateral treaties and agreements among the CMEA countries are aimed to develop fundamentally new technology or new types of hardware. Cooperation in this field has yielded tangible results: in the course of the 1970s it has provided the basis for over 16,000 projects, solution of a number of major basic and applied problems, and development of 2,000 new models of machines, mechanisms, equipment and instruments, nearly 1,500 new materials and

preparations, and over 1,000 improved technological processes.

Mutual cooperation now involves about 3,000 scientific and technical organizations and establishments in the CMEA countries. They have concluded over 200 agreements and treaties on scientific and technical cooperation, including roughly 100 for realizing the long-term programs. Following the adoption in 1974 of the CMEA Statute on Standards and the conclusion of a convention on the use of standards in the CMEA economies, more than 2,700 common standards have been approved and are in force.

The main content of integration processes is determined by the development and deepening of production specialization and cooperation on a multilateral basis. There is now considerable experience in specialization and cooperation in industries like those turning out equipment for atomic power plants, computers, shipbuilding and chemical, petrochemical and electro-technical equipment.

There is a steady growth of the share of specialized products in mutual deliveries of machinery and plant. In 1978, for instance, deliveries under specialization and cooperation agreements accounted for the following percentages in total exports of engineering products: Bulgaria 42.4, Hungary 50.6, GDR 43.8, Poland 26.7, Romania 38.4, USSR 23.3 and Czechoslovakia 30 per cent. In 1980, the figure for the CMEA countries averaged 34 per cent as compared with 18 per cent in 1971. From 1971 to 1980, mutual exports of specialized engineering products increased from 1.3 billion to 9.1 billion rubles.

The division of labor on the basis of the multilateral specialization and cooperation agreement in the design and manufacture of computer facilities developed most rapidly, with specialized products accounting for more than 80 per cent of total exports in this line. The agreement provides for the complex solution of problems, ranging from research, development and engineering projects to mutual deliveries, which in the current five-year period are to double as compared with the preceding five-year period.

Considerable results have been achieved in the development of national power grids and integrated power systems of the CMEA countries. The generation of electric power is one of the most dynamic industries in the socialist community. In 1980, it produced 1,726 billion kwh, or 12.7 times more than in 1950, as will be seen from the following table.

Power Generation in CMEA Countries
(bln kwh)

	1950	1970	1980	1980 over 1950 (times)
Bulgaria	0.8	19.5	34.8	43.5
Hungary	3.0	14.5	23.9	8.0
Vietnam	—	—	4.0 ¹	—
GDR	19.5	67.7	98.8	5.1
Cuba	—	4.9	9.9	—
Mongolia	0.02	0.5	1.4	70.0
Poland	9.4	64.5	121.9	13.0
Romania	2.1	35.1	67.5	32.1
USSR	91.2	741.0	1,295.0	14.2
Czechoslovakia	9.3	45.2	72.7	7.8

1. Estimated.

Source: CMEA Secretariat

In the 1970s, large power installations and 220 and 400 kV transmission systems were started. The general agreement on cooperation in the long-term development of integrated power systems is being implemented. Under the agreement, the integrated power systems and the USSR's power grid have been operating in parallel with each other. Mutual deliveries of electric power have increased substantially, to 31.6 billion kwh in 1980.

One long-term goal-oriented program (adopted in 1978) concerns, in particular, the CMEA countries' cooperation in the accelerated development of the nuclear power industry. Nuclear power plants now operate not only in the Soviet Union, but also in Bulgaria, the GDR and Czechoslovakia. One plant is going up in Hungary, and preparations are under way for building others in Cuba, Poland and Romania. During the 1960s and 1970s, nuclear power plant capacities in the CMEA countries multiplied more than 170-fold: from 105,000 to 18 mln kw. Under the program, nuclear power plants with a total capacity of 37 million kw are to be built in the European CMEA countries and in Cuba by 1990, with the Soviet Union's technical assistance. In addition, two nuclear power plants with a capacity of 4 million kw each are to be erected on the territory of the USSR. The power they generate will be transmitted to neighboring fraternal countries. By the end of the 1980s, nuclear power plants are to meet almost 25 per cent of the CMEA countries' electric-power requirements. Full realization of the program will help to save roughly 80 million tons of conventional fuel a year.

Equipment for the nuclear plants will be supplied by what is, in effect, an international assembly line that is to be built up on the basis

of specialization and cooperation among 50 enterprises in 8 countries. The USSR and Czechoslovakia will jointly make reactors, pipelines and pumps. Hungarian enterprises will supply equipment for purifying water to cool the reactors, Polish enterprises — heat-exchange installations, Bulgarian — bio-protection devices, and GDR and Romanian enterprises — other types of equipment. Similar assembly lines are being or are to be set up within the framework of other long-term goal-oriented programs for cooperation.

Long-term stable lines of export and import are shaped in the process of specialization and cooperation of production. The deepening of the international socialist division of labor expands the volume of trade between the CMEA countries. Over the 1970s, it multiplied 3.3 times, developing much faster than production: as national income goes up by 1 per cent, the quantum of mutual trade increases by about 1.6 per cent. Its faster development is an indicator of the growing economic interaction between the socialist community states. The bulk of most of these countries' import requirements in machinery, equipment, oil, iron ore and consumer goods is ensured through mutual deliveries, which in 1980 accounted for almost two-thirds of their imports.

Joint investment activity has been developing successfully, especially in sectors with a high demand for marshalling material, financial, manpower and other resources. The Soyuz gas pipeline, which is unique in scale, is among the major integration installations erected in the recent period through the joint efforts of the countries concerned. Since 1980, the countries which took part in building it have been receiving 15.5 billion cub.m. of natural gas a year from the USSR. Among the joint projects effected on Soviet territory are the Kiembai asbestos combine, the first section of the Ust Ilimsk pulp plant, new facilities for the production of ferrous raw materials and ferro-alloys, and the Novovolynsk plant which makes equipment for the electrotechnical industry. On the same basis, construction has been started of the Mozyr Works to produce feed yeast from petroleum raw materials, and the 4 mln kw Khmel'nitsk nuclear power plant with a transmission line to Rzeszow (Poland). The large Erdenet combine for the production of copper and molybdenum concentrate has been built in Mongolia. Nickel plants are being built and remodelled in Cuba.

The Soviet Union has an especially important role to play in deepening and perfecting socialist economic integration. With its large

economic, technical and scientific potential, it supplies fuel, raw materials, machinery, equipment and other goods, and renders to the fraternal countries extensive technical assistance in the erection of industrial installations. The vast Soviet market guarantees for most CMEA countries stable export sales of a large part of the machinery and goods they produce. From 1981 to 1985, trade between the USSR and the other CMEA countries is expected to increase by about 40 per cent as compared with the preceding five-year period.

These results provide a solid basis for the further deepening of cooperation in accordance with the conditions and requirements of the 1980s. The CMEA's 35th session noted that among the goals which will continue to be meaningful in the period ahead are the utmost enhancement of the economic efficiency of social production and the boosting of labor productivity, the provision of fuel, energy, raw materials, modern equipment, food and consumer goods, and the further approximation and alignment of economic development levels.

The latest congresses of the fraternal parties showed that the attainment of these goals will require serious decisions and fresh efforts.

The key task today is to *raise the technical level of production and its quality indicators*. The only way to do this is to accelerate scientific and technological progress, with special importance being attached to the use of scientific and technical potentialities for reducing the power and material intensiveness of production.

The 1980s will be a period of intensive international production, scientific and technological cooperation. The CMEA countries have recognized the need to accelerate the joint design of machine complexes for the open-cast mining of minerals and the construction of long-distance gas pipelines, power-saving equipment, and modern facilities for production control. The idea is to provide these by starting their manufacture on the basis of cooperation from the beginning of the second half of this decade. Decisions have also been taken on the joint development of a standard element base for radio-electronics devices, means of communications and computers, and the boosting of production and extensive use of micro-processors. The pooling of efforts by the countries concerned in solving problems which are especially important for the economy and in most rapidly applying the obtained results in production will be promoted by the coordination of their scientific and technical policy, as

recommended by the 35th session of the CMEA.

The deepening and extension of economic integration implies not only clear-cut operation of the inter-state mechanism by which it is managed, but also the establishment of direct interaction between the mass of enterprises, big and small. The fraternal socialist countries favor a *further improvement of the forms and methods of mutual cooperation aimed to enhance its efficiency*. Among the potentialities for such improvement are more extensive exchanges of experience in economic planning and management; further development of direct ties between ministries, associations and enterprises involved in cooperation, above all in production cooperation; establishment of joint economic organizations, whenever it makes economic sense to do so, and so on.

All these lines, concretized in the relevant program of practical measures, lead to the solution of the problem which has been brought out by life itself and which was formulated at the 26th congress of the CPSU and the party congresses of other fraternal parties, namely, the need to *complement plan coordination with the coordination of economic policy as a whole*. The need for this springs from the ever greater complexity of the process of internationalization of economic activity. In these conditions, an "autonomous" approach to various aspects of cooperation which fails to reckon with their organic interrelation with other, allied matters, does not yield the desired effect. Such coordination is also necessary from the standpoint of tackling the vital structural problems which, in particular, hamper the effort to balance out economic development and mutual ties.

Such, on the whole, are the main results of the first decade and the prospects for the development of socialist economic integration in the 1980s. The practice of cooperation within the CMEA framework shows very well that a fundamentally new type of economic relations between states has been established. These relations combine the national and international interests of the fraternal countries, which are fully in line with the interests of progressive mankind as a whole. The principles of competition and plunder of the national wealth of weaker countries by the stronger which dominate the capitalist world have given way to the principles of equality, mutual assistance and coordination of efforts aimed to perfect the socialist economy. This equitable and fruitful cooperation guarantees uninterrupted socio-economic progress for the peoples of the socialist community.



Swept overboard

A survey of the socio-psychological aspects of mass unemployment in capitalist countries as dealt with in the press and in books.

These days, one can hardly find a newspaper or periodical published in a capitalist country without some story on mass unemployment. That is understandable: even according to official data, the plague of unemployment has made nine million people in the Common Market countries and eight million in the United States redundant.

Conceding that the society of "free enterprise" is unable to cope with this chronic sickness, bourgeois economists in some countries have even introduced average, "acceptable" unemployment figures for periods when capitalist economies function normally. The only thing is, we have not seen such "normal" periods for a long time now.

The press emphasizes that unemployment has acquired radically new features. First, it affects virtually all social categories of the working people. Today, lines at employment offices are made up not only of blue-collar workers, who used to predominate, but of white collars too — bank clerks, office workers, engineers and even managers. Young people — high school and university graduates — are especially numerous. So are women. "To be young and female is double jeopardy," as *Time* magazine puts it.¹ The second difference is that today's unemployed are not simply and not only a reserve of labor which, as we all know, capitalism has always required. Many of those who are joining this pool today are perhaps fated to spend most of their time not working but looking for work.

Addressing the problem of mass unemployment, the capitalist press gives its attention increasingly not only to its economic aspect — financial losses — but also to its socio-psychological consequences, to the moral damage it brings. Unemployment is a social evil, and the entire society is forced to pay the price. Today, progressive publications are not the only ones to arrive at this conclusion. For example, *Time* magazine says that unemploy-

ment "has a corrosive effect at all levels of society, destroying individual self-esteem, heightening class tensions, ultimately eroding the work ethic and social values that keep a modern economy ticking."² One can hardly suspect the magazine of concern for the lives of the working people. It is a forced admission, and the causes behind the concern are obvious: the "employment crisis" (the genteel term of the bourgeois propagandists for the current phenomenon of mass unemployment) is so deep that the ruling class fears grave social upheavals. The condition of young people is especially alarming. Their discontent was eloquently expressed in the disturbances in Britain last summer. This means that the apprehension of the bourgeois press is mostly prompted by a desire to check the ripening of the "grapes of wrath."

The purpose of this review is not to analyze the economic or political causes of unemployment (a subject that merits special attention) but to show its socio-psychological consequences for the people it affects. The facts in the press give an idea of how those swept overboard feel and assess their plight.

First, a few typical stories reported in West European and U.S. periodicals.

Item, Jean-Claude, 36, unemployed, received nationwide "publicity" after *Le Monde* featured his story. From morning till night he is at the Charles de Gaulle-Etoile metro station in Paris carrying a signboard saying, "I will take any job." He made this humiliating step after a long and futile search for work. And while the letters are stenciled large, it appears that no one reads them: people throw small change at his feet as though he were a beggar. He almost died of shame when he bent to pick up the coins for the first time, but what else could he do? "I accept the money because I need it to survive, but I am looking for work... I want to work. I do not want to live off others without giving anything in return."³

Item. A young woman came to a police station in the small Italian town of Ancona. She startled the officer on duty by producing a coffee service she had stolen and demanding that

the police arrest her. "If you refuse, I will go and smash a store window or do something even worse," said 27-year-old Giuliana Massacesi, driven to desperation, hunger and illness by a fruitless search for work. Later, she told the press: "There was no other way. Prison is my only hope, and I am glad I got what I wanted."⁴

Item. Steve McGurty of Liverpool is 21. Only three years ago he was a merchant seaman. The abrupt recession in Britain's economy left him and many other seamen on the rocks. Since then Steve has been looking for any line of steady work. Once he saw a help wanted ad for the job of a trainee draftsman in an architect's office. In school, Steve had been good at drawing and drafting sketches. He passed the test but another applicant got the job. Steve was told he was not "presentable" enough. But where could he get the money to buy decent clothes when almost all of his weekly unemployment allowance went to pay the rent? "All I have are jeans and an old pair of trousers," McGurty says. "I was turned down at the social security office for a clothing grant to get me started. I felt like vaulting the desk and punching the clerk who did it. It's all right for those fellows pushing paper around. They can be snotty sods because they've got jobs. I haven't, so I'm dirt." Steve is constantly hungry: "I can only afford one meal a day."⁵

Item. Since the Chrysler Corporation shut down its plant in Ionia, Michigan, "we've had one suicide, one attempted suicide, three mental breakdowns, some divorces, a lot of heavy drinking, and others seeking emotional therapy," Elsa Pant, a laid-off auto worker from Ionia, told *U.S. News and World Report*. "When you have no job, it's like dying — except you don't stop breathing. Your whole source of motivation is gone."⁶

"Murder, suicide, mental illness, heart failure, alcoholism, divorce, family fights — all these problems appear to be increasing as a result of the current economic slump," *U.S. News* concludes, citing opinions by doctors, sociologists and psychologists.⁷ The magazine carried a chart prepared by M. Harvey Brenner, associate professor of health at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, which says that a one per cent rise in unemployment would cause 37,000 deaths in the United States.⁸

How long does it take to reach the limit when a man no longer cares whether he lives or dies? "Nine months seems to be a crucial point when hope and patience give out," says a top psychologist.⁹

The British economists Terry Word and Robert Rowthorn of Cambridge have studied

the problem and concluded that the Tories' current policy has already doomed about 50,000 people in Britain to premature death, which would be brought about by various types of stress stemming from unemployment and the cuts in social services; by 1984 these causes would drive 50,000 more people to hospitals and mental institutions and 14,000 people to jail.¹⁰

In late 1980 the French Psychological Hygiene League sponsored a UNESCO seminar of sociologists, ergonomists and psychiatrists to discuss the links between unemployment and the growing number of mental disorders. According to Christophe Dejours, an expert in industrial preventive medicine, the loss of one's job, even though unskilled and unsatisfying, almost invariably damages the person's psychical and mental condition. When a person stops working, Professor Chombart de Lauwe maintains, the entire system of links which he had previously underrated is disrupted. The psychological shock is so great, he says, that psychological and psychosomatic disorders and family fights can entail long-term consequences. Doctors have recorded that their unemployed patients suffer from a number of disorders always accompanied by profound feelings of uselessness, loneliness and dejection, Dr. Jacques Delivre observed. The changes in a person's personality and behavior brought about by forced idleness, he stressed, often lead to drug addiction and alcoholism, which aggravate family difficulties. Symptoms of depression and excitability, Dr. Delivre added, are often coupled with somatic symptoms — deterioration of gastric conditions, abrupt changes in arterial blood pressure, heart, spine and back pains, allergies and skin diseases.¹¹

A vicious circle is thus completed: a person falls sick if he cannot find a job for a long time, and sickness makes it increasingly difficult for him to find a job.

A host of facts about the way the "unwanted" people live has been collected in a book based on a poll in Paris: *A Life Without Work. The Unemployed Speak* by Anne Mathis.¹² She undertook to describe the psychology, feelings and views of the unemployed. Numerous interviews have shown that for most of them, unemployment is not merely something that affects them financially. Often it is seen as a socio-psychological tragedy, as a "grave personal failure" (p. 31). It breeds profound disillusionment, helplessness and protest. "Man cannot agree to a verdict of society," Mathis writes, "which relegates him to pariah status, all the more so because he does not accept that

verdict as fair . . . The status of unemployed . . . brings only humiliation and disillusionment. He is seized with either depression or anger, thus displaying his apprehension and helplessness." A painful reaction by many unemployed people to their new social status is exacerbated, the researcher demonstrates, by the response of those around them, long a stereotype in bourgeois society. The cliché maintains that the person himself is to blame for losing his job: an enterprising go-getter would never be thrown overboard; unemployment in conditions of free enterprise only affects the weak, the irresponsible, the lazy and the spongers. The stereotype's inertia is so great that, unfortunately, even today many unemployed workers blame themselves and not the system for their condition — especially since the mass media in capitalist countries are in no hurry to debunk the delusion. And if the number of unemployed who come to understand the true causes behind their ordeal is growing with each day (and Mathis is convinced this trend is mounting), the credit goes to the progressive forces, the communists in the first place.

For example, the book *Down the Road*,¹³ published some years ago in London, is doing the British working people a good service. It is a scientifically sound and understandable explanation of the causes behind unemployment as a chronic capitalist condition; it suggests alternative ways out of the economic crisis and offers advice on organizing the struggle for job conservation and the right to work. The authors have dealt an especially severe blow to the false cliché "if you are unemployed, you are yourself to blame." The book exposes it for the fallacy it is, citing specific cases and laying bare the benefits it offers to the exploiter classes.

The West German journalist Klaus Rose pursued an equally worthy objective when he went to the employment office of the town of Gelsenkirchen in the Ruhr and talked to many people there. He reports that he did not meet a single loafer.

As Anne Mathis shows in her book, more and more people among the unemployed categorically reject any attempt to blame them for their plight. "It is not our fault that we are unemployed," the author quotes them. "It is society's fault."¹⁴ The same sentiment is recorded in a document adopted by the Stuttgart mutual aid for the unemployed group (many such organizations have sprung up in the FRG). It stresses that unemployment testifies to the inability of capitalist society to guarantee the human right to work.

As to unemployment benefits, which, according to that same bourgeois myth, "enable loafers to sponge off the government," the situation is not so simple either.

True, over the long years of class battles, the working people of the industrialized capitalist countries did make the government officially recognize unemployment as a status, with the relevant rights to financial assistance. That happened in the wake of the Great Depression, when the frightened bourgeoisie had to make concessions in order to survive. Social security systems were set up against the possibility of layoffs during a recession. However, a large proportion of all social security benefits is financed by the workers themselves while they are employed. Moreover, the bourgeois state makes it difficult to receive unemployment benefits by burying the application procedure in red tape. One has to collect all kinds of certificates, fill out innumerable complicated forms, and have an expert knowledge of law.

With this in mind, the progressive West German publishers Marxistische Blätter have recently brought out a book entitled *Unemployment: What Do I Do? A Practical Manual*.¹⁵ It offers comprehensive information on the legislation, rules and regulations concerning the rights of the unemployed in the FRG. The book contains charts showing the size of unemployment benefits depending on the social category, seniority, occupation, marital status and so on. The manual shows the correct way to fill out application forms and correspond with the employment office. Besides, the authors show factory industrial councils and trade unionists how they can use the industrial status law to resist job slashing and defend workers' rights before the management.¹⁶

The crux of the matter, however, is that the social security systems in capitalist countries, as *Time* magazine puts it, "may prevent absolute penury, but they can do nothing to heal the psychological wounds of prolonged unemployment."¹⁷

Item. Sean Grant and Graeme Rathbone of Widnes, England, were both 19 years old. I use the past tense because they are no longer alive. They committed suicide in a car by running a hose from the exhaust pipe into the passenger compartment. A brief note they left for their parents said, among other things, "What have we left to live for now there is no work for anyone?"¹⁸

These two youths might have chosen a better way of protest. Their tragedy is perhaps the gravest charge against the system which drove them to the wall. A society unable to make use

of the energy, intelligence and talent of scores of millions has no moral right to exist. It must make way for a new kind of society. The communists in capitalist countries and their press are trying to bring this home to the working people.

John Alexander

1. *Time*, October 12, 1981, p. 17. Female unemployment is discussed by the West German economist B. Nauhaus in *Probleme der Frauenarbeitslosigkeit in der gegenwärtigen Krise*, Cologne, 1979).
2. *Time*, October 12, 1981, p. 16.
3. *Le Monde*, March 22, 1981.
4. *Il Giorno*, February 21, 1980.
5. *Time*, October 12, 1981, p. 18.
6. *U.S. News and World Report*, June 23, 1980, p. 68.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, p. 69. *Horizont*, a GDR weekly, has concluded that a one per cent rise in unemployment increases the number of mental breakdowns by 3.4 per cent and pushes

up the crime rate by 4 per cent; the suicide rate, by 4.1 per cent; and the murder rate, by 5.7 per cent (*Horizont*, No. 10, 1980, p. 24).

9. *Ibid.*
10. *Labour Weekly*, July 18, 1980.
11. *Le Monde*, December 10, 1980.
12. Anne Mathis, *Vivre sans travail. Les chomeurs parlent*, Paris, 1979.
13. Sarah Cox and Robert Golden, *Down the Road. Unemployment and the Fight for the Right to Work*. London, 1977.
14. Anne Mathis, op. cit., p. 147.
15. Klaus Dammann, Evelyn Butter, *Arbeitslos-was tun? Ein praktischer Ratgeber*, Frankfurt am Main, 1981.
16. One of London's secondary schools has introduced a course on "how to live while unemployed" for its graduate pupils. A teacher says that young people in Britain should know about their rights when they join the vast army of the unemployed; they should also be able to fill out various forms properly.
17. *Time*, October 12, 1981, p. 17.
18. *The Times*, August 28, 1981.

An eye-witness writes about the land of Lenin

Emil Carlebach, *Reise in den Bolschewismus* (A Journey Into Bolshevism), Frankfurt on Main, Verlag Marxistische Blätter, 1981, 205 pp.

When one analyzes the writings of some bourgeois propagandists about life in the socialist world one cannot help thinking that they believe all the people can be fooled all the time.

One could, of course, simply ignore falsifications, much as a caravan ignores barking dogs, had the lies not had some effect. In the capitalist world many people are still either uninformed or held captive to tendentious ideas about life in socialist countries. One can therefore only welcome every unbiased book about existing socialism.

The West German journalist Emil Carlebach wrote this book, *A Journey Into Bolshevism*, as a contribution to the exposure of bourgeois lies about the USSR. He was well qualified for this task: he "had the good fortune to spend 25 years studying different aspects of life in this vast country, which is, in fact, a continent in itself, even a double continent, to observe it in the process of development" (p. 5). To see things at first hand is particularly important. Carlebach's reminiscences about the past intertwine with the present. He knew the Moscow of the 1950s and saw modern residential neighborhoods take the place of old wooden houses. He saw the Siberian city of Bratsk when it was no more

than a township near the power station under construction on the Angara, and then visited it when it was a large modern city. In Tashkent, capital of Uzbekistan, he spoke to a woman who in her youth wore the humiliating yashmak. When he spoke to her she was a minister in the Government of the republic. One journey took Carlebach along the highway used by the nazis in 1941 to sow death and destruction in Byelorussia; they called it the "rumbling" highway. Recalling this, Carlebach writes of the resurrection of Minsk and a state farm, that has a health-building facility on its territory. He toured Estonia and Armenia, and in his book relates the changes that took place in these Soviet republics in the course of a quarter of a century after the war. In Leningrad he visited the old Putilov plant (now the Kirov works), which was one of the smithies of the October Revolution. And, of course wherever he went he spoke to people — workers, engineers, party functionaries, journalists, collective farmers and soldiers.

A strong side of this book is, first, that Carlebach puts to people questions asked by his countrymen under the influence of anti-Soviet propaganda; second, he reproduces their answers verbatim and thereby gives them greater credibility; and, third, the present does not prevent him from visualizing the future.

Although it is not the accepted practice to give long quotations in a review, I should like to quote at some length to illustrate my point, and

I hope the reader will forgive this departure from tradition. The following are the closing lines of the book.

"Before I left, the curator of Leningrad's Museum of History had a surprise for me: veterans of the Civil War and the anti-Hitlerite war and young people who were born after the war and helped to build the Baikal-Amur Railway were waiting for me in her office. To the veterans my question was: 'Were you able in the years of your youth, in the years of famine and bloodshed, to see yourself in the year 1980?' And of the young people I asked: 'What motivates you today? How do you picture your future?'"

"Farutin, whose father was a peasant, was 16 in 1918 when he was elected secretary of a rural Soviet and assigned to organize the poor peasants against the kulaks. At 17 he was in command of a special unit that operated against Kolchak in Siberia. In 1941 he was deputy commander of an armored brigade. 'We only had our bodies to oppose the material preponderance of the nazi Wehrmacht . . . But we never lost our faith in victory, in the triumph of socialism.'

"I was born in 1915,' said the engineer Smirnov. 'When I was a young boy there was little to eat. Bread was rationed. For us, young people, study and work were one and the same thing: I helped to build the institution of higher learning in which I later studied. I was among the people who built the ice road (the road across Lake Ladoga that was the only winter-time line of communication with Leningrad during the siege. — W.H.) under a hail of

bombs. Those were difficult times, but we knew we would win.'

"The schoolteacher Zaitseva is 76 and a pensioner. Her brother was killed in the Great Patriotic War and her sister died of starvation.

"We got 125 grams of bread a day. During air-raids children stood by on roof-tops to extinguish incendiary bombs. In between air-raids they continued to study. Many went to the firing-lines straight from their school desks. What we have achieved today was not conceivable then. But we were successful. I want our young people to be happy.'

"The student Panchuk wants to be a civil engineer.

"You ask why I came to Siberia? I felt it would be interesting and I wanted to help build the Baikal-Amur Railway. I was not disappointed. I want to go there again. It is an honor to work there.'

"The student Belevzova wants to be a railway engineer.

"You want to know why I volunteered for the Baikal-Amur Railway project? Our grandparents and parents starved and were willing to give their lives to build socialism. Of course, nobody is asked to make such sacrifices today, but we want to show what we can do.'

"What do you think the year 2000 will bring you?"

"Panchuk: 'I hope to prove myself and work at a huge project.'

"Ivanov: 'I hope to be a senior lecturer in 25 years. But most of all I hope there is no war.'

"Belevzova: 'It is hard to say what I expect of the year 2000. But I know for certain that in our hearts we'll be as young as the veterans sitting here. We shall bring up the new generation in the same way as they brought us up!'" (pp. 203-205).

In this book a person of the capitalist world indoctrinated by bourgeois media in the spirit of pessimism is given answers to his questions by builders of communism. The replies are optimistic and confident. Soviet people look forward to the new projects in the year 2000, at and with the help of which life will be better than ever. And they believe in peace on earth.

The reason for this hope and confidence is given in every chapter of this book. Carlebach shows how together with the Party of Lenin, Soviet people draw up peaceful plans and what is produced by a people's creative energy released by the October Revolution.

I should like to hope that this book is read not only in the FRG but in many other countries as well.

Wolfgang Hutmann

National Liberation

Rostislav Ulyanovsky

Analysis of theory and practice in light of contemporary world developments and studies of specifics in India, Burma and African countries.

Subject, name and geographical index.

Cloth 396 pp. \$6.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street

Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Canada's Party of Socialism

History of
the Communist Party of Canada
1921-1976

The history of a party which throughout its 60 years has been linked inseparably in struggle with the working-class and democratic movements.

A history which shows how communist policies are developed, refined and updated in keeping with what is new in the context of both Canadian and international developments.

A history which pays fitting tribute to the communists who were harassed, imprisoned and murdered for their dedication to the goal of a socialist Canada.

A history for working class and democratic political activists, trade unionists, for young and old.

319 pp, over 175 photographs, index
paper \$14.95 cloth \$29.95

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

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, Costa Rica, 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, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, South African Republic, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam.

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., \$12.50 a year. Institutions, double rate.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, Amharic, French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Por-

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, 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.



Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

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 Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
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

Gestu BP 2678
Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc

Dar Al-Hilal
16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

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

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

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

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
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 Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya, English,
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 EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

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

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

ROMANIAN 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. Cantacaro, Caracás, Venezuela

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

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

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

