

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

November 1981, Volume 24, Number 11 \$1.00



Iran / 31

Israeli CP vs
chauvinism / 52

U.S. foreign
policy — Hall / 14

Dialectics of
categories / 62

Liberation
movements / 24

Brazil / 36



WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

November 1981, Vol. 24, No. 11

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 The uniformities generated by the October Revolution
J. Lenart
- 9 Defend and build the new Kampuchea
Pen Sovan

Peace versus war
- 14 The dangerous doctrine of world domination
Gus Hall
- 18 The deep roots of anti-war protest
J. Jensen
- 24 The present stage of the national liberation movement
K. Bagdash

Viewpoints

- 31 The Iranian revolution: its friends and its enemies
N. Kianuri
- 36 Brazil: the time has come for democratization
G. Dias
- 40 Comment

The party

- 43 Portugal/FRG: how to strengthen the working-class core
B. Teixeira, W. Feldmann
- 52 Israel: line of action
P. Boychuck, V. Morozov

Against repression and persecution
- 58 Turkey: end arbitrary acts!
K. Kervan
- 59 Uruguay: comrades under threat of death
M. Perez
- 60 New experience

Exchange of views

- 62 Concerning the dialectics of categories
International study group
- 70 Bulgaria: new elements of economic mechanism
E. Khristov
- 75 Our view of the specific ways of revolution
J. Sarkar



The uniformities generated by the October Revolution

Josef Lenart
CPCz CC Presidium member,
First Secretary, CP Slovakia CC

As we communists analyze the processes characterizing the new type of relations in the world of the socialist community, we go back in our minds even today to their origins, the Great October Socialist Revolution. That is in no sense a tribute to tradition or a mark of orthodoxy, but a necessity which makes it possible to comprehend the course of historical development and its perspectives in scientific, Marxist-Leninist terms.

Before the October Revolution, the triumphant slogans of all revolutions which sprang from the needs of the broad masses of people were either erased from the memory of the people by the classes which rose to power, or were given a new, and sometimes antithetical meaning. The Great October Socialist Revolution carried a fundamentally different message. The Communist Party of Russia, which led the struggle and which roused the people to it, expressed the interests of the proletariat and broad strata of other working people. The main and vital demands inscribed on the revolutionary banners have not gone with the wind, but have, on the contrary, been reaffirmed and developed by the subsequent socialist revolutions in other countries, by the whole process of the conscious historical creativity of the masses building a new life. As the precepts of the October Revolution are asserted and concretized under the impact of social practice, they serve the struggle carried on not only by our Soviet comrades, but also by us communists of Czechoslovakia and other fraternal countries.

We regard the legacy of the October Revolution as presenting instructive lessons for the class strategy and tactics, a wealth of material helping to solve contemporary problems. We are not at all afraid to turn to these lessons, because we are not guilty of betrayal, and because we believe that it is necessary again and again to concentrate on establishing the uniformities and ways in which they determine the development of the new world. The depth of our notions about this depends on our persistence in studying reality itself. After all, the construction of socialism cannot in any sense

be likened to a well-paved road; there are many complicated problems, difficulties and obstacles in the way. All of this leaves an imprint on practical experience and, as this is extended and ramified, the picture of the manifestations of the general uniformities certainly does not remain unchanged. It is enriched and requires further comprehension. That is the only approach which helps one to be guided by the objective laws creatively, and not dogmatically, with the benefit of the whole of modern scientific knowledge.

The 1917 Revolution in Russia, which broke the chain of world imperialism, first gave mankind a view of existing socialism, and this marked the crucial boundary line for the emergence, development and contemporary might of the world socialist system. That is the most important one of the global international consequences of the October Revolution, which have shaped the face of our epoch. It testifies to the total collapse of imperialist prophecies, including those made by some prominent bourgeois leaders today, about the "inevitable decline" of communism. The countries and peoples which have started to build a new life have convincingly demonstrated their loyalty to their chosen course. It is within the framework of the socialist system that a new and unprecedented type of international relations has taken shape, relations which were already envisaged by the great revolution and which are directly antithetical to those which exist in the capitalist world to this day.

Indeed, whereas imperialism, whose main features were exhaustively formulated by Lenin, continues its ruthless plunder of the peoples, especially through the export of capital, the system of plunderous loans, unequal terms of trade and the transnational corporations, in the new world relations between countries are based on the principles of socialist internationalism resting on fraternal cooperation. Whereas imperialism is marked by ruthless assimilation of economically weaker partners by the stronger, in our community we have the objectively operating

mechanism of socialist economic integration, which rests on equal partnership. Whereas in the imperialist camp, competitive infighting is rife, in our world we have unfolding processes of mutual assistance, and a concerned and open exchange of experience. Whereas imperialist contradictions in the fight to recarve the world are fraught with wars, our community conducts a line in the foreign policy arena which serves the cause of peace. Exactly 60 years ago, on the fourth anniversary of the October Revolution, Lenin wrote that on this question as well — on the question of the peoples' attitude to imperialist wars produced by the policy of finance capital — "Our October Revolution marked the beginning of a new era in world history" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 55).

An analysis of these new socialist relations could, we think, be of interest both in theoretical and practical terms. Our ideological adversaries have been directing their fire straight at the basic principles of socialism, and now and again they have managed to deflect the building of a new life from the true road. The stubbornness of these attacks, the hopes pinned on them by imperialism are due precisely to the importance of objective uniformities for the development of the socialist system. Departures from these merely play into the hands of our enemies and, conversely, observance of the basic uniformities and skilful use of them with an eye to the peculiar circumstances is a source on which socialism draws for insuperable strength. But before getting down to the analysis of the relations taking shape within the socialist community and the new type of relations on the global scale, there is a need to take a brief look at the history of the question.

In starting preparation for the socialist revolution, Lenin gave an exhaustive definition of the substance of proletarian internationalism: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own country*, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle, this, and only this, line in every country without exception*" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75). Once the Leninist Bolsheviks won power, they raised this principle to the level of state policy as a basis for the shaping of cooperation between the young Soviet republics formed within the boundaries of the former tsarist Russia. This policy also determined the relations with the regrettably short-lived Bavarian, Hungarian and Slovak Soviet republics, and then with Mongolia, where the people's revolution triumphed.

After the Second World War, when a whole group of countries taking the road of socialist development appeared on the map of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, their ties with the country of the October Revolution and with each other were established in the light of the uniformities brought out and asserted in the formation and consolidation of the Soviet Union as a united, well-knit multinational state. Their close relations with each other were based on their similar type of relations of production and common economic policy, on their common class tasks and goals in building socialism and communism, on their loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the proximity of their ideological and political positions. An objective expression of the new type of ties in the economic field has become the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and in the military-political field, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, which has been set up to counter the formation of the aggressive, North Atlantic Pact. The socialist community acquired a world character with the further advance of revolutionary transformations and with the victories of the peoples in Vietnam, in Cuba and other countries. It is this genesis of our community that manifested the new uniformities of international relations, whose very possibility was established by the October Revolution.

The triumph of the socialist revolution, first in one country, bore out the objective truth of the law discovered by Lenin concerning the uneven development of the world capitalist system. This law continues to operate fully to this very day. In accordance with it, there is a further enrichment of the industrial-financial monopolies of the United States, the FRG, Japan and other industrialized capitalist countries, together with a sharpening of their contradictions; there is a growing economic gap between these states and the relatively backward countries. This division within the old world system has continued to grow, being manifested in the fierce rivalry which erodes the inequitable inter-state alignments and blocs. This inequality has attained its extreme form in the practices of the U.S. administration, which crudely and high-handedly seeks to impose on the other capitalist countries, including its allies, its own narrowly selfish political decisions which go to benefit it alone.

A kind of unevenness of development will also be found within the world socialist system and it springs from the different levels of initial economic potential. But whereas in the capitalist part of the globe this process is a negative one, so that "the strong become stronger and the weak weaker," in our com-

munity uneven development is expressed in a pulling up, in an acceleration of the advance of those who have lagged for historical reasons. This is a directly opposite uniformity resulting in a drawing of the states closer to each other, in an integration of their political life on the principles of socialist internationalism. It flows from Lenin's scientific prediction concerning the post-revolutionary changes in the world: "Under capitalism all economic, political and spiritual life is becoming more and more international . . . socialism will make it completely international" (Coll. Works, Vol. 19, p. 246).

The fraternal countries' experience shows that just and mutually advantageous relations have in actual practice been taking shape between them, and that they are based on respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, non-intervention in each other's domestic affairs and voluntary political and economic alliances. Such truly equitable relations ensure a blend of the interests of all the partners, big and small, and a gradual drawing together and evening out of their development level. What do the bourgeois claims about some "Soviet exploitation" of other socialist countries have to do with the actual reality? This myth is designed to spread suspicion and mistrust for the USSR. But life tends to explode these flimsy inventions.

The Soviet system rules out both exploitation and the drive for markets and sources of raw materials, for that is abhorrent to the very nature of socialism. On the contrary, the Soviet Union extends the broadest economic, scientific and technical assistance to other members of the community, helping them to develop their productive forces and to raise the peoples' well-being.

We in Czechoslovakia are fully aware of and highly value the fact that the USSR has acted not only as a reliable supplier of raw materials and a reliable outlet for large batches of our products. It has simultaneously delivered modern and efficient hardware, assemblies and equipment for enterprises in metallurgy, engineering, chemicals, and consumer goods, and also licenses which have an important role to play in ensuring technological progress. We highly value these aspects of the matter, and believe that it is of tremendous importance to advance markedly, specialization and cooperation with the Soviet Union, especially scientific and technological cooperation. New and broad horizons are opened up before us by the long-term program of cooperation and specialization between Czechoslovakia and the USSR, which was initiated by comrades Leonid Brezhnev and Gustav Husak. Its realization calls for a

non-traditional approach, primarily for radical measures in merging our research forces with Soviet science. We believe that that is the key to accelerating the intensification of the economy in the interests of the peoples of both countries.

The delivery of Soviet energy resources has made the CMEA zone the only industrialized zone in the world which has escaped the structural energy crisis. Over the past five years, the states in the zone received from the USSR almost 370 million tons of oil, 46 million tons of oil products, 88 billion cub.m. of gas, and 64 billion kwh of electric power. In addition, the USSR has made available large credits for balancing trade and expanding the deliveries of gas and electric power. It goes without saying that no imperialist power is capable of helping its partners so selflessly — and that is a fact that springs from the very substance of capitalism.

When considering the processes of political internationalization within the socialist community, one has to emphasize that in contrast to alignments in the capitalist world, where one group of countries can impose unacceptable decisions on another, within the socialist community all the states, regardless of their size, economic and defense potential, population, etc., have equal rights. Each of them takes part only in the multilateral measures which it finds of interest.

The socialist mode of production, established as a result of the triumph of the October Revolution, predetermined the emergence of the most important uniformity of our internationalist relations: *socialist economic integration*. This is a necessary condition for consolidating the economic and defense potential of the countries which have taken the socialist road. In the past, most of them did not rank among the industrialized countries, while in industrialized Czechoslovakia there remained under the capitalist system a profound internal unevenness of development attendant, in particular, with our Slovakia lagging badly behind.

The hard legacy of the past was overcome stage by stage, through cooperation and mutual assistance, and in the course of this process a new type of regional and international division of labor fundamentally distinct from the capitalist type was worked out. It rules out one-sided economic development of individual regions and countries or their narrow specialization on the production of one or two raw materials. Specialization within the framework of the socialist community has run along the line of multisectoral ties and the establishment of territorial and national economic complexes for which the necessary

prerequisites and favorable natural and economic conditions existed in the localities. This tends to bring to the fore and stimulate progress in sectors which are important for the community as a whole, together with those which supplement the leading spheres of the economy of one's country. Let us add specifically that of exceptional importance here has been the line of developing industry in each country as the leading element of the national economy.

Economic integration extends both in breadth and in depth: joint planning activity within the CMEA, specialization and cooperation of production, scientific and technological cooperation, and foreign trade, monetary and credit relations are perfected. The economy of the once lagging countries within the community is developed at an accelerated pace. Simultaneously, internal evening out continues in each country, as is most clearly seen from the example of Slovakia as a part of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Under the bourgeois power, our Slovakia was a backward area, but under socialism it has grown into a region with a modern industry and a mature agriculture, with developed education, culture and science. Since the February 1948 victory, the social product increased 7-fold for the whole country, and 9.6-fold for Slovakia. Industrial output increased, respectively, 11.8-fold and 25-fold. Slovakia's industry now takes three and a half months to turn out roughly as much as the whole country produced in 1948. Agricultural production has doubled in Czechoslovakia as a whole, while increasing 2.5-fold in our republic. In 1948, the whole country had about 20,000 scientific and technical personnel, and 3,000 in Slovakia; today the figures are, respectively, 181,000 and 50,000. On the strength of this reality, the 16th congress of the CPCz had good grounds to state that the historically rooted distinctions in the economic, political and cultural life of our peoples have, on the whole, been evened out.

When one considers the evening out of development levels within the socialist community as a whole, one has to note that the national income gap between the European CMEA countries has been reduced from 3.2-fold (30 years ago) to 1.3-1.2-fold, and for industrial output, respectively, from 5-fold to 1.6-1.5-fold.

Economic integration has steadily boosted the social wealth of the whole community and of each of its national units, while their economies tend increasingly to be complementary with each other. The CMEA countries now account for nearly 25 per cent of the world's national income. Since 1950, industrial output

per head in our countries has multiplied over 8-fold (as compared with the world average of 3.6-fold), and the total volume of this output is now roughly double that of the Common Market countries.

Further perspectives in the development of our community are closely connected with a marked deepening of integration processes. Leonid Brezhnev says: "The CPSU and the other fraternal parties are setting their course on making the coming two five-year periods a time of intensive cooperation among the socialist countries in production, science and technology.

"Life is setting the task of supplementing coordination of our plans with coordination of economic policy as a whole. Also being put on the order of the day are such issues as aligning the structures of economic mechanisms, further extending direct ties between ministries, amalgamations, and enterprises, participating in cooperation, and establishing joint firms. Other ways of combining our efforts and resources are also possible."

Responding to these ideas and proposals, Gustav Husak told the 16th congress of the CPCz: "Our party favors an early meeting of the leading representatives of the fraternal socialist countries to discuss fundamental questions of coordination of economic policy, and is prepared to contribute to making it a total success."

The other communist parties of the fraternal countries take a similar stand in this respect, and this was expressed in concrete terms in the decisions of the CMEA's 35th session in the summer of this year on the further development of cooperation and integration in the current decade.

In the light of these actual facts of life, which show that socialist economic integration is natural and necessary, the claims by some bourgeois ideological centers about a growing economic "differentiation" of our countries appear to be especially absurd.

The Great October Revolution made a qualitative contribution to scientific socialism by translating its cardinal propositions from the theoretical plane to living practice. Experience in building the new society has consolidated the Marxist-Leninist ideological basis which is a source of energy for the peoples of the community and their revolutionary transformations. The attractiveness of socialist ideals has been visibly enhanced. All of this provides the basis for the integration of masses of working people in the new world in the sphere of spiritual life. From this follows yet another uniformity underlying the relations be-

tween the fraternal countries: *profound mutual influence in the sphere of ideology, science and culture.*

The internationalization of these superstructural institutions also takes place in its own way on the global scale as well. But for the capitalist system it is marked by unevenness, and most importantly, by a one-sided orientation. The states dominating the capitalist world seek to impose on other peoples either their crude anti-communist propaganda, sparing no effort or expense to do so, or low-grade "mass culture" products which help to make money. Meanwhile, genuine popular culture both at home and in other countries, especially less developed ones, is of no interest for the monopolies doing business in the spiritual sphere, which is why it is not popularized, supported or spread. But state monopoly capital seeks actively to entice away the most gifted members of the technical and creative intelligentsia whenever it can benefit by this.

In the world of the socialist community, spiritual treasures have, above all, a high value in themselves. That is the result of the cultural policy born of the October Revolution and aimed to make accessible to the broadest masses of people the masterpieces of creative thinking in the past and the present, at home and abroad. The ideological, political and scientific institutions of the community countries are united in close interaction, working under coordinated programs in elaborating meaningful research problems, both of general science and applied importance. There are many impressive examples and results of such cooperation, among them the Intercosmos program and the joint cosmic flights, measures to develop nuclear energy, etc. But we are also aware that life requires a further strengthening of our mutual contacts in the exact, natural, and social sciences for the attainment of tangible material results. Our peoples have a stake in ideological, scientific and cultural exchanges, regarding them, on the one hand, as an accelerator of the advance to the common goal, and on the other, as a means for the all-round and harmonious development of the individual within the framework of each nation. The creative unions of writers, film-makers, artists, architects and workers of the stage are bonded together by strong friendship. One need merely refer, among other things, to such striking international events as the Prague Spring Music Festival, the traditional Days of Soviet Culture in Czechoslovakia and of Czechoslovak Culture in the USSR, which are festivals not only of those who work in culture, but also of the broadest masses of working people. Litera-

ture has a key role to play in bringing the nations closer together and in helping them to assimilate the spiritual values of others. In the past five to six years, 849 books by Soviet authors were published in Slovakia, while readers in the USSR were acquainted with more than 100 Slovak authors. Thousands upon thousands of people in our country and in the Soviet Union have visited exhibitions by masters of art. In this way there is an enrichment of the cultures, which are national in form and socialist in content.

The coordination of efforts and exchange of experience by ideological and political institutions in the fraternal countries help further to improve ideological, mass political, educational and cultural work so as to make propaganda and agitation more vigorous, to educate a sense of intolerance to hostile ideology and morality and to enhance the ideological, moral and cultural level of our people.

Such, we believe, are the most important uniformities underlying the international relations which within the community have become literally *relations between nations*. These uniformities, unknown to the old world, stimulate the internationalization of the life of the socialist nations. But this internationalization has nothing to do with the unification of everyday practice which bourgeois "analysts" ascribe to the communists. We remember Lenin's idea that each country needs to put the finishing touches to the new system in its own way (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 112), and we interpret it the Leninist way: the general uniformities in the struggle for socialism, for its construction are manifested specifically in each country. And each party independently, with due regard to the concrete conditions, formulates its own policy, seeking correctly to maintain the balance between the general and the particular, to prevent the particular from being exaggerated, from becoming a distorting factor.

The dialectics of the national and the international is expressed in the strengthening of each fraternal country's state sovereignty and independence and in their growing international authority, with a simultaneous enhancement of the community's role as a key factor of world affairs exerting the definitive influence on the whole global system of interstate relations.

Let us now consider the second aspect of the uniformities underlying the new type of international ties encompassing the "external sphere," the sphere beyond the boundaries of the world socialist community.

Marx once said that the foreign policy of the

working class would come to replace bourgeois foreign policy.* Before the proletariat had won state power, that prediction could not become reality in relations between countries which continued to be based on exploitation, a policy of hegemonic aspirations, extortionist threats and aggressive wars. Only with the victory of the October Revolution did the foreign policy of the working class aimed to ensure peace, cooperation among nations and intensified social progress come out into the world arena as the policy of the world's first socialist state. Following the formation of the world community of socialist countries, it became a global policy and exerts a growing influence on international development.

Let us recall that the first act of the October Revolution was Lenin's Decree on Peace, which was addressed to all the governments and peoples involved in the imperialist war. It was, in effect, the first stone of the foundation of the policy of peaceful coexistence between two antagonistic systems: the socialist and the capitalist. In the early days of the Soviet power, Lenin ridiculed those who held that the interests of the world revolution ruled out any peace with the imperialists: "A socialist republic surrounded by imperialist powers could not, from this point of view, conclude any economic treaties, and could not exist at all, without flying off to the moon" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 71).

Since these words were written, tremendous changes have occurred in the world. The course of social development has markedly strengthened the positions of socialism at the expense of capitalism. Far from weakening, these changes have, in effect, further enhanced the importance of the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, to which there is no reasonable alternative in view of the threat of nuclear war. The incontrovertible truth is that thanks to the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole the peoples of Europe have now lived in peace on the continent for more than 35 years. It is alien to socialism to seek to redivide the world: that is a task which from its standpoint is simply absurd. The Marxist-Leninists maintain the class approach which rules out the very possibility of equating the imperialist NATO bloc and the peaceable Warsaw Pact. The fundamental distinction between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the military blocs of the capitalist states is that its activity is based on the principles of détente and security and has the task of strengthening

world peace, as proclaimed by the October Revolution.

It is equally alien to socialism to seek to put an end to the capitalist system by military means, by exporting revolution; we hold to the truth that capitalism is historically doomed, but we know that the peoples of the other countries will take the road of socialist transformations only when they themselves desire to do so and only when the objective and subjective conditions for this take shape. Until then, peaceful coexistence is the only way of safeguarding our planet from a thermonuclear catastrophe.

Today, in the early 1980s, the danger of war has become especially real. U.S. ruling circles, and with them NATO leaders as well, have executed a sharp turn in their policy toward a step-up of tension, confrontation and the arms race. This political adventurism, as the exhaustive analysis at the fraternal parties' congresses shows, springs not only from the diverse difficulties faced by capitalism, but is also dictated by the most reactionary forces, especially by the U.S. military-industrial complex and their urge to bolster their positions and obtain fabulous profits in defiance of mankind's vital interests. In such conditions, special importance is attached to the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence and the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which have been unanimously supported by the communist parties and governments of the community countries. These are the Peace Program, proclaimed by the 24th and 25th congresses and elaborated in the light of the 1980s by the 26th congress of the CPSU, the concrete proposals for greater confidence-building measures in Europe and other regions of the globe, as set forth at the congress and since then in Leonid Brezhnev's speeches, and also the Soviet Union's call for restraint in the field of strategic armaments and for a continuation of talks on their limitation.

This line does not, of course, mean that the socialist community makes concessions to pacifism. The imperialists' aggressive inspirations have forced us to spend a sizable part of our efforts on manufacturing the most modern weapons and maintaining armies. Without these it is impossible to have a dialogue with those who regard not the good will embodied in treaties but the number of missiles and nuclear warheads as the weightiest argument in politics.

That is why *close foreign policy and military cooperation among the socialist countries is also a uniformity of their relations*. But this does not infringe on their independence in the pursuit of concrete policy and does not lead to a levelling down of diplomatic practice.

*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 18.

The dialectics of inter-state relations within the community and relations with the capitalist world is an important problem for the fraternal countries. We are convinced that without abandoning ties with the capitalist countries, the socialist community countries should bring to the forefront *cooperation among themselves*. The primacy of this category of inter-state relations helps to avoid dangerous dependence on the imperialist powers, above all, in the economic, scientific, technical and financial spheres.

One of the main lessons of the Great October Revolution is that leadership of the revolutionary process by the Marxist-Leninist party is the key condition for the winning of power by the working class and the establishment of a socialist system. This lesson has been well learned by the communist parties of the fraternal countries, which have, in fact, become the authoritative leading force of the socialist society. Their role has continued to grow with the increase in the scale and with the ever more complex nature of the creative tasks not only within the national but also within the international framework. *That which is a uniformity for each country remains in effect for the community as a whole*. Its strength, viability, dynamic development, and its firm and consistent line in foreign policy are determined by the activity of the communist parties which is concerted on the cardinal lines, parties which are bonded together by their ideological kinship and their ability to reckon correctly with the objective uniformities of social development.

The role of the leading, guiding and coordinating activity of the fraternal countries' communist parties tends to increase as the construction of the developed socialist society becomes more complicated, as the pace of life is accelerated under the impact of scientific and technological progress, and as the contest between the two social systems is sharpened. The experience of our party and that of others acquired in the battle for the power of the working class and in building the new life shows that loyalty to Leninism and its creative development and skilled application in concrete situations is the guarantee of success in fulfilling this mission. Experience also indicates that any departure from Leninism inevitably leads to mistakes and harms the cause of the working class and all the other working people. Historical practice over the past several decades and in our own day confirms that without a real mastery of Leninism, to say nothing of a betrayal of its principles, the leading role of the party tends to decline, the masses lose confidence in its

policy, and the very gains of the new system are ultimately jeopardized. We in Czechoslovakia had to pay a high price for these lessons in the crisis period, and it is well known that for other parties life has not proceeded without similar lessons. The communist and working-class movement has had the opportunity to become convinced through multifaceted experience of the tragic consequences of ignoring the laws of social development, neglect of the demands of life, and departures from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

That is why loyalty to Leninism, resolute rebuffs to revisionism and dogmatism and timely and creative solution of mature problems, as was demonstrated by the 26th congress of the CPSU, the 16th congress of the CPCz and the congresses of other fraternal parties, are the crucial condition for the communists' successful fulfillment of their historical revolutionary mission and attainment of their goals.

Consequently, the growing role of the communist parties in the fraternal countries is a law-governed generalizing process. Its influence spreads to every aspect of the socialist community's development and calls for a complex Marxist-Leninist analysis of the various spheres of the new type of relations. This is of exceptional importance for the parties, because:

— first, on a knowledge of the mechanism for deepening the ties between the fraternal countries depends the conscious direction of these processes;

— second, theoretical comprehension of the available experience is a necessary condition for bringing out the potentialities of the world socialist system and the ways of its further progress;

— third, this is necessary for well-augmented exposure of the anti-communist hostile propaganda and falsifications and diverse attempts to smear existing socialism.

The fraternal parties' cooperation assumes many forms promoting a steady exchange of ideas, opinions and concrete experience in socialist construction, techniques in economic management, and collective formulation of a common line in international affairs. Of special importance is the fruitful activity of the Political Consultative Committee, the central unit of the mechanism set up to coordinate policy within the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

Regular friendly meetings of party and state leaders at the highest level have become a most important tradition. This summer, such meetings were once again held in the Crimea, and they made a valuable contribution to the development and strengthening of the fraternal

countries' interaction on a bilateral and multi-lateral basis.

The secretaries of our parties' central committees meet to consider the vital problems of international and ideological work, party construction, jointly analyze the available experience and map out measures for making the party guidance of social life more effective. Just now, we believe, there is a need for the CC secretaries responsible for economic matters and the development of the exact, natural and technical sciences also to hold meetings for similar exchange of experience and views, and a party discussion of such key problems as measures to accelerate socialist economic integration and scientific and technological progress, and to align the mechanisms of economic management. It would also be highly appropriate to have exchanges of experience in party influence on the faster spread of automation, the use of cybernetics and microelectronics, and also on the establishment of broad

and effective cooperation in genetics, biological production, and so on.

The socialist community's development along the road opened by the October Revolution is governed by the dialectical interaction of two tendencies: integration in greater depth, and consolidation of the sovereign independence of each country. The former has already been dealt with. As for the latter, it is expressed in the individual features of the communist parties' strategy and tactics, in the specifics of their practical organizational activity, and in the peculiar solution of the tasks in building the new society. This tendency must now and again result in the emergence of different views on separate issues, and these do actually emerge in some fields. But these differences are not permanent or antagonistic, and the means for overcoming them differ fundamentally from the methods of pressure, economic dictat and political and military force, the chief instruments in the capitalist contest. In the life of the socialist community countries, the differences are eliminated by means of collectively approved measures worked out by the fraternal parties on the basis of mutual discussion and a scientific approach to the matter in the light of the Marxist-Leninist methodology and in an atmosphere of complete equality.

Sixty-four years have passed since the victorious October Revolution opened a new epoch in world history. Mankind's socialist development along an ascending line, inaugurated by the October Revolution, continues. Socialism now exerts the most profound influence on all the processes in the world convincingly demonstrating its superiority over capitalism in the spheres of the economy, social relations, and the defense of peace, the most vital and burning issue of our day. This superiority will continue to grow with time, because the countries of our community do not advance along the road of progress spontaneously but under the leadership of their Marxist-Leninist parties, which are equipped with a knowledge of the uniformities of social development.

The ability correctly to take these uniformities into account and to use them provides a range of instruments by means of which it is possible to find optimal solutions for interstate problems and to fulfil internal economic and political tasks, to combine national and international interests more flexibly and more soundly to consolidate the great gains of the new system. We believe that the future of the whole of mankind lies in the strengthening and development of socialism as a world international system.

ROOTS OF OPPRESSION

The American Indian Question
by Steve Talbot

The so-called Indian problem, examined from colonial times to the present, is shown as an economic, political and social phenomenon created by the special oppressed status of Native Americans. This status, marked by racism, dispossession and economic exploitation, is documented as the product of U.S. capitalist relations. Professor Talbot (chairman, Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology, University of the District of Columbia) sharply details the course and meaning of Indian resistance as he treats such key subjects as nationhood, land, genocide and self-determination. 240 pages.

In the U.S. order from:
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Ave. South, N.Y., N.Y. 10016
Cloth \$14.00; Paper \$4.75 (U.S.)

In Canada:
PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6
Cloth \$18.75; Paper \$6.50 (Can.)

Defend and build the new Kampuchea

Pen Sovan

General Secretary, People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea CC;
Chairman, Council of Ministers of the
People's Republic of Kampuchea

Our people entered the 20th century with much experience in the national liberation struggle behind them. Following France's enslavement of the country (mid-19th century), the land of the world-famed civilization of Anghor was repeatedly the scene of major anti-colonial action; the common people, the clergy, and patriotically-minded members of the aristocracy did not cease resisting the alien invaders.

The liberation movement rose to a new height after the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. The Communist Party of Indochina, set up in 1930, had among its founders the first Vietnamese communist, comrade Ho Chi Minh, an active participant in the revolutionary movement in the peninsula and an outstanding leader of the Comintern, and it raised the banner of solidarity of the working class and the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. The masses started an active struggle against the common enemy — the French oppressors — for the independence and freedom of the countries of Indochina. There was a spread of anti-colonial action and strikes. Through the activity of revolutionary organizations which emerged in the 1930s, the ideas of national liberation and social emancipation reached the Khmer working people.

The victory of the August revolution in Vietnam (1945) had a great impact on the Kampuchean liberation movement. In cooperation with the Vietnamese fighters, the Khmer patriots set up bases and liberated areas on the territory of the country, with the communists acting as the leading force and nucleus of the popular struggle.

A historic event occurred in the life of Kampuchea on February 19, 1951: in accordance with the decision of the second congress of the Communist Party of Indochina on the formation of separate parties in the three countries of the peninsula, the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea (PRPK) emerged as the militant vanguard of the people and the Khmer nation. It united the most consistent, unflinching and selfless patriots and became the people's leader in the struggle against the French colonialists, the U.S. interventionists and their henchmen,

and for an independent, united and prosperous country of the Khmers. The party led the resistance war against the French imperialists, and after their crushing defeat in Indochina (1954) fought the local feudal authorities and the pro-American puppet regime set up in 1970. Springing, as it did, from the movement of the oppressed masses, the Kampuchean revolution steadily gained in scope.

Having overcome countless difficulties, our people carried their heroic mission to victory on April 17, 1975. Filled with enthusiasm, it was prepared to start a free and peaceful life in fraternal friendship with the peoples of the neighboring countries, putting all its strength and energy into the revival of the country.

But Kampuchea's road of social progress proved to be a thorny one: the destiny of a whole people, its very existence was at stake. State power was taken over by the Pol Pot clique, which usurped the party leadership. It destroyed the truly revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party, and converted it into a counter-revolutionary band of terrorists, murderers and sadists, and a Peking puppet. Ninety per cent of the cadre who remained loyal to Marxism and the cause of the revolution were killed. Nearly all the experienced comrades seasoned in the struggle lost their lives. The world witnessed the emergence of a monstrous regime of genocide with its system of communes (or simply concentration camps) set up in accordance with Maoist "recipes," ghost towns "purged" of inhabitants, and thousands of torture chambers in which Kampuchians — communists and non-communists, believers and non-believers, members of all the classes and social strata without exception — were killed. Technical personnel, administrative officials, and skilled workers were subjected to total physical annihilation. The same lot was in store for 80 per cent of the intelligentsia.

But the Kampuchians were not broken down by the massive terrorism. Resistance to the unheard of brutalities grew among party members and throughout the country. Those who came out against the Pol Pot clique and resolutely broke with it, gradually rallied their forces.

This led to the formation of the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea, which called on the people to crush the hated regime. From January 5 to 7, 1979, a congress was held to re-establish the party — the third in the party's history,* and it adopted a program of struggle to overthrow the power of the Pol Pot clique, a resolution on restructuring the party, and new party rules.

These are only a few facts from our country's tragic past to give the reader a clearer view of the situation in which the true Marxist-Leninists have had to work for the revival of disrupted life in a society trampled by the Pol Pot clique, following the overthrow of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Khieu Samphan regime.

Since then, nearly three years have elapsed. The rehabilitation process and the assertion of the new progressive order have on the whole run successfully. The country's territory is being cleared of the surviving Pol Pot men hiding out in the jungles and mountain regions. A large number of inhabitants whom the bandits forced to do guard duty or give them material aid have been released. Many fugitives have already returned to their old homes. The state is helping them to arrange their life, to build homes and to start working.

Industry is being rehabilitated, and dozens of enterprises supplying consumer goods and foodstuffs have been started. Three electric power stations, nine factories in the light industry and two plants turning out building materials were started in 1980 alone. Work has been resumed in the ports, and the trains are running. The fraternal countries of the socialist community have helped to enlarge our fleet of trucks. The country now has its own currency, the riel.

The volume of agricultural production has increased sharply. In the first half of this year, the peasants sold the state about 150,000 tons of unhulled rice. The export of valuable woods and rubber has been resumed. A sizable part of the hevea plantations are once again turning out their product. The fish catch has more than doubled. As a result of the measures taken, the threat of starvation has been eliminated.

The system of education and medical services is being organized. Our children, deprived of the possibility of studying for four years, are once again going to school, and the number of pupils now comes to about 1.5 million. Schools have been opened everywhere, in towns, villages, in the most remote areas. Twenty thousand orphans are being brought up in nursery schools and boarding schools set

up by the people's power; 230,000 adults are attending literacy courses.

Just after the collapse of the Pol Pot clique, there were only 50 doctors and midwives. Today they already number thousands. The birth rate has increased sharply and a network of maternity rooms has been set up. Despite the acute shortage of funds and organizational weaknesses, the prevention and treatment of diseases is yielding fruit. Epidemics have been averted and malaria and other diseases are being successfully combated.

Kampuchea is rising to a new life, a fact that has been admitted even by the imperialist press, which has slandered our Republic with such inventiveness, and which only now and again mentions the visible changes for the better in the Khmer people's life. But the Kampucheans themselves know the truth: the tyrannical order has gone for good. The first session of the National Assembly, the supreme organ of the state power, held in June 1981, adopted the Republic's constitution. This fundamental law has entrenched the victory of the democratic social system. The constitution says: "The people shall be the masters of their own country. Power shall belong to the people." This is a real reflection of the radical changes that have occurred over the past several years. The central and local organs of power set up as a result of general elections serve to conduct the will of the people. Virtually the whole of the adult population took part in the elections. All the members of the Central Committee of the National Construction Front of Kampuchea (NCFK)* and the People's Revolutionary Council were elected by an overwhelming majority. Mandates were received from the people by workers, peasants and intellectuals united in the desire to build a new socialist and prosperous Kampuchea.

The United Front, which brings together all Kampuchean patriots, has to play a tremendous mobilizing role. It is also open to all those who used to be mistaken and are now working for the country's rehabilitation. Guided by the principles of patriotism and international solidarity, the NCFK is working to safeguard and consolidate the great unity of the nation, carrying on a resolute struggle to eliminate the survivals of the ideology of nationalism and manifestations of discrimination, and against reactionary propaganda and attempts to split the people and undermine the friendship between the Kampucheans and their brothers, sisters and friends in other countries. The Front,

* The first was held in 1951, the second in 1960.—Ed.

* The present name of the United Front (earlier UFNSK) — Ed.

working under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Party, and relying on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, is mobilizing the masses for struggle to consolidate national independence, to defend the country, and to fulfil the tasks in gradually advancing toward socialism.

Our party's recent fourth congress frankly admitted the existence of shortcomings and outstanding problems, both in the economic sphere and in state administration. It is, of course, impossible to overcome in a short period the legacy inherited from earlier regimes. The participants in the congress justly emphasized that in tackling its revolutionary tasks, the party must start from the actual state of things and the country's potentialities, and formulate its correct political line accordingly. It would be wrong to copy blindly the rich experience of the initial period of socialist transformations in other states, but this needs to be extensively used in the light of Kampuchea's national specifics. It is important to take a creative approach, to consult with the people more often, and to be sensitive to its opinions. The advance toward socialism must be gradual, without any manifestations of subjectivism or voluntarism.

Summing up the experience accumulated over the recent period, we have reached the conclusion that in our country gradual transition to socialism implies the conversion of agriculture into the key element. This opens up a real prospect for successfully arranging the life of the people. We shall then be able to provide industry with raw materials, to increase the output of export goods, to produce more consumer goods and build up some reserves. Within five to seven years, Kampuchea is to put to the plough one million hectares of fallow land. Thanks to the timely preparations for the sowing and the labor enthusiasm of the masses, the overall area under rice and certain other crops has already been increased to more than 1.5 million hectares. Within the next five years, it is to increase to 2.3-2.5 million hectares, and the cattle population to 1.4-1.5 million.

In the light of these tasks, special importance is attached to the question of switching agriculture to collective labor. The first step here has been the creation of "mutual assistance production teams," which already involve more than 90 per cent of peasant households. Similar teams are being set up among fishermen and handicraftsmen.

We regard the role of other sectors, industry and transport in the first place, with an eye to the accent on the development of agriculture.

Plans are to be worked out for these sectors so as to help rehabilitate the agrarian economy destroyed by the Pol Pot clique. The handicraft industries are also to give more attention to the manufacture of manual implements for agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

Within a short period, a state sector has been formed in the economy, including industrial, agricultural and commercial enterprises of central and local subordination. The state is to exercise the guiding role in two other sectors: the cooperative sector, which involves mainly mutual assistance production teams, and the family sector, which consists of the households of peasants and handicraftsmen working on a private basis. The economic activity of private entrepreneurs is now doing much to revive economic life. Once the products turned out under contract with state organizations have been delivered, the rest can be sold by the producers on the free market or sold to the state at mutually agreed prices.

Consequently, our strategy of socio-economic development proceeds from the need to use and stimulate the growth of every sector of the economy benefiting the people. The state sector has the leading role to play but it can operate successfully only in close interaction with other sectors. We believe that there is a need to avoid the tendency both to clamp down and contract the family sector in trade and handicraft industry, and, conversely, to allow private economic operations to develop without a plan.

Finally, in considering the prospects for economic development, we should like specifically to emphasize the importance of cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, Vietnam and the USSR in the first place. Their assistance has enabled Kampuchea to survive in the first few of the hardest months following the overthrow of the Pol Pot regime, which sought to doom the people to starvation by dispatching to China or deliberately destroying stocks of rice. Their assistance now serves to revive our country, to rehabilitate and reconstruct the remaining facilities, to build new ones, and to develop various sectors of the national economy. At our recent friendly meeting in the Kremlin with Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, we expressed, on behalf of the Kampuchean people, our feelings of profound gratitude for the all-round fraternal assistance we have been getting from the Soviet Union.

The more stable the people's life, the greater its confidence in the new social system. We were convinced of this when getting down to

the arduous work of reviving our country ruined by the Pol Pot clique. Still, in order to fulfil the tasks of tremendous dimensions there is also a need for the correct ideological line by means of which the vanguard is able to rouse the masses. Our activity in the ideological sphere was complicated by the fact that the Pol Pot clique, together with the Peking Maoists, had either corrupted the consciousness of some people by their cannibalistic man-hating doctrine, or had altogether repulsed them from socialism by their monstrous atrocities, which they claimed were leading to socialism.

The first thing we had to do was to carry to the masses the truth about what actually happened in Kampuchea under the murderers' regime and to show that what the Pol Pot men did had nothing in common with socialism. Second, we had to expose their conception of "national isolation" and "autarky," which meant a return to the feudal society. Third, there was the need to show the true substance of this conception, which in fact amounted to blindly fulfilling orders from Peking. Fourth, the party and state leadership of the PRK had to counter the "Maoist-Pol Pot socialism" with true, scientific socialism, with the Marxist-Leninist conception of social development as applied to Kampuchea's specific conditions. This had to be done in such a way as to carry the ideas of scientific socialism to broad masses of people and to have them accept these ideas.

The accent was put on awakening patriotic feelings and national pride through a revival of the people's spiritual life, something that is largely promoted by the activity of the party and the state in the field of national culture, and on the education of an internationalist consciousness. We explain that Kampuchea is now the scene of a fierce struggle between the forces of the working class, the peasantry, the petty urban bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the patriotically-minded clergy, rallied together in the United Front on the one hand, and on the other — Pol Pot and Ieng Sary's reactionary groupings of traitors to the revolution, Sihanouk, who represents the reactionary feudal elite, and Son Sann, who expresses the interests of compradore bourgeoisie, all of whom serve as instruments of Peking and Washington.

History testifies that revolutionaries are successful only when they blend patriotism with internationalism. This is exemplified by the effective militant alliance of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos. Throughout the 35 years of struggle against the French colonialists, the U.S. aggressors and the pro-Peking clique, the Communist Party of Vietnam, its government,

its people, and its armed forces helped us to bring on the coming victory. Vietnamese soldiers fought shoulder to shoulder with our soldiers against our common enemies, sharing their joys and sorrows, their rice and salt. A great many outstanding sons of Vietnam gave their lives for the sake of our country's independence and freedom. We fought together, and we won together.

On the other hand, the revolution in Kampuchea always suffered defeat when our country's friendship with the socialist community and the peace forces was undermined, and when the militant alliance of the three countries of Indochina was subjected to the most dangerous trials.

That is why the PRPK intends to continue firmly following the well-tested internationalist line of most closely cooperating with our Vietnamese and Laotian brothers, and with the whole of the socialist community, while developing friendship with other peoples. Without the leadership and vigorous activity of the party, the National Construction Front, the People's Revolutionary Council, without genuine patriotism, mutual assistance and solidarity of all the strata of the population, without the tremendous and effective all-round internationalist assistance on the part of Vietnam, Laos, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also the humanistic aid of international organizations, our people could not have overcome the hard legacy left by the genocidal regime and Peking expansionism.

The victory of the people's democratic revolution in Kampuchea in January 1979 was an event of major international importance. The family of states in Southeast Asia taking the road of democracy and socialism has become larger. Peking's hegemonistic plans to set up a puppet state entity on the territory of Indochina so as to use it as a base for its aggressive line against neighboring Kampuchea and other states in the region have proven to be a fiasco. Our foreign policy is a policy of peace, independence and nonalignment; it is designed for the utmost development of equitable cooperation and friendship with other countries and peoples. More than 30 states and organizations have already established official relations with the PRK, and its authority in the international arena has been steadily growing. Fresh confirmation of this came from the visit to India by the PRK Foreign Minister Hun Sen, when he was received by the country's President Neelam Sanjiva Reddy, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, and had talks with the Foreign Minister Narasimha Rao. The meetings in Delhi, at which there was a discussion of the situa-

tion in Southeast Asia and questions of bilateral relations, simultaneously demonstrated the urge of the two states to establish a climate of good neighborliness, cooperation and peace in our region. Despite the intrigues and subversive activity of the Peking expansionists and U.S imperialists, these principles of interstate relations — the only reasonable ones — have won tremendous popularity in Asia and other parts of the world. Our country has also pursued a profoundly peaceable line in the international arena.

But from the outset this line was met with hostility by the imperialist and Peking circles. External reaction has been making loud noises over the notorious "Kampuchean question." Washington and Peking have demanded some kind of "political solution" in Kampuchea. This streamline formula is a cover for direct interference in the sovereign affairs of the PRK. To this day, the Peking hegemonists, the U.S. imperialists and Thailand's reactionary authorities keep clutching at the dead body of the Pol Pot regime in an effort to undermine the revolution by military means and to isolate it diplomatically. The attempts to destabilize the revolutionary power are being made by terrorist groups infiltrating deep into the country, and agents are being smuggled even into the ranks of our party. Reaction has put its stake on a drawn-out "guerrilla war" so as to create an atmosphere of chaos and pave the way for external aggression.

Kampuchea's party and state leadership believes that it has a direct duty to use all the necessary ways and means to frustrate the enemies' schemes. Our armed forces are in a state of constant readiness, raising their vigilance and combat capability. We have been carrying on extensive educational work among the population by exposing the crafty schemes and intrigues. Of tremendous value for us is Vietnam's assistance in defending the PRK against external aggression. The presence of Vietnamese troops on the territory of Kampuchea is not aimed against any third country, but springs from the need to ward off the threat to its independence and security posed by the Chinese hegemonists, who are operating in a compact with the United States and other reactionary forces.

The hostile campaign being carried on against our revolution reached a peak at the notorious "international conference on Kampuchea" held in New York last summer. It was planned and prepared with the closest cooperation between the foreign policy departments of China and the United States. This provocative undertaking was designed to mis-

lead world public opinion, to present a distorted picture of the situation in the PRK, and to incite the remnants of the Pol Pot bands and other Khmer reactionaries to fresh crimes against the Kampuchean people. In the forefront of the noisy "champions" of its right to "self-determination" we now find the U.S. imperialists and Chinese expansionists, who ruthlessly used to trample in Kampuchea and Indochina as a whole, the basic right of any people, namely, the right to life.

These forces are now trying to cover up their hostile, aggressive acts with the name of the United Nations. They have stepped up their intrigues because the situation in Kampuchea has been improving and stabilizing from day to day, while its government exercises effective control over all the country's external and internal affairs.

Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos have sharply condemned the provocative venture of holding the "conference," qualifying it as a gross violation of the PRK's independence and sovereignty. The stand of the three Indochinese states was resolutely supported by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and many developing states.

An effort was made to force us to discuss a problem which does not exist and to do this in defiance of the will of the people who in January 1979 chose the road of progress. We were invited to sit down to the negotiating table with the Pol Pot cannibals. The holding of the "conference" was presented by the imperialist circles almost as a "peace initiative." But what kind of a "peace initiative" can there be when Peking and Washington are simultaneously straining to cobble together a counter-revolutionary bloc consisting of pro-Peking and pro-U.S. groupings, and also of pro-Thailand reactionary elements. Just recently, Khieu Samphan, Son Sann and Sihanouk met in Singapore to discuss the establishment of a "united front" or "coalition government" to fight the legitimate government of the PRK. The reactionary assemblage merely went to demonstrate once again the deep divisions and contradictions within the camp of the Kampuchean people's enemies. At the time, for all the efforts of their imperialist and Peking patrons, the "coalition government's" venture did not succeed. But these circles have not abandoned their sinister plans, and have continued to try to knock together a puppet front. They want Sihanouk to head it, and he would have been flattered at the "honor," but for a little catch. After all, even reaction is now forced to recognize that its plans are doomed. The Kampuchean people who stayed abroad as a result of the

national tragedy are coming to realize the truth about the radical changes at home, about the construction there of a truly just society in accordance with the uniformities discovered by scientific socialism. The Marxist-Leninist theory has truly shed light on our advance along the road of progress.

Peace is necessary for successfully realizing our creative plans, but attempts are being made to push us into a war by means of subversion, sabotage and direct armed action. While standing up in arms in face of the intrigues of our avowed enemies, we address the sober-minded circles and leaders in our region and emphasize that there does exist a realistic basis for settling the problems which have taken shape over Indochina. In January 1981, the Foreign Ministers of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos put forward a proposal to hold a regional meeting between the countries of Indochina and the ASEAN countries to discuss matters of interest to both sides so as to transform Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability. If for some reason ASEAN is not prepared for such a conference, multilateral and bilateral consultations on the broadest range of problems could be

held. The countries of Indochina also expressed their readiness to sign bilateral non-aggression treaties with China. Last June, the Foreign Ministers of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos meeting in Phnom Penh reaffirmed their countries' proposals.

The peace initiatives of the three Indochinese states have the resolute support of the Soviet Union. This was reiterated by comrade Leonid Brezhnev in the course of our meeting at the Kremlin.

The people of Kampuchea have a long road of armed struggle behind them. That is why they so cherish peace. We want a dialogue, instead of confrontation, and we shall bend every effort to bring about the ultimate triumph of the cause of peace. At the same time, the members of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and all other Kampuchean patriots will work to consolidate the gains that have been achieved, and to defend and build their people's republic. We have no fear of difficulties or trials. The revolutionaries of Kampuchea are resolved to overcome them and to bring about the victory of socialism in the beautiful country of Angkor.

The dangerous doctrine of world domination

Gus Hall
General Secretary
Communist Party USA

The Reagan administration continues along its dangerous reactionary path. It has resurrected and adopted the doctrine of U.S. world domination as its primary guiding principle for its foreign policy. And, it has adopted monopoly capital's anti-working class, anti-union, anti-people and racist offensive as the guideline for its domestic policies.

The fact that these foreign and domestic guidelines are based on miscalculations and illusions makes them all the more dangerous because such policies are pursued without any regard for the real world. They are on a collision course with reality.

A very basic miscalculation by the Reaganites is that U.S. imperialism can, in this century, resurrect the aborted "American Century" of years past. This self-delusion determines their attitude to and their relationship with the countries of the world. This illusion of political grandeur is reflected in the arrogant, presump-

tuous demeanor of the provincial-minded entourage surrounding Reagan.

The Reagan foreign policy is based on a drive for military nuclear superiority. It is a policy based on nuclear terrorism. The Reagan clique correctly sees the Soviet Union as the major roadblock on the path to U.S. world domination. So they have established the Big Lie as the framework for their ideological offensive. They are re-heating the cold war on all fronts.

The Reagan administration has adopted aggressive colonialism and neo-colonialism as the official U.S. policy in relations with the countries in Africa, Asia, South and Central America. It is out to crush the heroic people of El Salvador and to destroy the historic achievements of socialist Cuba. The Haig-Crocker hatchet team is withdrawing all U.S. financial support from United Nations projects that make financial aid available to the "poorest 31 countries."

Instead, the Reagan policy is to tie all economic aid to the developing countries conditional on accepting the dictates of U.S. imperialism. The plan is to fund only the most reactionary, fascist, militaristic, corrupt governments and counter-revolutionary groups.

The plan is to cut government-to-government aid and replace it with investments by U.S.-based multinationals. And Haig has added a new condition. To be eligible for any U.S. aid the potential recipient must become involved and contribute to the drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination. This is what Haig had in mind when he said: "We recognize that progress in our relations with the many nations of the South is dependent on our success in dealing with East-West security problems." The new ideological invention is to label all struggles against imperialism as "international terrorism."

The "American Century" doctrine is also creating problems between the United States and the other major capitalist countries. The Reagan administration is putting heavy pressure on its capitalist allies to contribute to U.S. global designs, but to do so as non-voting, junior partners. They are pressured to spend more on arms and to "promote the establishment of U.S. leadership throughout the world."

In assessing the policies of the Reagan administration the words used most frequently are — "reckless," "insane," "shooting cowboy-movie-style from the hip," "dangerous" and "irresponsible."

There has been a great deal of demagogic mouthing by Reagan spokesmen about disarmament negotiations. But to this point it has been nothing but pure fakery. It is a cover for the fanatical arms build-up.

There is an irreconcilable contradiction in talking about negotiations for reduction of strategic nuclear weapons while throwing unlimited billions into the most frenzied military build-up in U.S. history. It is nothing but brazen fakery to talk about wanting to talk about mutual arms reduction while pursuing a policy of heating up the arms race, a policy of working frantically for nuclear military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The war game plan of the Reagan administration is to placate and mislead the world by endless double-talking about negotiations, while placing absolutely unrealistic preconditions and obstacles that make negotiations impossible for the Soviet Union.

It should be kept in mind that a meeting of negotiating teams does not necessarily mean serious negotiations. At this point, it does not

look as though the Reagan administration has decided to start in fact the give-and-take that is necessary in any serious negotiations.

The U.S. drive for nuclear military superiority is a long-range Reagan-monopoly plan. These plans include new scientific and technological breakthroughs in many areas, such as use of laser weapons in outer space. The shuttle spacecraft was designed primarily for military purposes in outer space.

Therefore, it can be safely assumed that the talk about coming negotiations will be stretched out indefinitely for as long as possible. And, when the talks finally do begin they most likely will follow a similar pattern.

It is crystal clear, as far as the Reagan administration is concerned its goal is to procrastinate, postpone and forestall negotiations until the Pentagon "thinks" it has reached the point of nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. The evil, murderous designs of the Haig-Weinbergers is to then attempt to dictate treaty terms to the Soviet Union from a "position of new strength." That is a path to total disaster.

In the meantime, the plan calls for a tremendous military build-up for the purpose of preparing to fight so-called "limited wars," which will include a mixture of nuclear, conventional, chemical and germ warfare. The neutron bomb was specifically designed for this mixed-weapon warfare.

The Reagan administration has embarked on a revival and modernization of the old "counter-insurgency wars." This is the purpose of the establishment of the rapid deployment force. All these weapons and forces are being prepared for total readiness, for activation to frontline positions, behind the concept of "forward basing."

There is no room for or need to speculate as to the direction of the Reagan policies. However, now the point is being reached where these reactionary policies and designs are coming face-to-face with reality, with growing obstacles and resistance, both objective developments and subjective reactions.

Therefore, formidable contradictions are continuing to sharpen between these policies and reality, both at home and abroad.

The Reagan domestic game plan is to give monopoly capital a completely free hand. Regulations that have been on the books for a hundred years are now being repealed and scrapped. As a result, monopolization has gone hog wild. And this has added a new quality to anarchy in capitalist production relations. We are entering a phase of state-monopoly capitalism that is completely unregulated, uncontrolled, unrestricted and untaxed.

The New York Times observed: "Corporate income tax may soon be a relic, the lingering remnant. By the close of this decade, taxes on profits of big business will have faded to a trickle." This, at a moment when the unearned income flows at a rate of \$3 billion per day into the coffers of the corporations.

The Reagan-monopoly offensive is proceeding to wipe out the social and economic gains of the last 50 years. In the process there is taking place the most massive transfer of wealth from the working and poor people to the rich and corporations in the history of the United States. The number of jobless keeps growing. Real wages continue to decline. Racism is being completely decontrolled and desegregation, affirmative action and anti-discrimination measures are coming unglued. Racist terror is on the rampage throughout our land.

As the Reagan administration pushes its policies in both foreign and domestic affairs there is a process taking place of withdrawal of support and a growing resistance, both at home and abroad. On the world scene, U.S. imperialism is becoming increasingly isolated. Some of the withdrawal of support or resistance is against the Reagan policy as a whole, some only against the more extreme positions.

The withdrawal of support and the resistance are developing also in the capitalist world. In most of the older capitalist countries the opposition is developing against the more extreme positions. This has sharpened the inter-relationship between the United States and the other industrialized nations.

The 13-1 vote in the United Nations Security Council, condemning South Africa for its aggression against Angola, was an example of the withdrawal of support for an extreme U.S. position.

The statement of support for the liberation forces of El Salvador by Mexico and France was another example of the growing resistance in the capitalist world against the extreme U.S. positions.

There is a growing separation from and a growing criticism of the Reagan administration's refusal to enter into meaningful, serious strategic nuclear arms negotiations with the Soviet Union.

There is a growing antagonism by the major capitalist countries over the high interest rates in the United States because they are seen as a monetary club over their economies. High interest rates in the United States have become a weight holding back economic recovery in the other major capitalist countries.

There is the resentment and growing open resistance to the placing of the new Cruise and

Pershing II missiles on European soil, as well as the growing anti-neutron bomb movement gaining momentum throughout Europe.

Because of the open support for South Africa and the growing economic integration between the United States and South Africa, as well as the U.S. cover-up of the racism of the South African regime, there is a growing anger and resistance to the Reagan policies in most of the developing and nonaligned countries and the national liberation movements. This is also pushing U.S. imperialism into further isolation from the rest of the world.

The areas of the world where the Reagan-imperialist policies get uncritical support are in the leading circles in the People's Republic of China, South Africa, Chile, Israel and Egypt.

The sale of new technology military weapons to the Peking hegemonists adds a new, highly charged element to the danger of war.

The inheritors and practitioners of Maoism are the most consistent boosters and supporters of the imperialist policies of nuclear confrontation and aggression. They have adopted the old Chinese saying "resort to peace and friendship when circumstances force you to do so. But consider war as your main policy." This is their guideline in their relationships with the socialist, newly independent and developing countries.

The same kind of withdrawal and resistance to both the domestic and foreign policies are developing on the home front. Sections of monopoly capital are beginning to withdraw their support because of what they believe are reckless statements regarding foreign policy and unworkable economic policies.

U.S. state-monopoly capitalism is getting into ever deeper economic and financial ensnarements. The crises have become an encirclement from which it is impossible to break out without negatively affecting the whole circle. The Reagan snake oil was supposed to create an economic breakthrough, a miracle. That has not happened.

Monopoly capital was for the big corporate tax cut Reagan has pushed through Congress. They are also happy with military expenditures that are reaching the \$1 billion per day level. But they are now concerned about the results.

The tax cuts and huge military expenditures result in ever larger budget deficits, which in turn force the government to borrow more, which in turn drives up the interest rates on the money the monopolies need to borrow. A booming economy was supposed to take care of all the contradictions. But the economy has refused to boom!

The savage cuts in social programs are

geared to cut consumption to the bone and result in greater supply that was supposed to bring down inflation. Well, they are cutting down consumption. But because of tight monopoly controls inflation is not being affected.

It is estimated that the first Reagan budget will add some \$60 billion to the \$980 billion national debt. Fifteen per cent of the national budget goes to pay the interest to the banks and financial institutions on the debt. The federal government is now borrowing over \$8 billion a month to stay in operation. The Reagan policies generally favor finance capital. However, sections of monopoly capital are getting nervous because they see the Reagan economic programs leading to serious economic and financial crises.

The strongest opposition to the Reagan policies is the unprecedented mass upsurge against the massive cuts and the destruction of hundreds of social programs, which will disastrously affect the lives of tens of millions of people. The struggles and movements of this upsurge are being led by the trade unions. But the upsurge is bringing together and molding a broad, anti-monopoly coalition of labor, the racially and nationally oppressed, poor farmers, intellectuals and professionals, the women's and senior citizens' movements, as well as the young generation. Most of the cuts will go into effect on October 1, 1981, and will be felt by millions almost immediately. And the Reagan-Stockman plans call for even bigger slashes in social programs in 1982, 1983 and 1984.

The Reagan policies of massive military expenditures, huge cuts in corporate taxes, balanced by unprecedented cuts in funds for social programs, is the state's contribution to the state-monopoly capitalist offensive against the working class and the people.

For some five years the cut in real wages, because of inflation, has averaged about five per cent per year. During the past year, the cuts have been even more direct. Because of the overall decline in industrial production, because of the depressed conditions, by way of threats to close or move the factories to other states or countries, the corporations are forcing millions of workers to agree to big direct wage cuts.

Not since the days of Herbert Hoover has there been a President or Government administration so alienated from the trade union movement as is the Reagan administration.

For the first time in its 100-year history, the top leadership of the AFL, now the AFL-CIO,

has called for and organized a massive outpouring of protest marches and rallies.

The Solidarity Day demonstration in Washington, D.C., on September 19th, led by the trade unions, with about 500,000 participating, was the biggest, most militant demonstration of this kind in U.S. history.

And most important, for the very first time the top trade union leadership has called for united action with the racially and nationally oppressed, with the women and youth movements, with farmers and intellectuals, with all victims of monopoly oppression. The top union leadership is now calling for a united working class to beat back the anti-working class, anti-union offensive of big business.

Therefore, in assessing the present moment, one must take into consideration the growing, many-sided pressures that are building up against the policies of the Reagan administration. In many cases, the resistance stands in opposition to the most extreme positions, but when put together the pressures are against the overall direction.

U.S. imperialism cannot operate in isolation. No administration or government can operate for long with across-the-board opposition at home. Even the rumors of boycotting U.S. goods abroad is a concern on Wall Street. There is good reason to believe that as the pressures grow, as the reactionary policies fail, U.S. imperialism can be forced to retreat and change course.

September 1981

Nuclear Strategy and Common Sense Nikolai Luzin

- who wants nuclear warfare and why
- who fights for détente
- how détente can and must be won

Popularly written, invaluable information and convincing arguments.

cloth \$4.95

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

The deep roots of anti-war protest

Jorgen Jensen
Chairman, CP Denmark

Within six weeks of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin resolutely emphasized: "To kill war is to defeat capital." He called for a struggle for peace, but warned: "This struggle is a difficult one. He who thought that peace is easy to achieve, and that one need merely hint at peace for the bourgeoisie to present it to us on a platter is a very naive person indeed" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 345). Let us add that such a person does not really understand the intricacies of the class conflicts or the substance of the foreign policy of imperialism.

The flow of recent events has shown how meaningful Lenin's warning is in the modern world and confirmed that peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism is a specific form of class struggle carried over into the international arena, a struggle whose development and outcome at every stage are determined by the balance of economic, social, political and, even, military forces between the two world systems.

There is no doubt that under the impact of the development of the ideas and accomplishments of the October Revolution in Russia the sphere of imperialist rule is now being steadily narrowed down. It is being narrowed down territorially as more and more countries take the road of a socialist orientation. It is being narrowed down socially as masses of people are disillusioned with the ideals and potentialities of the bourgeoisie. It is also being narrowed down economically under the pressure of the ever more frequent crises in the capitalist world with their ever more terrible consequences. But imperialism will not give up. As it loses the historical initiative, it turns again to the "strength" policy in an effort to stop the advance of world socialism, and of the international communist and national liberation movements.

The 1980s opened in an alarming atmosphere. U.S. leaders began to use "détente" almost as a swear-word, and hedged negotiations on disarmament issues with conditions which make such negotiations virtually impossible. Washington's avowed intention is to secure "military superiority" over the socialist com-

munity and to talk to it in the language of armed threats.

This has brought the world to a dangerous crossroads. Millions of people ask themselves this question: whither mankind? On the answer to that question depends the future of the world, indeed, life itself on the globe. What Lenin said in his lifetime now carries even greater conviction: "The question of peace is a burning question, the painful question of the day" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 249).

The communists' response is straightforward. Despite the explosiveness of the present situation, they have not panicked. Relying on historical experience, the communists reject the idea that war is fatally inevitable, expose the mounting aggressive tendencies of imperialism and work to prevent the militaristic forces from realizing their plans. The CP Denmark program says: "Now as never before it is possible to ensure peace and avert another world war. This can be achieved by forcing imperialism to recognize the principles of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, and this implies cooperation among states on the basis of equality, respect for their sovereign rights and repudiation of interference in each other's affairs."¹

Of course, only vigorous action going deep into the social structure of the society can prevent the present tension from developing into a war. This means rallying the broadest strata of the peoples for the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly struggle. Political and ideological differences must not hamper the attainment of this goal. The 26th congress of our party, which was held in 1980, emphasized: "The policy of détente has struck deep roots. Because this policy meets the vital interests of all the nations, the struggle for peace creates the broadest basis for joint action. This calls for struggle and vigorous action against any attempts to suppress the people's resistance to war, and to undermine its urge to ensure lasting peace."²

In defiance of the cynics who claim that the main lesson of history is that people never learn any of its lessons, the communist and workers' parties have drawn the relevant conclusions from the grave experience of the past. They

emphasize, first of all, that imperialism managed to start the two world wars, which heaped calamity and adversity on the working people of the globe, largely because of the lack of cohesion on the part of the anti-war masses and their organizations, above all because of the divisions within the working class. The Danish communists see the contemporary socio-political situation as providing real conditions for overcoming the weaknesses of the past and for raising anti-imperialist cohesion to a new level.

The 1976 Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties said that "the communist and workers' parties of the European countries, together with the other democratic and peace-loving forces, have played the crucial role in the political initiatives which made possible the swing toward détente, and the consolidation of security and cooperation in Europe." Their performance of this role is even more vital today when the world finds itself confronted with the stepped up activity of the shock forces of reaction.

The struggle for peace, the Danish communists believe, is a struggle against those who benefit from the build-up of armaments, a struggle against powerful groups seeking by means of pressure and the use of force to safeguard their privileges and their right to exploit the working people.

The masses hate war. That is why the advocates of the arms race are trying to split the anti-militarist movement along the same lines on which they would like to divide the participants in the social battles, that is by scaring them with the "threat of communism." Our adversaries have been vainly trying to prove that all the organizations of the peace fighters cooperating with the communists or even working for the same goals are "camouflaged communist groups," "communist fellow-travellers," whose alleged goal is to strengthen the Soviet Union by weakening the defense capability of the "free world."

That is why one of the concrete ideological tasks in the struggle for peace is to convince the masses that we oppose the arms race and war because we have the interests of all the working people at heart. It is clear, at the same time, that the call for peace and coexistence, and non-interference in the affairs of other states does not at all signify a curb on the right to struggle for national independence and social change.

When the imperialists use hypocritical calls for peace to cover up their denial of this or that people's right to turn to its allies in defense of its freedom, they merely expose themselves. When the United States tries to frustrate any

discussion of peace initiatives and stage boycotts of peace-loving peoples and states, the anti-imperialist character of the struggle for détente and peaceful coexistence is intensified. When the working class takes an active stand against the growth of military budgets, against nuclear weapons and the siting of new U.S. missiles in Europe, and against NATO's collaboration with reactionary, repressive regimes in newly liberated countries, the working class enters into confrontation with imperialist domestic and foreign policy, and an awareness of the class nature of the existing alliances emerges even in the ranks of social democrats.

At their congresses — and nearly 30 of these have been held over the past three years — the communist and workers' parties formulated concrete proposals aimed to organize resistance to the threat of war and achieve a settlement by political means of international problems fraught with armed conflicts and have been perseveringly working to solve these problems. Last year's 26th congress of the CP Denmark also concentrated on the issues of war and peace. The CP Denmark's tasks in the struggle to strengthen peace and détente were discussed by our communists at a conference in late September 1981.

The need to ensure joint action by the working class and its organizations is a cardinal problem on which the communists have been working. Here they have given much attention to the development of contacts with socialist and social democratic parties, which is to some extent promoted by a modification of the latter's stand on the problem of war and peace.

The urge for anti-war action has also affected the leadership of the Socialist International. Indicative in this respect was last summer's Bonn meeting of its Bureau, which concentrated on the results of the trip to the Soviet Union by Willy Brandt, President of the Socialist International and Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. Summing up the results of his Moscow negotiations, he said: "I have no doubt at all about Leonid Brezhnev's urge for peace."

Reflecting the mood of broad circles of world opinion, the participants in the meeting came out for the earliest possible start on negotiations between the United States and the USSR on limiting medium-range nuclear-missile weapons. Most of them condemned Washington's intention to deploy additional U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, regardless of whether negotiations with the Soviet Union are held or not, or of their outcome. The leaders of the social democratic parties of the Nordic

countries, including Denmark, discussed in detail the prospects of setting up a nuclear-free zone in that part of the continent.

There should, of course, be no illusions. Now and again obvious contradictions arise between the stand taken by the socialist and the social democratic parties in evaluating international events and the policies pursued by the governments they head. This is exemplified by the foreign policy conceptions of FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who has repeatedly advocated Washington's policy of turning Western Europe into a testing ground for U.S. nuclear-missile weapons and who has stubbornly claimed that the peace fighters in West Germany are "henchmen" of the Soviet Union. President Francois Mitterrand of France, a socialist, approves of the U.S. plan for deploying new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe regardless of negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The Danish "Atlanticists" — most of whom are right-wingers — support the U.S. demand for the establishment on our territory of depots for U.S. heavy military equipment, erection of new NATO facilities, and the conclusion of an agreement envisaging the transfer of U.S. Air Force planes and military units to Denmark in the event of a "crisis situation." But such an extension of Denmark's cooperation with NATO contradicts the existing ban on the deployment of nuclear weapons and foreign troops on our territory in peace time.

The changes in the international trade union movement are highly encouraging. Today, not only the World Federation of Trade Unions, but also the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the World Confederation of Labor come out for peace and against the arms race. For all the differences in their stand on concrete issues, the ever more clear-cut anti-militarist tenor of their action paves the way for broader cooperation in the struggle against the threat of war.

Similar changes will be seen in the stand taken by national trade unions, and Denmark offers one example. Thus, the shop stewards of the Northern Jutland trade union organization declared that "the time has come for the working-class movement to use the whole of its organized strength for peace" and sponsored an international conference of trade unions from the Nordic countries, which was held at Aalborg last May, and which concentrated on ways to advance the popular movement for the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. The meeting laid a broader basis for the struggle for peace within the framework of the trade-union movement, a struggle in which social democrats and non-party people are join-

ing alongside trade unionists who are communists. Activity in this direction by trade unions and trade union associations has continued. It will undoubtedly become more vigorous and acquire broader dimensions in the course of the on-going campaign to collect signatures for the demand: "Start talks at once!"

We have watched with interest the development of the situation in the other countries. Our interest was drawn by the fact that, for instance, the most influential British trade unions, which had earlier shunned the peace movement, are now among its active participants. The annual congress of the British TUC in September passed a resolution motioned by the TUC General Council calling for the country's unilateral nuclear disarmament. The Federation of German Trade Unions in the FRG is also taking more vigorous action. By countering the NATO idea of "peace through additional armaments" with its call for "peace through disarmament," it has expressed the will of the West German working people for greater international security.

The agreement of the leading political and trade union organizations of the working class on issues of war and peace is convincing evidence of the great distinction of the present situation within the working-class movement from the ominous years which preceded the First and Second World Wars. In these conditions, it can stop the advocates of another total armed clash. The unity of the movement, which includes communists and socialists, Christians and non-party people, could become the generator of a broad popular anti-war coalition and give it the right tenor.

The communists' political line is to avoid closing in upon themselves within a circle of those who have the same ideology, and to go out into the broad fields of the battle for peace. That is precisely why the Paris meeting of European fraternal parties in the spring of 1980 called for negotiations and joint action by all the peace forces, regardless of nationality, convictions and way of life. They addressed the following call to all the peoples of the continent: "Peace is our common cause, and our joint struggle can ensure the triumph of this cause."

It is now possible to note with satisfaction that alongside peace fighters from 137 countries, acting under the leadership of the World Peace Council, new organizations have been emerging in the international arena inspired by a common comprehension of the historical importance of saving mankind from a fatal nuclear war. Is it not, after all, a sign of the times that even some high-ranking military men from

bourgeois armies have joined in the movement? "Military honor today consists in averting war," said a statement addressed to the Helsinki signatories by Generals Pasti (Italy), Bastian (FRG), Gomes (Portugal), von Meyenfeldt (Holland) and Koumanakos (Greece).

An important feature of the peace movement today is that its acts tend ever more frequently to be international. Thus, in early June, 160 representatives of 85 organizations and movements from 30 European countries, the United States and Canada, and 13 international organizations met in Stockholm to exchange views on ways of ending the arms race. At the end of June, Sweden was the meeting place of young people from Nordic countries campaigning for a nuclear-free North. In August, almost 200 writers from many countries in Europe, including Denmark, issued an address which said: "Let us act together to prevent Europe from becoming a field of atomic battle of another — and the last — world war." In the course of the 31st Pugwash Conference, which was held in late August and early September and which discussed "The Search for Peace in a Crisis-Ridden World," over 200 prominent scientists from 50 countries discussed ways of strengthening international security, relaxing tension and establishing control over armaments.

New forms of action have sprung from the direct threat of Western Europe's conversion into the battlefield of a thermonuclear conflict. Much publicity has been given to the "Manchester initiative," the decision by the municipal council of one of Britain's major cities urging the British government to "refrain from the manufacture and deployment of any types of nuclear weapons within the city limits." It was supported by Liverpool, Bristol, Sheffield and Derby. Over 70 municipal councils have proclaimed their cities nuclear-free zones.

The demonstrations against NATO's decision to deploy new nuclear missiles in Europe have assumed such proportions in our country that the government has been forced to voice its "apprehensions" with respect to the Washington-imposed plans, and has proposed that their implementation should be postponed. The sweep of the campaign has also helped to back up the demands for the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone, and has involved in the anti-missile action social democratic parties and trade union organizations in our region.

One cannot but recall in this context the Peace March-81, which started from Copenhagen. Its participants started out on their

march on June 22 and, after covering over 1,200 kilometers across Denmark, the FRG, Holland, Belgium and France, arrived in Paris on August 6, the anniversary of the atomic tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Highly characteristic of the present level of the anti-war action is the fact that the success of the march was not hampered either by the absence of preliminary consultations between its Norwegian initiators and organizations in other countries, or by the political and organizational imprecision which marked its preparation. Nor was it hampered by the stand taken by some groups of participants, which took shape under the impact of the lying imperialist propaganda, concerning the Soviet Union's policy. Eventually, a great many people were rallied together around the anti-militarist slogans. The Peace March-81 involved men and women of 20 nationalities, among them people from Denmark and Holland, Britain and Italy, Ireland and Japan, the United States and Finland. Among its organizers were people of the most diverse political and ideological trends. But they were united by a common idea: to prevent a nuclear disaster and pave the way for disarmament.

Some bourgeois politicians in the West have tried to convince themselves and others that the present upsurge in the anti-war protest movement is just another craze, and that always tends to be short-lived. But all the facts indicate that we are witnessing the *evolution of mass public consciousness* on a major scale and in the most diverse forms. This evolution is so deep that it could evidently spread to a much broader spectrum of social and ideological issues. The working people are coming to see ever more clearly the direct connection between militaristic policy, on the one hand, and the economic and political foundations of the bourgeois state, on the other.

What then are the factors in the present situation that favor the development of the above-mentioned new qualitative characteristics of the mass movement against the threat of war? What are the objective factors that have given it such scope that some pro-imperialist leaders have to ask this question: is that "the beginning of European neutrality," as they have dubbed the urge of influential forces of Western Europe for peaceful coexistence? We think that such factors boil down to the following:

— Broad public circles, which are diverse in social and political make-up (now and again including leaders of ruling political parties in capitalist countries) are coming to realize the disastrous consequences of a thermonuclear war for the destiny of mankind. It is not fears

based on emotion but sober assessments by experts that go to show the fatal results that could spring from the Pentagon's strategy, which is designed to conduct a "mixed war" in Europe, that is, a war involving the simultaneous use of conventional, nuclear and chemical weapons, and also the arming of field troops with nuclear warheads. The idea itself, which fits into the "limited nuclear conflict" theory, envisages the conversion of Western Europe into a U.S. bridgehead and shows that U.S. ruling circles are prepared to fight there to their last ally and to convert the West Europeans into "nuclear hostages" of the United States. There is justified alarm over the build-up of the imperialist powers' armed forces in other regions of the world as well, including the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, and Washington's attempts to revive its "gunboat diplomacy" with respect to independent states like Libya, Cuba, Angola and People's Korea.

— The incapacity of state monopoly capital to stop the development of the crisis has made much more obvious the inter-relation between the militarization of the economy and the socio-economic burdens falling on the working people. Many workers, members of the middle strata of town and country, who have felt the beneficial effect of détente on the solution of their vital problems, are fully resolved to do their utmost to halt the worsening of the international situation and to return the world to the road of mutually advantageous cooperation among nations.

— The mounting imperialist contradictions — above all those between the North American and West European groupings of monopoly capital — have produced an urge among the ruling classes in countries allied with the United States to prevent it from using its junior partners as pawns in world politics. Economic interests impel the European countries to develop economic ties with the socialist world, and this gradually creates the material basis for peaceful coexistence.

— The constructive role played in European and world affairs by the Warsaw Treaty Organization, whose participants have put forward a comprehensive package of ideas for consolidating international security, and the Peace Program for the 1980s formulated by the 26th congress of the CPSU, which is gradually assuming the form of concrete diplomatic initiatives and proposals, have created a platform for rallying the efforts of the anti-militaristic forces. The socialist community countries' realistic stand and their readiness to accept a reasonable, mutually acceptable compromise for the purposes of attaining an agreement have

attracted the sympathies of the peoples.

— The growth of world socialism's political, military and economic resources, the ever greater influence of the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist world, the ever stronger anti-imperialist tenor of the policy of some developing countries — all of this goes to create a growing potential of the peace forces. For the first time in the history of mankind it has become possible to break the vicious circle of the end of one war merely becoming the prelude for the next, with peace being no more than a breathing space between armed conflicts. For over a third of a century now Europe has not heard the roar of guns, the whine of sirens and the blast of bombs. The strength of international anti-imperialist solidarity helped to halt U.S. aggression in Vietnam and is hampering attacks against the peoples of Angola, Ethiopia, Arab countries and Nicaragua, which have risen to independence. In other words, the contradictions between the aggressive aspirations of imperialism and its capability of realizing its sinister plans have been brought out. This gradually makes it a realistic possibility first to stem the slide toward the brink of war and then to tackle the long-term task of excluding war from the life of the society.

— The time has long passed when some tried to prove that the peace movement is no more than a "rending of the air." The peace forces have already scored many successes. U.S. officials now openly voice their alarm over the fact that in face of the mounting resistance by masses of people, the governments of NATO's West European countries will not be able to realize the decision to site medium-range missiles in Western Europe by the end of 1983. All of this gives the peace fighters confidence in their strength and shows that their struggle is important and fruitful.

The communists are working to transform mass protest against imperialist wars "from a vague and helpless waiting into a clear and definite political program, into an effective struggle waged by millions of oppressed people under the leadership of the proletariat" (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 56). We do not just reject the policy of militarism and war, but counter it with our own constructive alternatives.

As for the Communist Party of Denmark, in the light of its country's concrete conditions, it has invited the country's progressive, peace circles to concentrate their action on the struggle against:

— NATO's decision to deploy new nuclear

missiles on the territory of the European countries which are members of that bloc;

— the manufacture, stockpiling and use of neutron warheads;

— the storing in Denmark of equipment for foreign armed forces;

— the construction of NATO military facilities on our territory;

— NATO's demand that in the event of "crisis situations" Danish straits should be closed to Warsaw Treaty ships;

— preparatory measures for transferring foreign armed forces to Denmark in the event of "crisis situations."

Simultaneously, we urge action for:

— Denmark's inclusion in a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe, with a guarantee that such weapons will not be used from the territory of countries in our region and against them;

— real negotiations ensuring constructive steps in realizing the Helsinki accords, which for us, in particular, means putting an end to NATO's interference in Denmark's affairs.

These proposals, we know, are largely shared by the communist parties of the Nordic countries. The fraternal parties acting in other regions have put forward their own plans for ensuring regional security: in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the Balkans and the Middle East, and in Latin America. Realization of such regional programs is sure to help to consolidate world peace.

The new dimensions of the war danger stemming from the U.S. administration's line require a further improvement of our anti-militarist struggle and a precise definition of its immediate and long-term goals. Today, this means a concentration of forces on the task of frustrating the attempts by reaction to put through its "global diktat" concept, materially (restructuring of the war machine to adapt it to new strategic ideas, like the formation of a Rapid Deployment Force, the manufacture and deployment of modernized types of weapons, above all mass destruction weapons), politically (efforts to ease the disagreements within imperialist blocs and increasingly to gear these to the interests of U.S. imperialism), and ideologically (the inflation of anti-communist and especially anti-Soviet attitudes).

We face important and complicated tasks in view of the stepped-up psychological warfare by reaction against the progressive and anti-war forces. The bourgeois mass media keep trying to spread among the people fear of a "Soviet threat," to convince them that the arms race is economically "useful," and that nuclear war is morally and militarily "thinkable." With

our facts and convincing arguments, we seek to expose the true meaning of these and other similar propaganda clichés and to show what lurks behind them. This helps to overcome the doomsday feeling in the mass consciousness, which produces a mentality of meekly expecting some kind of "predestination."

This is also promoted by the explanation of the socialist countries' peaceable foreign policy. We support the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and the Warsaw Treaty Organization as a whole not because they come from the "socialist East." Would not the communists vote for any constructive initiatives coming from the "capitalist West"?

The point is that the class character of the North Atlantic bloc impels its members to step up military preparations. By contrast, the class character of the Warsaw Treaty Organization predetermines its tireless quest for new ways toward détente and the creation of an atmosphere favoring international cooperation for the purposes of social and economic progress. Failure to understand this fundamental distinction between the two military-political alignments makes some equate the two.

We have never demanded and cannot demand that this or that participant in the peace movement should make a choice between communism and capitalism. We merely urge them to decide, without bias, whose acts—and which of these—serve détente and what tends to undermine it. To decide, so as to act accordingly.

For our part, we communists take a totally unambiguous attitude to this problem. We are not faced with the question of which side we are on in the conflict between the aggressiveness of the imperialist powers and socialist countries' peaceableness. *The Danish communists, consistently adhering to the platform of Marxism-Leninism, declare: The struggle for peace and disarmament, which is being consistently carried on by the socialist countries is also our own struggle, and its goals are our own goals.*

Greater cohesion of the communist movement, and joint action by the fraternal parties on the problems of peace, détente and disarmament are the key conditions for effectively using the potentialities for improving international relations. The reality and usefulness of this have been confirmed by the Berlin conference and the Paris meeting of the communist and workers' parties of Europe, other regional conferences and bilateral contacts.

Our party's representative at the Paris meeting said: "We regard our common action as a

prerequisite for the creation of a broader unity and a contribution to it, and must totally reject the view that . . . meetings of communist parties with each other are harmful." That is the view we hold to this very day. Life has already proved that such meetings, while doing no harm to the independence, sovereignty and equality of each communist party, have a favorable effect on the development of cooperation among them and with other political forces, above all in the struggle for peace.

The communists' multifaceted and fruitful experience has convinced them that the social and political changes over the past several decades have created the conditions making it possible not only to stop the current slide toward an armed conflict, but also to exclude

world war from the life of society over the historical perspective. This requires further efforts to mobilize broad strata of peaceable public opinion for the struggle against the imperialist "strength" policy for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between countries with different social systems, and for the erection of the edifice of a lasting and stable peace. We communists regard this as a key prerequisite for the fulfillment of our historical mission: the social and economic emancipation of the working class and of all the other working people.

1. Kommunisternes program. København, 1976, p. 14.
2. Danmarks kommunistiske partis 26 kongres. København, 1980, p. 123.

The present stage of the national liberation movement

Khaled Bagdash

CC General Secretary, Syrian Communist Party

Everyone knows that Lenin's doctrine has the credit of discovering the mighty revolutionary potential of the national liberation movement. While international social democracy ignored that movement and denied its role as a great ally of the proletariat in the struggle for a socialist reconstruction of the world, Lenin asserted: "The socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie — no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries against international imperialism" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159). Emphasizing the need in the revolutionary struggle to take account of the role of social sections and forces differing in class nature, he said: "To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolt by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts by a section of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without a movement of the politically non-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against oppression by the landowners, the church, and the monarchy, against national oppression, etc. — to imagine all this is to repudiate social revolution" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 355).

At the same time, one could say that the national liberation movement has a special and relatively autonomous place with respect to the

other streams of the world revolutionary process. It has to operate in specific conditions, the range of the classes and social strata involved in it and the goals and tasks before it are very broad. This creates the ground for discussions concerning its orientation and destinies.

When the world colonial system collapsed and dozens of young independent states emerged on its ruins, this posed a question of cardinal importance: how would relations between the states and the imperialist powers develop — toward harmonization and improvement, or complication and aggravation?

This question was considered not only by bourgeois politicians and ideologists from the world imperialist camp. It arose also within the liberated countries themselves, in the national liberation movement and even among the revolutionary democrats. In Syria, for instance, it long remained an open question. There was talk about how to find common ground with the United States by satisfying some of the U.S. political and economic claims as an inducement to abandon anti-Arab plots. Some discoursed on the possibility of securing U.S. neutrality in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Now and again there was talk about the two "super-powers" — the United States and the USSR — without any distinctions being made concerning their social-class nature. This provided the basis for the conclusion: there are neither con-

tion in Southeast Asia and questions of bilateral relations, simultaneously demonstrated the urge of the two states to establish a climate of good neighborliness, cooperation and peace in our region. Despite the intrigues and subversive activity of the Peking expansionists and U.S imperialists, these principles of interstate relations — the only reasonable ones — have won tremendous popularity in Asia and other parts of the world. Our country has also pursued a profoundly peaceable line in the international arena.

But from the outset this line was met with hostility by the imperialist and Peking circles. External reaction has been making loud noises over the notorious "Kampuchean question." Washington and Peking have demanded some kind of "political solution" in Kampuchea. This streamline formula is a cover for direct interference in the sovereign affairs of the PRK. To this day, the Peking hegemonists, the U.S. imperialists and Thailand's reactionary authorities keep clutching at the dead body of the Pol Pot regime in an effort to undermine the revolution by military means and to isolate it diplomatically. The attempts to destabilize the revolutionary power are being made by terrorist groups infiltrating deep into the country, and agents are being smuggled even into the ranks of our party. Reaction has put its stake on a drawn-out "guerrilla war" so as to create an atmosphere of chaos and pave the way for external aggression.

Kampuchea's party and state leadership believes that it has a direct duty to use all the necessary ways and means to frustrate the enemies' schemes. Our armed forces are in a state of constant readiness, raising their vigilance and combat capability. We have been carrying on extensive educational work among the population by exposing the crafty schemes and intrigues. Of tremendous value for us is Vietnam's assistance in defending the PRK against external aggression. The presence of Vietnamese troops on the territory of Kampuchea is not aimed against any third country, but springs from the need to ward off the threat to its independence and security posed by the Chinese hegemonists, who are operating in a compact with the United States and other reactionary forces.

The hostile campaign being carried on against our revolution reached a peak at the notorious "international conference on Kampuchea" held in New York last summer. It was planned and prepared with the closest cooperation between the foreign policy departments of China and the United States. This provocative undertaking was designed to mis-

lead world public opinion, to present a distorted picture of the situation in the PRK, and to incite the remnants of the Pol Pot bands and other Khmer reactionaries to fresh crimes against the Kampuchean people. In the forefront of the noisy "champions" of its right to "self-determination" we now find the U.S. imperialists and Chinese expansionists, who ruthlessly used to trample in Kampuchea and Indochina as a whole, the basic right of any people, namely, the right to life.

These forces are now trying to cover up their hostile, aggressive acts with the name of the United Nations. They have stepped up their intrigues because the situation in Kampuchea has been improving and stabilizing from day to day, while its government exercises effective control over all the country's external and internal affairs.

Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos have sharply condemned the provocative venture of holding the "conference," qualifying it as a gross violation of the PRK's independence and sovereignty. The stand of the three Indochinese states was resolutely supported by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and many developing states.

An effort was made to force us to discuss a problem which does not exist and to do this in defiance of the will of the people who in January 1979 chose the road of progress. We were invited to sit down to the negotiating table with the Pol Pot cannibals. The holding of the "conference" was presented by the imperialist circles almost as a "peace initiative." But what kind of a "peace initiative" can there be when Peking and Washington are simultaneously straining to cobble together a counter-revolutionary bloc consisting of pro-Peking and pro-U.S. groupings, and also of pro-Thailand reactionary elements. Just recently, Khieu Samphan, Son Sann and Sihanouk met in Singapore to discuss the establishment of a "united front" or "coalition government" to fight the legitimate government of the PRK. The reactionary assemblage merely went to demonstrate once again the deep divisions and contradictions within the camp of the Kampuchean people's enemies. At the time, for all the efforts of their imperialist and Peking patrons, the "coalition government's" venture did not succeed. But these circles have not abandoned their sinister plans, and have continued to try to knock together a puppet front. They want Sihanouk to head it, and he would have been flattered at the "honor," but for a little catch. After all, even reaction is now forced to recognize that its plans are doomed. The Kampuchean who stayed abroad as a result of the

national tragedy are coming to realize the truth about the radical changes at home, about the construction there of a truly just society in accordance with the uniformities discovered by scientific socialism. The Marxist-Leninist theory has truly shed light on our advance along the road of progress.

Peace is necessary for successfully realizing our creative plans, but attempts are being made to push us into a war by means of subversion, sabotage and direct armed action. While standing up in arms in face of the intrigues of our avowed enemies, we address the sober-minded circles and leaders in our region and emphasize that there does exist a realistic basis for settling the problems which have taken shape over Indochina. In January 1981, the Foreign Ministers of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos put forward a proposal to hold a regional meeting between the countries of Indochina and the ASEAN countries to discuss matters of interest to both sides so as to transform Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability. If for some reason ASEAN is not prepared for such a conference, multilateral and bilateral consultations on the broadest range of problems could be

held. The countries of Indochina also expressed their readiness to sign bilateral non-aggression treaties with China. Last June, the Foreign Ministers of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos meeting in Phnom Penh reaffirmed their countries' proposals.

The peace initiatives of the three Indochinese states have the resolute support of the Soviet Union. This was reiterated by comrade Leonid Brezhnev in the course of our meeting at the Kremlin.

The people of Kampuchea have a long road of armed struggle behind them. That is why they so cherish peace. We want a dialogue, instead of confrontation, and we shall bend every effort to bring about the ultimate triumph of the cause of peace. At the same time, the members of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and all other Kampuchean patriots will work to consolidate the gains that have been achieved, and to defend and build their people's republic. We have no fear of difficulties or trials. The revolutionaries of Kampuchea are resolved to overcome them and to bring about the victory of socialism in the beautiful country of Anghor.

The dangerous doctrine of world domination

Gus Hall
General Secretary
Communist Party USA

The Reagan administration continues along its dangerous reactionary path. It has resurrected and adopted the doctrine of U.S. world domination as its primary guiding principle for its foreign policy. And, it has adopted monopoly capital's anti-working class, anti-union, anti-people and racist offensive as the guideline for its domestic policies.

The fact that these foreign and domestic guidelines are based on miscalculations and illusions makes them all the more dangerous because such policies are pursued without any regard for the real world. They are on a collision course with reality.

A very basic miscalculation by the Reaganites is that U.S. imperialism can, in this century, resurrect the aborted "American Century" of years past. This self-delusion determines their attitude to and their relationship with the countries of the world. This illusion of political grandeur is reflected in the arrogant, presump-

tuous demeanor of the provincial-minded entourage surrounding Reagan.

The Reagan foreign policy is based on a drive for military nuclear superiority. It is a policy based on nuclear terrorism. The Reagan clique correctly sees the Soviet Union as the major roadblock on the path to U.S. world domination. So they have established the Big Lie as the framework for their ideological offensive. They are re-heating the cold war on all fronts.

The Reagan administration has adopted aggressive colonialism and neo-colonialism as the official U.S. policy in relations with the countries in Africa, Asia, South and Central America. It is out to crush the heroic people of El Salvador and to destroy the historic achievements of socialist Cuba. The Haig-Crocker hatchet team is withdrawing all U.S. financial support from United Nations projects that make financial aid available to the "poorest 31 countries."

Instead, the Reagan policy is to tie all economic aid to the developing countries conditional on accepting the dictates of U.S. imperialism. The plan is to fund only the most reactionary, fascist, militaristic, corrupt governments and counter-revolutionary groups.

The plan is to cut government-to-government aid and replace it with investments by U.S.-based multinationals. And Haig has added a new condition. To be eligible for any U.S. aid the potential recipient must become involved and contribute to the drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination. This is what Haig had in mind when he said: "We recognize that progress in our relations with the many nations of the South is dependent on our success in dealing with East-West security problems." The new ideological invention is to label all struggles against imperialism as "international terrorism."

The "American Century" doctrine is also creating problems between the United States and the other major capitalist countries. The Reagan administration is putting heavy pressure on its capitalist allies to contribute to U.S. global designs, but to do so as non-voting, junior partners. They are pressured to spend more on arms and to "promote the establishment of U.S. leadership throughout the world."

In assessing the policies of the Reagan administration the words used most frequently are — "reckless," "insane," "shooting cowboy-movie-style from the hip," "dangerous" and "irresponsible."

There has been a great deal of demagogic mouthing by Reagan spokesmen about disarmament negotiations. But to this point it has been nothing but pure fakery. It is a cover for the fanatical arms build-up.

There is an irreconcilable contradiction in talking about negotiations for reduction of strategic nuclear weapons while throwing unlimited billions into the most frenzied military build-up in U.S. history. It is nothing but brazen fakery to talk about wanting to talk about mutual arms reduction while pursuing a policy of heating up the arms race, a policy of working frantically for nuclear military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The war game plan of the Reagan administration is to placate and mislead the world by endless double-talking about negotiations, while placing absolutely unrealistic preconditions and obstacles that make negotiations impossible for the Soviet Union.

It should be kept in mind that a meeting of negotiating teams does not necessarily mean serious negotiations. At this point, it does not

look as though the Reagan administration has decided to start in fact the give-and-take that is necessary in any serious negotiations.

The U.S. drive for nuclear military superiority is a long-range Reagan-monopoly plan. These plans include new scientific and technological breakthroughs in many areas, such as use of laser weapons in outer space. The shuttle spacecraft was designed primarily for military purposes in outer space.

Therefore, it can be safely assumed that the talk about coming negotiations will be stretched out indefinitely for as long as possible. And, when the talks finally do begin they most likely will follow a similar pattern.

It is crystal clear, as far as the Reagan administration is concerned its goal is to procrastinate, postpone and forestall negotiations until the Pentagon "thinks" it has reached the point of nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. The evil, murderous designs of the Haig-Weinbergers is to then attempt to dictate treaty terms to the Soviet Union from a "position of new strength." That is a path to total disaster.

In the meantime, the plan calls for a tremendous military build-up for the purpose of preparing to fight so-called "limited wars," which will include a mixture of nuclear, conventional, chemical and germ warfare. The neutron bomb was specifically designed for this mixed-weapon warfare.

The Reagan administration has embarked on a revival and modernization of the old "counter-insurgency wars." This is the purpose of the establishment of the rapid deployment force. All these weapons and forces are being prepared for total readiness, for activation to frontline positions, behind the concept of "forward basing."

There is no room for or need to speculate as to the direction of the Reagan policies. However, now the point is being reached where these reactionary policies and designs are coming face-to-face with reality, with growing obstacles and resistance, both objective developments and subjective reactions.

Therefore, formidable contradictions are continuing to sharpen between these policies and reality, both at home and abroad.

The Reagan domestic game plan is to give monopoly capital a completely free hand. Regulations that have been on the books for a hundred years are now being repealed and scrapped. As a result, monopolization has gone hog wild. And this has added a new quality to anarchy in capitalist production relations. We are entering a phase of state-monopoly capitalism that is completely unregulated, uncontrolled, unrestricted and untaxed.

The New York Times observed: "Corporate income tax may soon be a relic, the lingering remnant. By the close of this decade, taxes on profits of big business will have faded to a trickle." This, at a moment when the unearned income flows at a rate of \$3 billion per day into the coffers of the corporations.

The Reagan-monopoly offensive is proceeding to wipe out the social and economic gains of the last 50 years. In the process there is taking place the most massive transfer of wealth from the working and poor people to the rich and corporations in the history of the United States. The number of jobless keeps growing. Real wages continue to decline. Racism is being completely decontrolled and desegregation, affirmative action and anti-discrimination measures are coming unglued. Racist terror is on the rampage throughout our land.

As the Reagan administration pushes its policies in both foreign and domestic affairs there is a process taking place of withdrawal of support and a growing resistance, both at home and abroad. On the world scene, U.S. imperialism is becoming increasingly isolated. Some of the withdrawal of support or resistance is against the Reagan policy as a whole, some only against the more extreme positions.

The withdrawal of support and the resistance are developing also in the capitalist world. In most of the older capitalist countries the opposition is developing against the more extreme positions. This has sharpened the inter-relationship between the United States and the other industrialized nations.

The 13-1 vote in the United Nations Security Council, condemning South Africa for its aggression against Angola, was an example of the withdrawal of support for an extreme U.S. position.

The statement of support for the liberation forces of El Salvador by Mexico and France was another example of the growing resistance in the capitalist world against the extreme U.S. positions.

There is a growing separation from and a growing criticism of the Reagan administration's refusal to enter into meaningful, serious strategic nuclear arms negotiations with the Soviet Union.

There is a growing antagonism by the major capitalist countries over the high interest rates in the United States because they are seen as a monetary club over their economies. High interest rates in the United States have become a weight holding back economic recovery in the other major capitalist countries.

There is the resentment and growing open resistance to the placing of the new Cruise and

Pershing II missiles on European soil, as well as the growing anti-neutron bomb movement gaining momentum throughout Europe.

Because of the open support for South Africa and the growing economic integration between the United States and South Africa, as well as the U.S. cover-up of the racism of the South African regime, there is a growing anger and resistance to the Reagan policies in most of the developing and nonaligned countries and the national liberation movements. This is also pushing U.S. imperialism into further isolation from the rest of the world.

The areas of the world where the Reagan-imperialist policies get uncritical support are in the leading circles in the People's Republic of China, South Africa, Chile, Israel and Egypt.

The sale of new technology military weapons to the Peking hegemonists adds a new, highly charged element to the danger of war.

The inheritors and practitioners of Maoism are the most consistent boosters and supporters of the imperialist policies of nuclear confrontation and aggression. They have adopted the old Chinese saying "resort to peace and friendship when circumstances force you to do so. But consider war as your main policy." This is their guideline in their relationships with the socialist, newly independent and developing countries.

The same kind of withdrawal and resistance to both the domestic and foreign policies are developing on the home front. Sections of monopoly capital are beginning to withdraw their support because of what they believe are reckless statements regarding foreign policy and unworkable economic policies.

U.S. state-monopoly capitalism is getting into ever deeper economic and financial ensnarements. The crises have become an encirclement from which it is impossible to break out without negatively affecting the whole circle. The Reagan snake oil was supposed to create an economic breakthrough, a miracle. That has not happened.

Monopoly capital was for the big corporate tax cut Reagan has pushed through Congress. They are also happy with military expenditures that are reaching the \$1 billion per day level. But they are now concerned about the results.

The tax cuts and huge military expenditures result in ever larger budget deficits, which in turn force the government to borrow more, which in turn drives up the interest rates on the money the monopolies need to borrow. A booming economy was supposed to take care of all the contradictions. But the economy has refused to boom!

The savage cuts in social programs are

geared to cut consumption to the bone and result in greater supply that was supposed to bring down inflation. Well, they are cutting down consumption. But because of tight monopoly controls inflation is not being affected.

It is estimated that the first Reagan budget will add some \$60 billion to the \$980 billion national debt. Fifteen per cent of the national budget goes to pay the interest to the banks and financial institutions on the debt. The federal government is now borrowing over \$8 billion a month to stay in operation. The Reagan policies generally favor finance capital. However, sections of monopoly capital are getting nervous because they see the Reagan economic programs leading to serious economic and financial crises.

The strongest opposition to the Reagan policies is the unprecedented mass upsurge against the massive cuts and the destruction of hundreds of social programs, which will disastrously affect the lives of tens of millions of people. The struggles and movements of this upsurge are being led by the trade unions. But the upsurge is bringing together and molding a broad, anti-monopoly coalition of labor, the racially and nationally oppressed, poor farmers, intellectuals and professionals, the women's and senior citizens' movements, as well as the young generation. Most of the cuts will go into effect on October 1, 1981, and will be felt by millions almost immediately. And the Reagan-Stockman plans call for even bigger slashes in social programs in 1982, 1983 and 1984.

The Reagan policies of massive military expenditures, huge cuts in corporate taxes, balanced by unprecedented cuts in funds for social programs, is the state's contribution to the state-monopoly capitalist offensive against the working class and the people.

For some five years the cut in real wages, because of inflation, has averaged about five per cent per year. During the past year, the cuts have been even more direct. Because of the overall decline in industrial production, because of the depressed conditions, by way of threats to close or move the factories to other states or countries, the corporations are forcing millions of workers to agree to big direct wage cuts.

Not since the days of Herbert Hoover has there been a President or Government administration so alienated from the trade union movement as is the Reagan administration.

For the first time in its 100-year history, the top leadership of the AFL, now the AFL-CIO,

has called for and organized a massive outpouring of protest marches and rallies.

The Solidarity Day demonstration in Washington, D.C., on September 19th, led by the trade unions, with about 500,000 participating, was the biggest, most militant demonstration of this kind in U.S. history.

And most important, for the very first time the top trade union leadership has called for united action with the racially and nationally oppressed, with the women and youth movements, with farmers and intellectuals, with all victims of monopoly oppression. The top union leadership is now calling for a united working class to beat back the anti-working class, anti-union offensive of big business.

Therefore, in assessing the present moment, one must take into consideration the growing, many-sided pressures that are building up against the policies of the Reagan administration. In many cases, the resistance stands in opposition to the most extreme positions, but when put together the pressures are against the overall direction.

U.S. imperialism cannot operate in isolation. No administration or government can operate for long with across-the-board opposition at home. Even the rumors of boycotting U.S. goods abroad is a concern on Wall Street. There is good reason to believe that as the pressures grow, as the reactionary policies fail, U.S. imperialism can be forced to retreat and change course.

September 1981

Nuclear Strategy and Common Sense Nikolai Luzin

- who wants nuclear warfare and why
- who fights for détente
- how détente can and must be won

Popularly written, invaluable information and convincing arguments.

cloth \$4.95

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

The deep roots of anti-war protest

Jorgen Jensen
Chairman, CP Denmark

Within six weeks of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin resolutely emphasized: "To kill war is to defeat capital." He called for a struggle for peace, but warned: "This struggle is a difficult one. He who thought that peace is easy to achieve, and that one need merely hint at peace for the bourgeoisie to present it to us on a platter is a very naive person indeed" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 345). Let us add that such a person does not really understand the intricacies of the class conflicts or the substance of the foreign policy of imperialism.

The flow of recent events has shown how meaningful Lenin's warning is in the modern world and confirmed that peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism is a specific form of class struggle carried over into the international arena, a struggle whose development and outcome at every stage are determined by the balance of economic, social, political and, even, military forces between the two world systems.

There is no doubt that under the impact of the development of the ideas and accomplishments of the October Revolution in Russia the sphere of imperialist rule is now being steadily narrowed down. It is being narrowed down territorially as more and more countries take the road of a socialist orientation. It is being narrowed down socially as masses of people are disillusioned with the ideals and potentialities of the bourgeoisie. It is also being narrowed down economically under the pressure of the ever more frequent crises in the capitalist world with their ever more terrible consequences. But imperialism will not give up. As it loses the historical initiative, it turns again to the "strength" policy in an effort to stop the advance of world socialism, and of the international communist and national liberation movements.

The 1980s opened in an alarming atmosphere. U.S. leaders began to use "détente" almost as a swear-word, and hedged negotiations on disarmament issues with conditions which make such negotiations virtually impossible. Washington's avowed intention is to secure "military superiority" over the socialist com-

munity and to talk to it in the language of armed threats.

This has brought the world to a dangerous crossroads. Millions of people ask themselves this question: whither mankind? On the answer to that question depends the future of the world, indeed, life itself on the globe. What Lenin said in his lifetime now carries even greater conviction: "The question of peace is a burning question, the painful question of the day" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 249).

The communists' response is straightforward. Despite the explosiveness of the present situation, they have not panicked. Relying on historical experience, the communists reject the idea that war is *fatally inevitable*, expose the mounting aggressive tendencies of imperialism and work to prevent the militaristic forces from realizing their plans. The CP Denmark program says: "Now as never before it is possible to ensure peace and avert another world war. This can be achieved by forcing imperialism to recognize the principles of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, and this implies cooperation among states on the basis of equality, respect for their sovereign rights and repudiation of interference in each other's affairs."¹

Of course, only vigorous action going deep into the social structure of the society can prevent the present tension from developing into a war. This means rallying the broadest strata of the peoples for the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly struggle. Political and ideological differences must not hamper the attainment of this goal. The 26th congress of our party, which was held in 1980, emphasized: "The policy of détente has struck deep roots. Because this policy meets the vital interests of all the nations, the struggle for peace creates the broadest basis for joint action. This calls for struggle and vigorous action against any attempts to suppress the people's resistance to war, and to undermine its urge to ensure lasting peace."²

In defiance of the cynics who claim that the main lesson of history is that people never learn any of its lessons, the communist and workers' parties have drawn the relevant conclusions from the grave experience of the past. They

emphasize, first of all, that imperialism managed to start the two world wars, which heaped calamity and adversity on the working people of the globe, largely because of the lack of cohesion on the part of the anti-war masses and their organizations, above all because of the divisions within the working class. The Danish communists see the contemporary socio-political situation as providing real conditions for overcoming the weaknesses of the past and for raising anti-imperialist cohesion to a new level.

The 1976 Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties said that "the communist and workers' parties of the European countries, together with the other democratic and peace-loving forces, have played the crucial role in the political initiatives which made possible the swing toward détente, and the consolidation of security and cooperation in Europe." Their performance of this role is even more vital today when the world finds itself confronted with the stepped up activity of the shock forces of reaction.

The struggle for peace, the Danish communists believe, is a struggle against those who benefit from the build-up of armaments, a struggle against powerful groups seeking by means of pressure and the use of force to safeguard their privileges and their right to exploit the working people.

The masses hate war. That is why the advocates of the arms race are trying to split the anti-militarist movement along the same lines on which they would like to divide the participants in the social battles, that is by scaring them with the "threat of communism." Our adversaries have been vainly trying to prove that all the organizations of the peace fighters cooperating with the communists or even working for the same goals are "camouflaged communist groups," "communist fellow-travellers," whose alleged goal is to strengthen the Soviet Union by weakening the defense capability of the "free world."

That is why one of the concrete ideological tasks in the struggle for peace is to convince the masses that we oppose the arms race and war because we have the interests of all the working people at heart. It is clear, at the same time, that the call for peace and coexistence, and non-interference in the affairs of other states does not at all signify a curb on the right to struggle for national independence and social change.

When the imperialists use hypocritical calls for peace to cover up their denial of this or that people's right to turn to its allies in defense of its freedom, they merely expose themselves. When the United States tries to frustrate any

discussion of peace initiatives and stage boycotts of peace-loving peoples and states, the anti-imperialist character of the struggle for détente and peaceful coexistence is intensified. When the working class takes an active stand against the growth of military budgets, against nuclear weapons and the siting of new U.S. missiles in Europe, and against NATO's collaboration with reactionary, repressive regimes in newly liberated countries, the working class enters into confrontation with imperialist domestic and foreign policy, and an awareness of the class nature of the existing alliances emerges even in the ranks of social democrats.

At their congresses — and nearly 30 of these have been held over the past three years — the communist and workers' parties formulated concrete proposals aimed to organize resistance to the threat of war and achieve a settlement by political means of international problems fraught with armed conflicts and have been perseveringly working to solve these problems. Last year's 26th congress of the CP Denmark also concentrated on the issues of war and peace. The CP Denmark's tasks in the struggle to strengthen peace and détente were discussed by our communists at a conference in late September 1981.

The need to ensure joint action by the working class and its organizations is a cardinal problem on which the communists have been working. Here they have given much attention to the development of contacts with socialist and social democratic parties, which is to some extent promoted by a modification of the latter's stand on the problem of war and peace.

The urge for anti-war action has also affected the leadership of the Socialist International. Indicative in this respect was last summer's Bonn meeting of its Bureau, which concentrated on the results of the trip to the Soviet Union by Willy Brandt, President of the Socialist International and Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. Summing up the results of his Moscow negotiations, he said: "I have no doubt at all about Leonid Brezhnev's urge for peace."

Reflecting the mood of broad circles of world opinion, the participants in the meeting came out for the earliest possible start on negotiations between the United States and the USSR on limiting medium-range nuclear-missile weapons. Most of them condemned Washington's intention to deploy additional U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe, regardless of whether negotiations with the Soviet Union are held or not, or of their outcome. The leaders of the social democratic parties of the Nordic

countries, including Denmark, discussed in detail the prospects of setting up a nuclear-free zone in that part of the continent.

There should, of course, be no illusions. Now and again obvious contradictions arise between the stand taken by the socialist and the social democratic parties in evaluating international events and the policies pursued by the governments they head. This is exemplified by the foreign policy conceptions of FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who has repeatedly advocated Washington's policy of turning Western Europe into a testing ground for U.S. nuclear-missile weapons and who has stubbornly claimed that the peace fighters in West Germany are "henchmen" of the Soviet Union. President Francois Mitterrand of France, a socialist, approves of the U.S. plan for deploying new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe regardless of negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The Danish "Atlanticists" — most of whom are right-wingers — support the U.S. demand for the establishment on our territory of depots for U.S. heavy military equipment, erection of new NATO facilities, and the conclusion of an agreement envisaging the transfer of U.S. Air Force planes and military units to Denmark in the event of a "crisis situation." But such an extension of Denmark's cooperation with NATO contradicts the existing ban on the deployment of nuclear weapons and foreign troops on our territory in peace time.

The changes in the international trade union movement are highly encouraging. Today, not only the World Federation of Trade Unions, but also the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the World Confederation of Labor come out for peace and against the arms race. For all the differences in their stand on concrete issues, the ever more clear-cut antimilitarist tenor of their action paves the way for broader cooperation in the struggle against the threat of war.

Similar changes will be seen in the stand taken by national trade unions, and Denmark offers one example. Thus, the shop stewards of the Northern Jutland trade union organization declared that "the time has come for the working-class movement to use the whole of its organized strength for peace" and sponsored an international conference of trade unions from the Nordic countries, which was held at Aalborg last May, and which concentrated on ways to advance the popular movement for the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. The meeting laid a broader basis for the struggle for peace within the framework of the trade-union movement, a struggle in which social democrats and non-party people are join-

ing alongside trade unionists who are communists. Activity in this direction by trade unions and trade union associations has continued. It will undoubtedly become more vigorous and acquire broader dimensions in the course of the on-going campaign to collect signatures for the demand: "Start talks at once!"

We have watched with interest the development of the situation in the other countries. Our interest was drawn by the fact that, for instance, the most influential British trade unions, which had earlier shunned the peace movement, are now among its active participants. The annual congress of the British TUC in September passed a resolution motioned by the TUC General Council calling for the country's unilateral nuclear disarmament. The Federation of German Trade Unions in the FRG is also taking more vigorous action. By countering the NATO idea of "peace through additional armaments" with its call for "peace through disarmament," it has expressed the will of the West German working people for greater international security.

The agreement of the leading political and trade union organizations of the working class on issues of war and peace is convincing evidence of the great distinction of the present situation within the working-class movement from the ominous years which preceded the First and Second World Wars. In these conditions, it can stop the advocates of another total armed clash. The unity of the movement, which includes communists and socialists, Christians and non-party people, could become the generator of a broad popular anti-war coalition and give it the right tenor.

The communists' political line is to avoid closing in upon themselves within a circle of those who have the same ideology, and to go out into the broad fields of the battle for peace. That is precisely why the Paris meeting of European fraternal parties in the spring of 1980 called for negotiations and joint action by all the peace forces, regardless of nationality, convictions and way of life. They addressed the following call to all the peoples of the continent: "Peace is our common cause, and our joint struggle can ensure the triumph of this cause."

It is now possible to note with satisfaction that alongside peace fighters from 137 countries, acting under the leadership of the World Peace Council, new organizations have been emerging in the international arena inspired by a common comprehension of the historical importance of saving mankind from a fatal nuclear war. Is it not, after all, a sign of the times that even some high-ranking military men from

bourgeois armies have joined in the movement? "Military honor today consists in averting war," said a statement addressed to the Helsinki signatories by Generals Pasti (Italy), Bastian (FRG), Gomes (Portugal), von Meyenfeldt (Holland) and Koumanakos (Greece).

An important feature of the peace movement today is that its acts tend ever more frequently to be international. Thus, in early June, 160 representatives of 85 organizations and movements from 30 European countries, the United States and Canada, and 13 international organizations met in Stockholm to exchange views on ways of ending the arms race. At the end of June, Sweden was the meeting place of young people from Nordic countries campaigning for a nuclear-free North. In August, almost 200 writers from many countries in Europe, including Denmark, issued an address which said: "Let us act together to prevent Europe from becoming a field of atomic battle of another — and the last — world war." In the course of the 31st Pugwash Conference, which was held in late August and early September and which discussed "The Search for Peace in a Crisis-Ridden World," over 200 prominent scientists from 50 countries discussed ways of strengthening international security, relaxing tension and establishing control over armaments.

New forms of action have sprung from the direct threat of Western Europe's conversion into the battlefield of a thermonuclear conflict. Much publicity has been given to the "Manchester initiative," the decision by the municipal council of one of Britain's major cities urging the British government to "refrain from the manufacture and deployment of any types of nuclear weapons within the city limits." It was supported by Liverpool, Bristol, Sheffield and Derby. Over 70 municipal councils have proclaimed their cities nuclear-free zones.

The demonstrations against NATO's decision to deploy new nuclear missiles in Europe have assumed such proportions in our country that the government has been forced to voice its "apprehensions" with respect to the Washington-imposed plans, and has proposed that their implementation should be postponed. The sweep of the campaign has also helped to back up the demands for the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone, and has involved in the anti-missile action social democratic parties and trade union organizations in our region.

One cannot but recall in this context the Peace March-81, which started from Copenhagen. Its participants started out on their

march on June 22 and, after covering over 1,200 kilometers across Denmark, the FRG, Holland, Belgium and France, arrived in Paris on August 6, the anniversary of the atomic tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Highly characteristic of the present level of the anti-war action is the fact that the success of the march was not hampered either by the absence of preliminary consultations between its Norwegian initiators and organizations in other countries, or by the political and organizational imprecision which marked its preparation. Nor was it hampered by the stand taken by some groups of participants, which took shape under the impact of the lying imperialist propaganda, concerning the Soviet Union's policy. Eventually, a great many people were rallied together around the anti-militarist slogans. The Peace March-81 involved men and women of 20 nationalities, among them people from Denmark and Holland, Britain and Italy, Ireland and Japan, the United States and Finland. Among its organizers were people of the most diverse political and ideological trends. But they were united by a common idea: to prevent a nuclear disaster and pave the way for disarmament.

Some bourgeois politicians in the West have tried to convince themselves and others that the present upsurge in the anti-war protest movement is just another craze, and that always tends to be short-lived. But all the facts indicate that we are witnessing *the evolution of mass public consciousness* on a major scale and in the most diverse forms. This evolution is so deep that it could evidently spread to a much broader spectrum of social and ideological issues. The working people are coming to see ever more clearly the direct connection between militaristic policy, on the one hand, and the economic and political foundations of the bourgeois state, on the other.

What then are the factors in the present situation that favor the development of the above-mentioned new qualitative characteristics of the mass movement against the threat of war? What are the objective factors that have given it such scope that some pro-imperialist leaders have to ask this question: is that "the beginning of European neutrality," as they have dubbed the urge of influential forces of Western Europe for peaceful coexistence? We think that such factors boil down to the following:

— Broad public circles, which are diverse in social and political make-up (now and again including leaders of ruling political parties in capitalist countries) are coming to realize the disastrous consequences of a thermonuclear war for the destiny of mankind. It is not fears

based on emotion but sober assessments by experts that go to show the fatal results that could spring from the Pentagon's strategy, which is designed to conduct a "mixed war" in Europe, that is, a war involving the simultaneous use of conventional, nuclear and chemical weapons, and also the arming of field troops with nuclear warheads. The idea itself, which fits into the "limited nuclear conflict" theory, envisages the conversion of Western Europe into a U.S. bridgehead and shows that U.S. ruling circles are prepared to fight there to their last ally and to convert the West Europeans into "nuclear hostages" of the United States. There is justified alarm over the build-up of the imperialist powers' armed forces in other regions of the world as well, including the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, and Washington's attempts to revive its "gunboat diplomacy" with respect to independent states like Libya, Cuba, Angola and People's Korea.

— The incapacity of state monopoly capital to stop the development of the crisis has made much more obvious the inter-relation between the militarization of the economy and the socio-economic burdens falling on the working people. Many workers, members of the middle strata of town and country, who have felt the beneficial effect of détente on the solution of their vital problems, are fully resolved to do their utmost to halt the worsening of the international situation and to return the world to the road of mutually advantageous cooperation among nations.

— The mounting imperialist contradictions — above all those between the North American and West European groupings of monopoly capital — have produced an urge among the ruling classes in countries allied with the United States to prevent it from using its junior partners as pawns in world politics. Economic interests impel the European countries to develop economic ties with the socialist world, and this gradually creates the material basis for peaceful coexistence.

— The constructive role played in European and world affairs by the Warsaw Treaty Organization, whose participants have put forward a comprehensive package of ideas for consolidating international security, and the Peace Program for the 1980s formulated by the 26th congress of the CPSU, which is gradually assuming the form of concrete diplomatic initiatives and proposals, have created a platform for rallying the efforts of the anti-militaristic forces. The socialist community countries' realistic stand and their readiness to accept a reasonable, mutually acceptable compromise for the purposes of attaining an agreement have

attracted the sympathies of the peoples.

— The growth of world socialism's political, military and economic resources, the ever greater influence of the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist world, the ever stronger anti-imperialist tenor of the policy of some developing countries — all of this goes to create a growing potential of the peace forces. For the first time in the history of mankind it has become possible to break the vicious circle of the end of one war merely becoming the prelude for the next, with peace being no more than a breathing space between armed conflicts. For over a third of a century now Europe has not heard the roar of guns, the whine of sirens and the blast of bombs. The strength of international anti-imperialist solidarity helped to halt U.S. aggression in Vietnam and is hampering attacks against the peoples of Angola, Ethiopia, Arab countries and Nicaragua, which have risen to independence. In other words, the contradictions between the aggressive aspirations of imperialism and its capability of realizing its sinister plans have been brought out. This gradually makes it a realistic possibility first to stem the slide toward the brink of war and then to tackle the long-term task of excluding war from the life of the society.

— The time has long passed when some tried to prove that the peace movement is no more than a "rending of the air." The peace forces have already scored many successes. U.S. officials now openly voice their alarm over the fact that in face of the mounting resistance by masses of people, the governments of NATO's West European countries will not be able to realize the decision to site medium-range missiles in Western Europe by the end of 1983. All of this gives the peace fighters confidence in their strength and shows that their struggle is important and fruitful.

The communists are working to transform mass protest against imperialist wars "from a vague and helpless waiting into a clear and definite political program, into an effective struggle waged by millions of oppressed people under the leadership of the proletariat" (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 56). We do not just reject the policy of militarism and war, but counter it with our own constructive alternatives.

As for the Communist Party of Denmark, in the light of its country's concrete conditions, it has invited the country's progressive, peace circles to concentrate their action on the struggle against:

— NATO's decision to deploy new nuclear

missiles on the territory of the European countries which are members of that bloc;

— the manufacture, stockpiling and use of neutron warheads;

— the storing in Denmark of equipment for foreign armed forces;

— the construction of NATO military facilities on our territory;

— NATO's demand that in the event of "crisis situations" Danish straits should be closed to Warsaw Treaty ships;

— preparatory measures for transferring foreign armed forces to Denmark in the event of "crisis situations."

Simultaneously, we urge action for:

— Denmark's inclusion in a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe, with a guarantee that such weapons will not be used from the territory of countries in our region and against them;

— real negotiations ensuring constructive steps in realizing the Helsinki accords, which for us, in particular, means putting an end to NATO's interference in Denmark's affairs.

These proposals, we know, are largely shared by the communist parties of the Nordic countries. The fraternal parties acting in other regions have put forward their own plans for ensuring regional security: in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the Balkans and the Middle East, and in Latin America. Realization of such regional programs is sure to help to consolidate world peace.

The new dimensions of the war danger stemming from the U.S. administration's line require a further improvement of our anti-militarist struggle and a precise definition of its immediate and long-term goals. Today, this means a concentration of forces on the task of frustrating the attempts by reaction to put through its "global diktat" concept, materially (restructuring of the war machine to adapt it to new strategic ideas, like the formation of a Rapid Deployment Force, the manufacture and deployment of modernized types of weapons, above all mass destruction weapons), politically (efforts to ease the disagreements within imperialist blocs and increasingly to gear these to the interests of U.S. imperialism), and ideologically (the inflation of anti-communist and especially anti-Soviet attitudes).

We face important and complicated tasks in view of the stepped-up psychological warfare by reaction against the progressive and anti-war forces. The bourgeois mass media keep trying to spread among the people fear of a "Soviet threat," to convince them that the arms race is economically "useful," and that nuclear war is morally and militarily "thinkable." With

our facts and convincing arguments, we seek to expose the true meaning of these and other similar propaganda clichés and to show what lurks behind them. This helps to overcome the doomsday feeling in the mass consciousness, which produces a mentality of meekly expecting some kind of "predestination."

This is also promoted by the explanation of the socialist countries' peaceable foreign policy. We support the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and the Warsaw Treaty Organization as a whole not because they come from the "socialist East." Would not the communists vote for any constructive initiatives coming from the "capitalist West"?

The point is that the class character of the North Atlantic bloc impels its members to step up military preparations. By contrast, the class character of the Warsaw Treaty Organization predetermines its tireless quest for new ways toward détente and the creation of an atmosphere favoring international cooperation for the purposes of social and economic progress. Failure to understand this fundamental distinction between the two military-political alignments makes some equate the two.

We have never demanded and cannot demand that this or that participant in the peace movement should make a choice between communism and capitalism. We merely urge them to decide, without bias, whose acts — and which of these — serve détente and what tends to undermine it. To decide, so as to act accordingly.

For our part, we communists take a totally unambiguous attitude to this problem. We are not faced with the question of which side we are on in the conflict between the aggressiveness of the imperialist powers and socialist countries' peaceableness. *The Danish communists, consistently adhering to the platform of Marxism-Leninism, declare: The struggle for peace and disarmament, which is being consistently carried on by the socialist countries is also our own struggle, and its goals are our own goals.*

Greater cohesion of the communist movement, and joint action by the fraternal parties on the problems of peace, détente and disarmament are the key conditions for effectively using the potentialities for improving international relations. The reality and usefulness of this have been confirmed by the Berlin conference and the Paris meeting of the communist and workers' parties of Europe, other regional conferences and bilateral contacts.

Our party's representative at the Paris meeting said: "We regard our common action as a

prerequisite for the creation of a broader unity and a contribution to it, and must totally reject the view that . . . meetings of communist parties with each other are harmful." That is the view we hold to this very day. Life has already proved that such meetings, while doing no harm to the independence, sovereignty and equality of each communist party, have a favorable effect on the development of cooperation among them and with other political forces, above all in the struggle for peace.

The communists' multifaceted and fruitful experience has convinced them that the social and political changes over the past several decades have created the conditions making it possible not only to stop the current slide toward an armed conflict, but also to exclude

world war from the life of society over the historical perspective. This requires further efforts to mobilize broad strata of peaceable public opinion for the struggle against the imperialist "strength" policy for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between countries with different social systems, and for the erection of the edifice of a lasting and stable peace. We communists regard this as a key prerequisite for the fulfillment of our historical mission: the social and economic emancipation of the working class and of all the other working people.

1. Kommunisternes program. København, 1976, p. 14.
2. Danmarks kommunistiske partis 26 kongres. København, 1980, p. 123.

The present stage of the national liberation movement

Khaled Bagdash

CC General Secretary, Syrian Communist Party

Everyone knows that Lenin's doctrine has the credit of discovering the mighty revolutionary potential of the national liberation movement. While international social democracy ignored that movement and denied its role as a great ally of the proletariat in the struggle for a socialist reconstruction of the world, Lenin asserted: "The socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie — no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries against international imperialism" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159). Emphasizing the need in the revolutionary struggle to take account of the role of social sections and forces differing in class nature, he said: "To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolt by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts by a section of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without a movement of the politically non-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against oppression by the landowners, the church, and the monarchy, against national oppression, etc. — to imagine all this is to repudiate social revolution" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 355).

At the same time, one could say that the national liberation movement has a special and relatively autonomous place with respect to the

other streams of the world revolutionary process. It has to operate in specific conditions, the range of the classes and social strata involved in it and the goals and tasks before it are very broad. This creates the ground for discussions concerning its orientation and destinies.

When the world colonial system collapsed and dozens of young independent states emerged on its ruins, this posed a question of cardinal importance: how would relations between the states and the imperialist powers develop — toward harmonization and improvement, or complication and aggravation?

This question was considered not only by bourgeois politicians and ideologists from the world imperialist camp. It arose also within the liberated countries themselves, in the national liberation movement and even among the revolutionary democrats. In Syria, for instance, it long remained an open question. There was talk about how to find common ground with the United States by satisfying some of the U.S. political and economic claims as an inducement to abandon anti-Arab plots. Some discoursed on the possibility of securing U.S. neutrality in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Now and again there was talk about the two "super-powers" — the United States and the USSR — without any distinctions being made concerning their social-class nature. This provided the basis for the conclusion: there are neither con-

to strengthen the hand of its conciliatory wing — the liberal bourgeoisie. Further, it hoped that all the forces and groups opposed to the policies and leadership of the Imam Khomeini would unite; provision was made to form an underground armed organization consisting of counter-revolutionary riff-raff and to supply it with the means for subversion. In order to launch a terror campaign² and clear the way for a coup or for a civil war at a propitious moment, pro-imperialist elements infiltrated the leadership of left-extremist (religious and non-religious) groups and also circles linked to ethnic minorities. Lastly, undisguised political pressure was brought to bear on Iran through hostile economic and military actions up to the enforcement of a total blockade and direct armed intervention.

The latest imperialist plot has been hatched and is now being put into effect with the participation of the former president Banisadr. He has now been joined by all the many elements U.S. imperialism has been gradually gathering under its wing over a period of more than two and a half years, by those who are out to bring down the anti-imperialist regime. These elements include counter-revolutionaries from among former SAVAK officials, supporters of the deposed shah, and the fifth column organized by Washington and Peking — Maoist, Trotskyist, and similar groups, sworn enemies of the revolution operating in ethnic regions, such as Qassem-lou and members of Komele,³ and the reactionary chieftains of the Fars and Baluchi tribes. In this ill-assorted conglomerate there are National Front-related liberals, the bourgeois-landowner Iran Liberation Movement, members of other strata that had enjoyed privileges under the monarchy, leftist organizations of the Mujaheddin Khalq type, and some others that call themselves Marxist groups.

With Banisadr at their head the conspirators attempted to paralyze the state apparatus, plunge the country into complete chaos, and thereby pave the way for a military (or paramilitary) coup and a change of power. However, the genuinely revolutionary forces were able to uncover the conspiracy in time. Banisadr's removal from the post of commander-in-chief of the Iranian army on orders from the Imam Khomeini at a time when the reactionary attack was still being prepared upset the counter-revolutionary plans. It is indicative that the former president fled the country together with the traitor Rajavi, leader of the Mujaheddin, and with the assistance of the personal pilot of the deposed shah. This allows forming a judgment of the nature of the counter-revolutionary front

operating in the country: there are rabid monarchists and left extremists in it.

However, despite this further fiasco it would be a mistake to think the enemy will cease plotting. The counter-revolution still has a social base in Iran, and the big capitalists and landowners, who are dependent on imperialism, still wield considerable influence. The forces of organized counter-revolution are undergoing training at special camps in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Pakistan, and Turkey. A special committee has been set up in Washington to direct subversion against the present regime in Iran. This committee includes representatives of all the agencies involved in this foul company — the Pentagon, the CIA, the U.S. State Department, and the White House.⁴

The military and economic blockade is being hardened. Vital industrial facilities have been made the object of sabotage or have been wrecked in the course of the U.S.-instigated war between Iran and Iraq. To aggravate the internal hardships still further, the imperialists are, with the complicity of the international oil concerns, trying to make it difficult for Iran to sell its oil. Simultaneously — against the event the attempts at destabilization fall through — they are planning a military intervention.

In preparing the overthrow of the rule of the followers of the Imam Khomeini's policies, Washington and the internal counter-revolutionary circles are counting, first, on the present socio-economic difficulties and second, on using some of the regime's weaknesses.

The source of the serious difficulties being encountered by the revolutionary process in spite of its impressive gains is still the unsurmounted calamitous effects of the shah's rule. From the shah's regime Iran inherited a misshapen economy hinging chiefly on an unproductive consumption of goods either imported or assembled locally from imported units and semi-finished products. The supply of prime necessities for the day-to-day needs of a population of nearly 40 million depended largely on oil exports to the USA, Western Europe and Japan and the import from these countries of goods, semi-finished products, and raw materials. One can easily appreciate the magnitude of the harm that has been inflicted on Iran by the economic blockade of the past few years.

The situation was further compounded by the unprecedented financial machinations of the monarchal regime's rulers who later fled the country; they had it good also under the liberal-bourgeois government headed by Bazargan. Obtaining loans several times greater than the actual value of their real and movable

property and converting this money into foreign currency at the most advantageous exchange rate, they transferred it to accounts in foreign banks. Most of the bank assets were likewise transmitted abroad. The Islamic Republic was left with a huge debt running into many billions of dollars. Characterized by the shrinking of domestic production, the disappearance of many consumer goods from the market, the profiteering, the artificial inflation of prices, and the growing unemployment which is making hundreds of thousands of working people jobless, the present grave situation is causing enormous difficulties for the government.

Huge sums of money are being spent on the war with Iraq forced upon Iran by the intrigues of the U.S. imperialists. The casualties, the material destruction (notably in the oil industry), and the evacuation of nearly 1,500,000 people from the zone of hostilities are a heavy burden on the nation which is aggravating the hardships experienced by the people.

The only way to end this period of trial, surmount the difficulties created by a wide front of enemies, both internal and external, and successfully to repulse their acts is to mobilize all sincere defenders of the revolution. An alliance of forces loyal to the fundamental aims of the revolution is an indispensable condition for defeating imperialism and its accomplices. However, regrettably, the biggest and most dangerous weakness lies precisely in this issue. Despite the bitter experience of the more than two and a half years since the victory of the people, the proponents of the Imam Khomeini's policies, who play the key role in the present regime, have as yet been unable to shed their prejudices and draw a distinct line between the true friends of the revolution and its implacable enemies in the country and on the international scene.

Ever since the upsurge of the revolutionary movement the U.S. imperialists, their agents in and outside Iran, and the local liberals who follow in the wake of imperialist policy have been trying to take advantage of this weakness. They hope that intrigues will help them to prevent rapprochement, mutual understanding, and an alliance of the popular anti-imperialist forces. True, the real face of imperialism's agents and liberals engaged in divisive activities such as Amir Entezam, Ghotbzadeh, and Banisadr has been unmasked. The exposure and disruption of their plans and, on the other hand, the steadfast and disinterested support for the revolutionary struggle of the Iranian people by the proponents of scientific socialism in the country and by the world

communist movement and the socialist community nations on the international scene have to some extent made it clear to a section of the Imam's adherents who are the real friends and allies of the Iranian revolution. However, there is an anti-communist wing seeking a monopoly of power and this is still affecting the situation in the country and Iran's relations with other states.

In this context note must be made of the large-scale subversive activities of the Maoists and the liberals who have adopted the guidelines of imperialism's strategists calling for whipping up the utmost hostility toward the Soviet Union and toward the adherents of scientific socialism. These elements would like to move the spearhead of the revolution away from its deadly enemy, the U.S. imperialists, and direct it in the opposite direction, against a mythical enemy. To illustrate, I shall quote the Imam Khomeini. "The line," he said, "was that one group spoke constantly of the Soviet Union in order to divert attention from the USA."⁵

To this day it has not come through to the authorities of the Islamic Republic that there is no threat whatever to Iran from the proponents of scientific socialism in the country or from the international communist and working-class movement. The regime's policy-makers have still to understand that the watershed between revolution and counter-revolution is not a boundary separating religious people from the adherents of scientific socialism. The watershed runs between two opposing fronts: one consists of Moslems ready to be reconciled with and capitulate to imperialism, the spokesmen of the predatory bourgeois system, and the other of Moslems fighting imperialism, of people who want fundamental changes in the interests of the disinherited masses. Life demonstrates that the watershed runs between orthodox Moslems who have taken a revolutionary stand and the advocates of "pro-American Islam." In the ongoing struggle, the true followers of scientific socialism support the former, while the pseudo-Marxists, fattened by U.S. imperialism, unite with the latter.

The same is the case as far as foreign policy is concerned. The Islamic Republic has taken a clear-cut anti-American position and regards U.S. imperialism as the principal enemy. But if one examines its attitude to the events around Afghanistan, one will find that the government has sided precisely with those who have the support of the ruling circles of the USA, China, Britain, Pakistan, Egypt, Israel and Saudi Arabia, in other words, of the Iranian revolution's sworn enemies. A large section of the Moslem anti-imperialists has yet to understand

that an enemy like U.S. imperialism, whose tentacles have spread to our region and other vast territories of the globe, cannot be fought effectively if support is extended simultaneously to its myrmidons in a neighboring country. We should like to hope that the experience of liberation battles will help the Moslem fighters of our revolution to find the correct road and reinforce the trend toward political realism, elements of which have become discernible in recent months.

Another weakness of the policy pursued by the government is the lack of a clear-cut program for resolving the main problems of the revolution. Despite strong opposition from the liberal bourgeoisie and the big landowners, the constitution of the Islamic Republic has formalized one of the cardinal demands of the masses, namely, the eradication of exploitation of man by man. The fundamental law contains provisions guaranteeing social justice. However, no serious steps have so far been taken to implement these provisions.

The profits of the local bourgeoisie are growing. The Chairman of the Majlis Budget Commission made public the unpalatable fact that last year alone Iranian entrepreneurs pocketed a net profit of more than 120 billion tumans⁶ (U.S. \$17 billion). Since there is no tax law protecting the people's interests, the taxes paid by the bourgeoisie amounted to only 3.5 billion tumans, or less than 3 per cent of what it had put into its pockets. This is only a fraction of the sum being taken from the disinherited masses in the shape of income taxes and indirect taxes on the goods of mass consumption. This robbery steadily undercuts the people's purchasing power and gives the counter-revolutionary forces more room for their provocations.

The authorities of the Islamic Republic still have no coherent plan for restoring national industry, for replacing the assembly plants dependent on imports by factories using local resources, and no program for building the foundations of an independent economy oriented on the accelerated development of heavy industry, including ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, petro-chemistry, and heavy engineering. The absence of an action program of this kind plays into the hands of our enemies.

Among the circles standing at the country's helm and, generally among those proclaiming themselves followers of the Imam Khomeini's line, one can distinctly see two trends. One is revolutionary and advocates a basic reform of the socio-economic system in the interests of the disinherited, and demands a limit on the size of property, on the opportunities to make profits out of capital. The other is reactionary

and advocates capitalism, private property, and unrestricted exploitation, and would like to see the preservation of the existing socio-economic system. It is no secret that the adherents of the second trend have strong positions in the power apparatus and among a section of the clergy. To date they are managing to halt any serious and radical measure to implement the provisions of the constitution aimed against the pillaging of the working people by the big capitalists and landowners, at ensuring genuine social justice. This is an alarming symptom. The further development of the revolution and the maintenance of its popular orientation depend largely on how consistently this trend is fought. If the present socio-economic system is not restructured radically with the purpose of uprooting survivals of feudalism, curbing capitalist relations in the economy, and generally cutting short capitalist development — as is clearly stated in the constitution — fertile social soil will be left for the poisonous seeds of endless imperialist and counter-revolutionary plots.

Yet another weakness is seen in the extremes to which some high officials of the government and judiciary and representatives of revolutionary institutions go. They usually motivate their actions by concern for the unconditional observance of Moslem law. However, it should be borne in mind that there are two sources of extremism: on the one hand, the religious dogmatists and, on the other, the enemy agents, the fifth column of imperialism and the counter-revolution, particularly the bourgeois liberals and the pro-Peking leftists. The counter-revolutionary elements that have infiltrated various organs of power have seriously hampered the consolidation of what was achieved by the revolution. In a speech in which he touched on the removal of Banisadr, the Imam Khomeini spoke of the danger of "werewolves" infiltrating the patriotic ranks: "Because of a mistake we have been given a slap in the face. All our present hardships are due to this mistake. It must not be repeated. We should not forget that we are in a state of war with America and the renegades used by it. They have wormed themselves into our ranks and we have not seen it. They are still among us."⁷

Enemy agents are using religious extremism for two purposes. First, to fuel discord in the camp of the genuinely revolutionary forces: quarrels are kindled not only between Moslems and people of other persuasions, including scientific socialism, but also among the adherents of Islam themselves. Second, to spur disaffection among those sections of the people

who support the revolution or are not hostile to it but do not condone extremist and coercive religious measures.

It is with deep regret that one has to note that by their ill-considered and incongruous actions, the religious extremists and dogmatists are playing into the hands of enemies. This has lately become increasingly more conspicuous. If the realistically-minded supporters of the Imam's line fail to stop these actions, serious damage will be inflicted on the revolution, on its influence among the masses and on its prestige on the international scene.

The people of Iran have chosen a hard but glorious path. The unparalleled revolutionary enthusiasm, the experience gained in the day-to-day struggles, and the epochal changes that have taken place in the arena of the global confrontation with imperialism are helping them to overcome many difficulties. Our party is active in this historic movement toward the summits of social progress. At the new stage of the liberation struggle it has been able to win acknowledged influence, indisputable political prestige in society and, despite obstacles, is pressing forward its revolutionary activity. It marked its 40th anniversary in an atmosphere of unprecedentedly solid ideological, political, and organizational unity.

The enlarged 17th plenary meeting of the PPI Central Committee in March 1981, adopted a new program conforming to the present stage of the nation's social development. The political aims of this program call upon the masses to crush the conspiracies hatched by reaction headed by U.S. imperialism. We urge the consolidation and development of the revolution's

achievements in order to continue deepening its anti-imperialist, popular character. A major condition for this is the creation of a united people's front resting chiefly on cooperation and united action by Moslem fighters, the adherents of the Imam Khomeini's line, and true advocates of scientific socialism. This front would unite all revolutionaries and patriots regardless of ideology, serve the interests of the working classes, and rely on other patriotic segments of society. In this lies the guarantee of victory, the guarantee of Iran's advance.

1. N. Kianuri. "For unity among patriotic forces," *WMR*, July 1981.

2. The scale of the terrorist acts and the elaborate planning that went into them are illustrated by the fact that within the space of a little more than two months (in the summer and autumn of this year) the victims were the nation's President M.A. Rajai, the Prime Minister M.J. Bahonar, the General Secretary of the Islamic Republican Party ayatollah Beheshti, one of Khomeini's closest associates ayatollah Madani, the Procurator-General of the Islamic Revolution A. Ghodussi, and many dozens of other prominent political, government and religious figures. — Ed.

3. Qassemloo, leader of the right wing of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan that is fighting the central authority. Komele, a Maoist organization operating in Iranian Kurdistan. — Ed.

4. U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig has made it clear that the USA has no intention of abandoning its interference in Iran's affairs in its bid to put that country back on the road followed by the deposed shah's regime. In mid-September he told *The Washington Post* that the Reagan administration was determined to do anything so that the outcome of the developments in Iran should be compatible with Western values and orientation. — Ed.

5. *Ettelaat*, July 5, 1981.

6. 1 tuman = 10 rials.

7. *Ettelaat*, July 5, 1981.

The time has come for democratization

Giocondo Dias
CC General Secretary,
Brazilian Communist Party

Today Brazil's socio-economic development is determined wholly by the capitalist mode of production. There has been a qualitative transformation of the nation's economic structure under the impact of the accelerated concentration of capital, a process that was purposefully encouraged by the regime brought to power by the military coup in 1964.

For some economic indices, Brazil looks quite well off compared with other capitalist countries. The annual growth rate of its gross domestic product fluctuates between 6 and 8 per cent. In 1979 it rose by 6.4 per cent, reach-

ing nearly U.S. \$216 billion. In 1980 the increment was 8 per cent, with the gross domestic product amounting to U.S. \$237 billion. But these impressive figures cannot hide the glaring blotches: the huge external debt, the imbalances in the structure of production and the mass poverty.

The nation's economic system is controlled by transnationals, particularly North American corporations, which operate mainly in technologically advanced industries. For example, a group of 200 of the biggest facilities have an aggregate capital that is equal to almost

half of Brazil's gross domestic product. According to statistics for 1979, foreign companies, (which hold 8.6 per cent of this group's assets) accounted for 18.3 per cent of their total sales. The ratio between net profit and the working capital in the mining industry is indicative. At state enterprises it was 4.8, at national private enterprises it was 11.5, and at foreign-run facilities it was 14.6 per cent. Or another example: the export sector which gets the maximum privileges from the state. The internationals handled 43 per cent of the sales in the foreign market. It is thus not hard to see who benefits most from the present "economic model."

The numerical strength of the proletariat and of the technical intelligentsia and the scale on which wage labor is employed in agriculture are growing in the process of capitalist evolution. Today in Brazil there are nearly 6 million industrial and 11 million agricultural workers, and also 6 million workers in the services industry. Most of this contingent is under the age of 30, and there is a large proportion of women.

The distribution of labor power has changed in favor of the technologically advanced industries. The level of concentration of the proletariat has risen in the big industrial centers. At present 30 per cent of the factory workers are in the heavy engineering industry, 32 per cent are in the mining industry, and 38 per cent are in the consumer goods industry. The factories employing more than 500 workers have 37 per cent of the industrial proletariat. Most of this proletariat — 85 per cent — is in the southeast (the states of Sao Paulo, Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, and Espirito Santo). Eleven cities with populations of more than half a million, contain 77 per cent of the factories employing over 250 workers.

When we speak of the features of capitalist development in Brazil we must emphasize that this development is taking place under conditions of dependence. Moreover, account must be taken of the fact that the relations of production contain pre-capitalist elements. Monopoly capital (local and foreign) goes with latifundism. The government, in which the leading role is played by the military, ensures the dovetailing of the interests of the various ruling strata. Internal reaction, headed by the financial oligarchy, has allied itself with foreign, chiefly North American imperialism. This socio-political system, which keeps the masses from participating in deciding the nation's destiny, made it possible to introduce the "economic model," the outcome of which in 1969-1973 was widely proclaimed as the "Brazilian miracle." Actually, it was the result of super-

exploitation of the working class economically and, through the use of fascist methods of management politically.

The "Brazilian miracle" years brought appalling misery to the working people. Government surveillance of the trade unions was complemented by political repressions. Real wages diminished, giving the bourgeoisie a higher rate of capital accumulation. The lifting of the restrictions on dismissals made employment precarious. In the distribution of the national income the share of the poorest sections of the population — one-tenth of the entire population — remained minute. In 1972, when the gross domestic product increased by 11.7 per cent, this share amounted to no more than 0.7 per cent. Between 1965 and 1974 the real wages of people of 81 professional categories (74 per cent of whom work in Sao Paulo) shrank by almost one-third. The decline in living standard was especially visible in this industrial heart of the nation. In 1974 the minimum real wage index fell to 42 points in this city (if the 1959 level is taken as equal to 100).

Mass actions against the dictatorship began in the mid-1970s. The "Brazilian economic model" proved to be little more than a flash in the pan. This became evident when the economic crisis hit capitalism. Cracks appeared in the bloc on which the regime rested. Some of its supporters went over to the opposition. The 1978 elections showed that the dictatorship was in growing isolation. It was then that indications appeared of political changes under the influence of the people's struggles and as a result of the jockeying by the ruling circles seeking to halt the shrinking of the regime's social base.

The working class, the working masses and progressive circles have won what may be described as a bridgehead. This bridgehead now gives them the possibility of defending their rights, upholding the common interests of the nation, and continuing the struggle for democratization within the present framework. The major achievements have been the abolition of press censorship, the repeal of "institutional act No. 5" (the main element of fascist legislation), and the amnesty for political prisoners. But the most important thing is that there has been a strengthening of the working-class and trade union movement.

The factors that facilitated the growth of the forces which compelled the dictatorship to make concessions are that the regime is increasingly compromising itself, that the contradictions in its political bases are growing sharper, and that headway was made by international détente in the latter half of the 1970s. But the

dictatorship has no intention of signing its own death warrant. While it has had to abandon its most odious methods of suppression, methods that characterized it as fascist, it is trying to preserve and institutionalize the authoritarian system in order to continue employing the development model that has inflicted so much harm on the working people and on the country's economy and sovereignty.

The dictatorship stands adamantly opposed to genuine democratization. In an effort to halt or at least slow down this process, it is using the weapon of violence and, at the same time, having recourse to subterfuge and maneuvers. Examples of these maneuvers are the party system reform law and the series of economic measures taken last December.

The purpose of the party system reform law is to split the opposition, prevent the 1982 elections from turning into a plebiscite (as was the case in 1974 and 1978 when the regime got a vote of no confidence from the people), obstruct the growth of opposition in local organs of power, and hinder the free formation of parties by the political and ideological streams existing in the country. The government has reason to fear that its defeat in the upcoming elections will be even more overwhelming than in the past. It hopes to extricate itself from the present situation (in which supporters of the regime are clearly a minority) by dividing the opposition as much as possible. However, these maneuvers are not likely to give the governing Social Democratic Party a majority in the parliament and among the state governors. The new opposition parties¹ are capable of uniting and nominating joint candidates. This is what the people want and it stems from the common desire for political and economic changes.

Last December's economic measures were taken to give the impression that the government was determined to fight inflation and other crisis phenomena. Actually, they were designed to preserve the prevailing model of economic development. The government wants to curb not inflation itself but only its "excess" that is hurting business and the accumulation of capital. Held at a "normal level," inflation is an additional means of robbing the masses, a way of cutting real wages. The measures that were instituted were designed to increase the flow of investments and loans from abroad: they reaffirm all the guarantees to the transnational corporations and banks covering the payment of interest, the export of profits, and the repatriation of capital.

Present-day problems cannot be reduced to the dictatorship merely trying to survive. It still has a large potential for defense and counter-at-

tack. The freedoms wrested from it are limited and constantly infringed upon by the authorities. That is why the masses are not slackening their struggle against arbitrary rule, for the full satisfaction of their democratic demands.

Various segments of society come into conflict or interact in the process of political changes. This gives rise to various trends. But the upper hand is being gained by what in Brazil is called an improvement.

Needless to say, it would be wrong to identify a real democratic improvement with the "improvement" scripted and now being put into effect by those who hold the key positions in the dictatorship. The script was conceived as a series of measures from above to contain the objective process of change. The pillars of the regime are trying to limit the change with some modification of authoritarianism, by attiring it in "constitutional" robes. Their aim boils down to this: while consenting to some of the rights already won by the people, to prevent any encroachment on the monopoly of power. That is why, while proclaiming freedom of public life the ruling circles simultaneously introduce a discriminatory law on parties. They allow for the existence of a parliament but are doing everything to prevent the restoration of its prerogatives. They speak of their recognition of the right to strike and unhampered trade union activity but continue to interfere in the internal affairs of the trade unions and suppress the strike movement.

The authors of the government script want "reforms" that will essentially change nothing. At the close of the 20th century they are trying to resolve the nation's problems by paternalistic methods. But even this variant encounters resistance in the government camp, from the "sacks."²

General Golbery do Couto e Silva,³ who masterminded the 1964 coup, had to remonstrate with the "hard-liners" and "purists," the military dictatorship's orthodox supporters demanding drastic measures. He argued that a slow, phased change was the only legal way left for taking the regime out of its present impasse. The powers that be are thus trying to contain pressure from the democratic forces, to offset the failure of their economic, fiscal and, especially, energy policy. By renouncing the signet-ring to save the finger, they are adapting to the new situation, which differs sharply from the "golden days" of the military regime.

The ongoing objective change is the result of the fusion of the struggle waged by heterogeneous social strata, beginning with the proletariat and ending with a section of the entre-

preneurs. It was pressure from civilian opinion, chiefly the popular forces, that took the formerly sole opposition party, the Party of the Brazilian Democratic Movement, from a crisis state to the road of effective action. Vigorous participation of the popular forces in the election campaign turned the elections of 1974 and 1978 into a nation-wide protest against fascism. Progressive public and religious organizations and the trade unions were the decisive factors behind the emergence and development of the objective process of change.

This does not imply an underestimation of the role of political parties in mobilizing and uniting the people. The legalization of all parties, including the Brazilian Communist Party, is an indispensable condition of democratization. This is demanded not only by the communists. Legalization of parties would signify real recognition of a key political right.

Our aim is to turn the struggle to win legal status for the Communist Party into a broad movement involving all of the nation's progressive forces. Official recognition of the BCP would consolidate the victory of democracy and open the road to new advances. The communists will do all in their power to spread democratization to the economic and social spheres. This will hasten deep-going changes holding out the prospect of an advance toward socialism.

The main task today is to prevent the dictatorship from prolonging its existence. This can be accomplished if the socio-political forces act in a united front. That this is realistic is indicated by the fact that the new opposition parties that have replaced the Brazilian Democratic Movement have published programs reaffirming their anti-dictatorship course. They are at one in demanding freedom of political and trade union activity, an agrarian reform, and a restriction on the power of the transnational corporations.

The vast majority of the nation wants a democratic change. For that reason the idea of a joint front as an instrument of struggle for a democratic system, an idea that was propounded only by a few some years ago, now has the support of most of the parties and public organizations. It is shared also by the Catholic Church, which has played a positive role in the anti-dictatorship movement. Small wonder then that the regime's proponents are doing everything to prevent the formation of a united front. They are compelling some factions of the parliamentary opposition to support the plans for "constitutionalizing" authoritarianism.

The right and ultra-right forces in Brazil have lately become perceptibly more active. They

are encouraged by the Reagan administration's policy of openly patronizing dictatorial regimes. To rechannel the nation into political regress, the ultras are having recourse to organized terrorism. The government is skilfully using this in its propaganda. It is blackmailing the democratic opposition, placing before it the odious dilemma of either a governmental authoritarian program or a return to the darkness of fascism.

Experience shows that the only way to isolate and then abolish the outworn regime is to unite all the people opposed to it. The fact that there is a new situation today is due chiefly to the trend toward unity in the anti-dictatorship movement. The communists see their central task in tirelessly continuing their efforts to ensure cooperation among all democrats, to bring all other progressive forces into a joint struggle to consolidate and extend the freedoms that have been won, and in fact democratize Brazilian society. In the long run this will give the people, the working class the political expanse needed for moving in the direction of socialism.

Objectively, a united front is already in existence. Its slogans call for the abrogation of extraordinary legislation, equal political rights, the convocation of a freely elected Constituent Assembly representing the nation's viable forces, and the formation of a democratic government. These are the slogans that can become the basis of a common minimum program of the democratic opposition.

1. These are the People's Party, the Brazilian Labor Party, the Democratic Labor Party, the Party of the Brazilian Democratic Movement, and the Working People's Party.

2. The name given in Brazil to the ultra-right semi-fascist circles who hold the key levers of political and economic power and are doing all they can to prevent democratic changes. — Ed.

3. An indication of the infighting in the government camp is that in August of this year General Golbery do Couto e Silva had to resign from the key post of head of the President's Civilian Office. — Ed.

Problems of the Development of the Mind

A.N. Leontyev

**Writings of a prominent Soviet
psychologist.**

cloth 454 pp \$7.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street

Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Comment

THE PERVERSE LOGIC OF AGGRESSION

First a piratical incident, a provocation, and then direct aggression. A sinister "novelty" has been recently introduced into this almost standard pattern for starting wars of conquest. The provocation was organized against Libya (U.S. fighter aircraft shot down Libyan patrol planes over Libya's shores), while aggression was unleashed at the other end of the continent, against Angola, by the South African racists, who are among the closest allies of the USA. Despite the distinction in scale and operational intent, both acts of brigandage are more than links of a single chronological chain. There is a certain political logic in the sequence of events.

The racists have sharply stepped up their offensive actions since the beginning of this year when Pretoria cut short the talks on Namibia's independence.¹ War hysteria is being whipped up in South Africa. Its rulers see a "Soviet military presence" and a "communist plot" in everything. The anti-Soviet campaign was used as a propaganda cover also for the recent large-scale incursion into Angola.

It was not Soviet troops but death-sowing racist hordes that invaded Angolan territory and advanced hundreds of kilometers deep into that country. This was not merely a raid, declared Nouraddine Djoudi, Deputy General Secretary of the Organization of African Unity. It was occupation of territory, a "glaring violation of the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola." The menace of armed expansion by Pretoria now hangs virtually over the entire southern part of Africa. Even *The Economist*, a British journal that can hardly be suspected of sympathizing with anti-imperialist nations, has noted that other neighboring countries, including Lesotho for the first time, have lately been attacked by the racists.²

What lies behind this sharp escalation of aggressiveness? First, Pretoria is conducting a policy of military piracy to intimidate its neighbors and, in the first place, crush the Namibian liberation movement that has the support of many countries. Another aim is to create a sort of "cordon sanitaire" around the citadel of apartheid itself, to erect a barrier around it against the progressive trends that have spread throughout the continent and are now so much in evidence in South Africa. Hence the new fit of bellicosity. The govern-

ment in Pretoria has no intention of letting Namibia out of its hands as long as the SWAPO armed detachments are not broken, writes *Le Monde*, quoting from a statement made by the South African Foreign Minister at the height of the intervention against Angola.³ Pretoria obviously wants a military settlement in Namibia. It wants to see a neocolonialist regime in Namibia propped up by South African bayonets, and to turn southern Angola into a racist-controlled "buffer zone" bringing constant military pressure to bear on Angola. This was the purpose of the recent aggression.

Zimbabwe is to be the next link of the "cordon sanitaire": South Africa is clinging to its plan (that has already had a setback) of installing there a racist-controlled puppet regime and is now mustering an army of 5,000 men to be led by the collaborationist Abel Muzorewa,⁴ who is thought highly of in racist circles, for an invasion of that country. Subversion is being intensified against Mozambique (into whose territory counter-revolutionary gangs are infiltrating from South Africa), Zambia and Botswana.

A lesson of history is that foreign invasions are planned when there is encouragement for them. Recall the policy of appeasement toward the Axis powers pursued on the eve of the Second World War by imperialist states: it was this that cleared the way for aggression by German fascism and Japanese militarism. Or take Peking's aggression against socialist Vietnam in 1979, which was preceded by Deng Xiaoping's visit to Washington. Who gave the green light for the recent eruption of a war of conquest in southern Africa?

Without question it was U.S. imperialism. The Reagan administration vetoed the Security Council resolution denouncing the latest South African aggression against Angola. There is another thing that draws attention, namely, the creation for this invasion of a moral-political climate in Africa and the Middle East throughout the preceding months. In Pretoria, bourgeois columnists write, they were not blind to the understanding shown by the USA for the criminal Israeli air raid on the Iraqi nuclear research center — this was a typical act of international terrorism. Then, in mid-July, Israel subjected Beirut to one of the heaviest bombings. Let us note that in the same period artillery were not silent for a moment along

Angola's southern frontier and there was a succession of raids by South Africa.

The NATO Ocean Venture-81 exercises in the South Atlantic were followed by exercises by the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean along the coast of Libya. These are what showed how thin the borderline is between war games and war. The provocation planned by the USA in the Gulf of Sidra led to an explosive incident that threatened peace in the region. But what these events showed above all was that Washington is itself prepared to use a mailed fist and to encourage international brigandage and terrorism by personal example. Five days later South African troops invaded Angola in force.

Progressive opinion worldwide has strongly censured this new crime by the racist-imperialist alliance, condemning the aggression as an attack on Angola's sovereignty, as an attempt to intimidate its people and compel them to stop supporting the Namibian patriots. This added emphasis to the words of Angola's President José Eduardo dos Santos, who declared that his country would continue extending all-sided assistance to the fraternal Namibian people and its militant vanguard, SWAPO. This stand is shared by the socialist community countries and also by nonaligned states and the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The struggle in the last citadels of racism is receiving growing support from the democratic forces in the capitalist West and this is something the bourgeois governments cannot afford to ignore. Most of them have denounced the aggression. Together with their U.S. patrons, the racists have found themselves in deep international isolation. Throughout the world there is a growing movement demanding effective economic sanctions against the apartheid regime, sanctions that would prevent it from getting arms and raw materials from imperialist states.

Aggression is getting a rebuff from the peoples.

John Nkosi

1. "Africa in the early 80s," WMR, September 1981.
2. *The Economist*, September 5-11, 1981, p. 15.
3. *Le Monde*, September 8, 1981.
4. *International Herald Tribune*, September 11, 1981.

WHO IS SOWING A WIND IN THE CARIBBEAN?

The U.S. State Department saw the joint Mexican-French declaration as a stone thrown at a window of its own house. This declaration, it will be recalled, extends recognition to the Salvadoran anti-dictatorship organizations — the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front

and the Revolutionary Democratic Front — as "a representative political force prepared to exercise the ensuring rights."¹

What infuriated Washington more than anything else was that France and Mexico appealed to world opinion to help, under the auspices of the UN, to "bring together the embattled political forces in El Salvador" and "prevent any interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador."

U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig reacted to the declaration with his usual "diplomatic tact." When it became known that it would be signed he called a press conference and accused the Salvadoran guerrillas — not for the first time — of "terrorism." True, he soon modified his tune. Some of his aides hastened to assure journalists that the text of the statement was not a "complete disaster."²

It was unquestionably taken into account that France is one of the USA's most important European allies, regardless of whether it is a NATO member, or whether it has a socialist government, in which even communists are included. As for Mexico, it is not only the next-door neighbor of the USA but also a major oil producer and enjoys considerable international prestige. Hence, in its endeavor to prevent the strengthening of solidarity with the Salvadoran patriots, the U.S. State Department has been compelled to call upon other countries, specifically Colombia and Venezuela, to act as proxies.

The governments of these countries undertook the unseemly mission of sending Mexico and France a "protest" to which seven other countries of the region (Chile, Paraguay, Guatemala, Argentina, Bolivia, Honduras and the Dominican Republic) subscribed. This was followed by similar statements by the governments of Brazil and Peru, who made, however, some reservations because they had not been opportunely invited to the "christening." Thus, in response to the Mexican-French declaration there was a chorus of disapproving voices in which the tone was, of course, set by blood-stained reactionary regimes like the Pinochet junta.

The most absurd thing about this whole business is that France and Mexico were accused of interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador. This was undisputably prompted by Haig, who is trying to divert his fellow-Americans from their own serious problems by spreading the myth that "extra-continental" powers — notably Cuba and the USSR — are interfering in the Caribbean. This is indeed knavery: the interventionists themselves yelling "intervention!" at the top of their voices.

L'Humanité, newspaper of the French communists, put the whole business in a nutshell, writing: "By reasserting, without any hard evidence, the charge that there are Cuban advisers fighting together with the Salvadoran patriots, Washington easily got the support of the governments of Argentina, Colombia and Venezuela, which protest against what they call 'interference' in the affairs of El Salvador. But they patently close their eyes to the actual and constant interference on the part of the USA in that country."³

It looks as though the present U.S. rulers suffer from hallucinations: they see Cuban-Soviet interference everywhere. This obsession is a deadly threat to peace but it has to be fought primarily by the Americans themselves. There is every likelihood of this happening, for the U.S. media are increasingly printing pronouncements by people who know that anti-communism and anti-Sovietism have never led to a constructive policy. At the 68th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Havana, Fidel Castro reiterated that there was not a single Cuban adviser — unlike U.S. servicemen — in El Salvador and that Cuba was not supplying arms to Central American states.⁴

After a recent interview with ranking State Department officials, a *Washington Post* reporter noted: "To mention El Salvador is to evoke flashes of early Haig. A new 'White Paper' is in the works to prove, once and for all, 'the activity of externally directed Marxist-Leninist insurgency.' The commitment to counter Fidel Castro and the communists is absolute."⁵

The Reagan-Haig policy toward El Salvador worries the USA's allies, notably France, which, apart from other motivations, has territories in the Caribbean — Martinique, Guadeloupe and French Guiana. Some quarters now believe it is high time to let the White House know there is a limit to its adventurist policy. The Mexican-French declaration is seen in precisely this light. "Mr. Cheysson,"⁶ *The New York Times* wrote, "warns that it can be the next grave crisis area, as dangerous as the Middle East, if the United States stays on its present course of indulging right-wing militarists."⁷

It would be more reasonable, the newspaper wrote, to take a positive stand toward the Mexican-French declaration, begin talks, and map out the ways and means of ending the crisis in El Salvador, because the government forces have been brought to a standstill and "Washington no longer talks of quick and easy victory."⁸ This is exactly the stand of the leaders of the nearly 80 parties and organizations of

the Socialist International, which at its recent meeting declared its full support for the joint Mexican-French declaration.

What the White House wants is not peace for the Salvadoran people, much less its freedom, but the suppression of the revolutionary movement in that country. This is precisely where the new administration has decided to give a major battle to the national liberation forces and resurrect U.S. supremacy. For it the main thing is to kindle a "small" flame in El Salvador and gradually spread it to the entire Caribbean, drawing Nicaragua and Cuba into the conflict. In San Salvador there is now a joint operational command in which, of course, the tune is called by U.S. military advisers, who comprise 15 per cent of the dictatorship's regular army. Together with the U.S. "embassy" it has taken refuge in a bunker. A correspondent of *The Washington Post* reported that he was received there behind a wall 20 feet thick by Ambassador Deane R. Hinton, who personally directs military operations to make sure the guerrillas "are not going to win."⁹

Developments in El Salvador bear out what we heard in one of our talks with Shafik Jorge Handel, CC General Secretary of the Communist Party of El Salvador. Speaking of the immediate prospects of the revolutionary forces, he noted that the fascists were finding themselves in growing isolation; militarily they were failing in their efforts to crush the guerrillas, while the political situation was deteriorating as the upcoming "elections," which Hinton was planning for next March, would only undermine the already shrinking social base on which the dictatorship relied.

The struggle of the Salvadoran patriots is receiving growing support in the world. The solidarity movement is gaining in strength in Latin America too. Naturally, the peoples of those Caribbean countries whose governments have so recklessly aligned themselves with the USA's bellicose policies are not standing aloof. Most people in Venezuela have denounced the reactionary policy of President Luis Antonio Herrera Campins, who is in fact conspiring with the Salvadoran junta that is massacring its own people.

In Washington they will once more have to face the fact that he who sows a wind will sooner or later reap a storm. It is no use blaming others for your own sins. It is not "international communism" but U.S. imperialism with its minions like Batista, Somoza, Gairy, and now Duarte of El Salvador that create the situations for new revolutionary explosions.

Jeronimo Carrera
CC Member, Communist Party of Venezuela

1. *Le Monde*, August 30-31, 1981.
2. *International Herald Tribune*, August 31, 1981.
3. *L'Humanité*, September 3, 1981.
4. *Granma*, September 16, 1981.
5. *International Herald Tribune*, September 10, 1981.

6. Claude Cheysson, a socialist who is currently Foreign Minister in Francois Mitterand's cabinet.
7. *International Herald Tribune*, August 18, 1981.
8. *International Herald Tribune*, September 9, 1981.
9. *International Herald Tribune*, August 22-23, 1981.



How to strengthen the working-class core

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN COMMUNISTS OF PORTUGAL AND THE FRG

Questions related to reinforcing the party's working-class core were discussed at *WMR* by Blanqui Teixeira, CC Political Commission and Secretariat member of the Portuguese Communist Party, and Werner Feldmann, GCP Board member and head of the Board's Department for Organizational and Personnel Policy of the German Communist Party. The following is a transcript.

Q. Why is it important to enlist workers into the party?

Teixeira. To begin with I should like to note that in terms of general theory the answer to this question is to be found in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In their research into the historic mission of the proletariat the classics of Marxism-Leninism substantively considered the dialectics of the relationship between the communist party, the working class, and the mass of working people. The special role played by the working class in the social revolution predicates its special place in the revolutionary party.

Our experience is that the party's potential for successful advance, even under the most difficult conditions, depends on the solidity of its links to the working class, on the strength of the working-class core of its organizations. The Portuguese Communist Party functioned underground for almost half a century. It was outlawed in 1926 following the reactionary military coup. However, throughout that period it did not relax its efforts on behalf of working-class interests, helping to promote working-class consciousness, organization and militancy. This enabled us to become a genuinely national political organization of the working people functioning nationwide. The

PCP is in fact the only democratic party that survived in Portugal under conditions of fascist rule. More, it played an inestimable role in the revolutionary process.

Fascist repression ravaged our primary organizations and took a heavy toll of life. It was not easy to restore these organizations. However, the influx of workers into the party did not cease even when persecution of communists was most ruthless. In turn, the party did all in its power to promote grass-roots initiatives. For instance, working people's committees sprang up when the Salazar regime was in power, and our party directed their work at the level of individual enterprises and even entire industries. The PCP used every opportunity for work in fascist trade unions. This explains why the Intersindical, a trade union association set up in October 1970 to coordinate the work of tens of trade unions, acted in the interests of the working people despite harassment by the authorities, despite the constant arrests of trade union leaders. After the revolution of April 1974, Intersindical was the foundation on which the nation's largest trade union association, the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People-National Intersindical, was formed.

Close interaction between the PCP and the working class was the factor behind the spreading actions of the masses for social demands, for democratic rights and freedoms, and against the colonial wars conducted by the fascist government. Taken together, this spelled out influence in various segments of society, as well as in Portugal's armed forces, who ultimately turned their guns against the regime hated by the people.

The PCP's uncompromising stand against fascism and its devotion to the cause of the working class resulted in a rapid growth of its

membership after the April Revolution. In less than three months, i.e., by July 1974, its membership had reached 15,000. Within the next three months the membership doubled, and a year after the revolution the PCP had over 100,000 members. In June 1980 the PCP had 187,018 members, of whom nearly 58 per cent were workers. Nationwide, between 8 and 9 per cent of the entire working class, roughly 10 per cent of the industrial workers, and almost 5 per cent of the rural proletariat are members of the PCP.

Moreover, these figures are an indication of our attitude to the working class as the main and leading force of social development, and of our undeviating line toward enlarging the party's working-class core.

Feldmann. In other words, it is not only a matter of definite conclusions from the lessons of history but also a problem that remains urgent for you to this day.

Teixeira. Unquestionably. There have been attempts to belittle the role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle, efforts to show that this role belongs to other segments of society. However, recent years have demonstrated the total untenability of such efforts. By its powerful actions in many countries the working class has most convincingly reiterated that it holds a special place in society and in the historical process. More than ever it has become evident that no other social force can replace it as the renewer and remaker of society.

In Portugal, after the April Revolution, some sections of intellectuals and students proclaimed that they were the sole proponents of Marxist-Leninist ideology capable of leading the workers. But they were not supported by the workers because the aims of the organization they tried to form clashed with the aspirations of those who were invited to join this organization.

Life is compelling intellectuals, other middle strata, and working people engaged in the new mass trades generated by the scientific and technological revolution to draw closer to the working class, to its stand in the struggle for democracy and social progress. Of course, the further growth of the social role played by the working class makes it imperative to draw more workers into the ranks of the PCP.

From the standpoint of the nation's most pressing problems we feel that the consolidation of the party's working-class core is a vital condition for enhancing its vanguard role in resisting the assaults of the right-wing forces on the achievements of the April Revolution, in the struggle for fundamental social change.

Feldmann. In making sure that there is a

strong working-class core in the party, our point of departure, as that of our Portuguese comrades, is mainly the status of the working class in modern society, the mission accorded to it by history. The status and role of the working class in society are predicated by the fact that it is in the center of social processes and determines their content and the direction and principal trends of development. Let me explain. The workers are the most numerous class. In the FRG there are nearly 26 million industrial and office workers and civil servants. Among them a special role is played by industrial and office workers engaged in material production, chiefly in large-scale industry. Having linked workers to more advanced and, I would say, revolutionary implements and methods of production, the scientific and technological revolution demands a higher level of education and facilitates their all-round development. This gives the working class a large role to play in both production and society. Moreover, scientific and technological progress is gigantically accelerating the socialization of production and creating a compelling need for social planning and economic management in the interests not of a handful of monopolies but of the entire working people. This change can be ensured only by the working class in alliance with other working people, for it has been and remains the most powerful organized force in opposition to state-monopoly capitalism, to the economic, social, political and spiritual enslavement of different classes and strata. Those who are oppressed and exploited by monopoly capital, who are defending social advances and democratic rights, or seeking to secure a turn toward democratic and social progress in our country are uniting around the working class.

The organization and militancy of the workers at large enterprises are the main unifying factors. While the big enterprises are centers of the economic might of industrial, banking and finance capital, they are also centers of the concentration of the working class, focal points of the class struggle, and hubs of the highest level of trade-union organization. In the FRG the most influential, developed and militant section of the working class is concentrated at the big factories.

It is indisputable that in our country every social movement that has become massive, united and effective owes this to support from the working class. In a differing degree this has been true of the past and will be true of the future. In the FRG the struggle for a policy of détente was crowned with success in 1972 when it was joined by industrial workers, who

held mass political demonstrations. The Committee for Peace, Cooperation and Disarmament, which unites various democratic forces, including the communists, has been and is able to mobilize large numbers of people only when its initiatives had or have the support of workers of big enterprises or, as is the case today, the trade unions subscribe to its demands. This was seen, for instance, when the trade unions backed the Committee's call for an Anti-War Action Day on September 1, 1980.

Teixeira. It would perhaps be worth pointing out that if retrograde views or an undeveloped social consciousness are displayed in the working-class milieu it is much more dangerous from the standpoint of social progress than analogous phenomena among other sections of society.

Feldmann. This is quite true. And one should perhaps also see two aspects in this relationship. The German Communist Party is doing everything to enable industrial workers to play the decisive role in it, for it is a party of the working class, the advanced class of our epoch. At the same time, while trying to enlist mainly industrial workers into the party, we are helping to promote their class consciousness, to develop and consolidate this consciousness in the working class of the FRG.

In the GCP, workers influence the shaping and conduct of party policy chiefly through primary organizations and production groups functioning at enterprises. We seek to reinforce the party groups mainly at production facilities employing thousands and tens of thousands of people: steel, electrical engineering (such as the Siemens plant), chemical, and car factories. For instance, the BASF chemical concern employs 50,000 people in just one of its factories, while the Volkswagen factory in Wolfsburg has 60,000 employees. Our party gives special attention to such giant factories because their workers hold key positions in the class confrontation between labor and capital — this is a decisive factor in the further development of the class struggle in the economic, political and ideological fields.

However, we cannot ignore big enterprises in the services industry such as the municipal utilities in Munich (25,000 employees), the Frankfurt airport with its 4,000 employees, or the big insurance corporations. For the communists to have large party organizations there means to win important positions in the struggle for the interests of the working class and all other working people, for peace and social progress.

Teixeira. I quite agree. Our party likewise attaches the utmost importance to enlisting

members from among workers of big factories. There are PCP cells in all sectors of the nation's industry. Our objective is that at least 10 per cent of the workers of large enterprises should be members of the PCP. At some of these enterprises between 20 and 25 per cent of the workers, in other words, one in every four or five workers, belong to the local party organizations. Let me note that our party's ninth congress was held at the people's indoor stadium of the nationalized Quimigal chemical works, which employs some 5,000 people. The party organization at the Quimigal works has over 1,000 members. Naturally, we aim to extend the party's influence at enterprises of this size, strengthen the position of the party organizations there, and enlarge the party cells. After all is said and done, they are the channels through which our ideology is spread and the party's policy is brought home to the working people.

I agree with you, comrade Feldmann, that priority attention to industrial workers does not mean that the party ignores working people of other categories. I am mentioning this because there is working-class clannishness in some party organizations. We censure this clannishness and try to win the support of people employed in the administrative apparatus, technical services and other fields.

A long-standing aim of the PCP is to have more influence among the peasants. This is not easy and the problem still remains to be resolved: so far only 1.8 per cent of the peasants are in our ranks. Further, we are taking vigorous steps to enlist new members from the women's and youth movements, and get a stronger foothold among artisans and small and medium shopkeepers and factory owners who share progressive views and take a democratic stand.

The party has to strengthen its influence everywhere. There is no contradiction between this orientation of its work and the fact that a basic task of the communists is to reinforce links with the working class.

Feldmann. The GCP likewise strives to unite the most diverse forces in the struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and socialism. Communists working at large enterprises act as a unifying factor and strengthen the core of every democratic alliance and the alliance as a whole, and this helps to attain our common goals. The more workers we enlist into our party the greater will be the opportunities for unity of action by the working class at factories, in trade unions, and in the democratic alliances springing up in various spheres of public life. Unity of action, you will agree, helps the work-

ing people to secure the satisfaction of their grievances more successfully. Consequently, strengthening the party by enlisting industrial workers into it conforms directly with the interests of all working people, of all the forces of democracy and peace.

In this dialogue considerable mutual interest was shown in the concrete experience of the parties concerned in the question of how to strengthen the working-class core of a communist organization.

Feldmann. When we speak of enlisting workers or other working people into the party it must be noted that this is not merely a question of the way we go about it. It would have been a simple matter if there were a direct dependence between an improvement of the efficacy of our work and a growth of the influx of new members. In practice things are much more complicated. Much depends on the party's place and role in society's life, the character of its relationship with the masses, its political line at different stages of the struggle, its organizational and ideological principles, the features of its structure and inner-party democracy, and the ability of the communists to discern the dialectical link between life's objective requirements and their subjective potentials for meeting these requirements. The essential factors here include the alignment of class and political forces in the country itself and on the international scene, the overall ideological situation in the country, and the impact of the historical past. One way or another, everything is interrelated and affects the growth of the party.

The GCP, which presently has somewhat under 50,000 members, is a small party relative to the numerical strength of the working class in the FRG. But this by no means signifies that the standard of our work among the people has been low or that our methods have been unsuitable. On the contrary, our party's policy has an effective influence in many areas of the social struggle and in many social movements. The sources of the difficulties lie elsewhere.

To begin with there is a historically-shaped bias, which, however great our efforts, makes it difficult to enlist new members into the GCP. Immediately after fascism's defeat by the Soviet Union in the Second World War the communists in West Germany found that because they had been active in the anti-fascist movement they were regarded as alien elements. The attitude of the Communist Party was seen by many people as anti-national because German fascism was smashed not from within the nation but from without, as a result of the defeat of nazi Germany at the hands of an external force,

of which the communists were allies. To this day this negative thinking on the part of a section of the population and also the mass dissemination of anti-communism and of the "communist threat" lie seriously obstruct our work. As a matter of fact this is precisely why in the field of education the Communist Party is demanding the restoration of truth in FRG historiography, so that school textbooks should correctly explain this period of German history, the reasons why the fascists were able to come to power, the consequences of their rule on the people, and fascism's responsibility for starting the Second World War.

While being active in the anti-fascist movement and in the struggle for peace, the GCP accentuates the national aspect of its policy. For example, it points out that the purpose of the actions against the NATO decision to deploy new U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe is to prevent a nuclear war and the destruction of our country, which would be inevitable if such a war broke out. Consequently, these actions are in harmony with vital national interests. This attitude is finding a response among the people. Nevertheless, it is not easy to surmount the bias created by bourgeois ideology relative to the Communist Party.

It would be proper to add that the mass media in the FRG — television, radio and the big newspapers — strongly influence public opinion by their incessant anti-communism. They preach anti-communism more and more subtly and more and more intensively in order to obstruct our efforts to achieve a speedy growth of the party's ranks. We have to spend much of our effort countering the anti-communist line of the bourgeois parties and the reformist influence of right-wing social democracy in the working-class movement, in the trade unions. Further, our work is complicated by the adventures of leftist groups that discredit communist ideals in the eyes of the people.

Every party is judged above all by what it does and by what it can accomplish. Naturally, people join a political organization more willingly when they believe it can achieve much. Since we are a relatively small party, it is especially important that we enlist industrial workers and show them that precisely the GCP most fully and consistently articulates the interests of workers. The workers' line of reasoning should be that even if the GCP is a small party it gives them the largest opportunities to uphold their demands as the demands of their class. Needless to say, everyone should see for himself that the GCP perseveringly pursues a policy that best of all accords with the interests of the working class, of all working people.

In our campaigns to enlist new members we encounter the need to surmount prejudices relative to existing socialism. This is due, in particular, to the fact that the FRG is at the junction, as it were, between two opposing social systems. For many people only a visit to the GDR or another socialist country gives the final impulse to join our party. Naturally, anti-communist prejudices are not destroyed merely by a visit, merely by crossing a frontier. A person must have the desire to learn as much as he can about what socialism is like in reality, in life, of what its actual problems are, and how it resolves them in the interests of the people. We are doing all we can to encourage this desire.

Despite the difficulties, the GCP membership is growing and it is winning ever greater influence among the people. Evidence of this is the fact that increasing numbers of workers and members of other classes and strata of society are joining our ranks and contributing to the struggle for deep-going changes.

Teixeira. Of course, a lucid, precise and consistent policy is of decisive significance in clearing the way for the growth of the party ranks and for the enhancement of its prestige among the people. But the methods used by the communists in the struggle for the working class are nonetheless also significant.

Although in Portugal the situation is in many respects different than in the FRG, an intensive propaganda offensive is also being conducted against us, and in their efforts to enlarge the party ranks the communists encounter difficulties. I have already mentioned the heightened post-April activity of those sections of intellectuals and students that are especially receptive to petty-bourgeois ideology. In their rhetoric addressed to the workers, members of these sections alleged that they were Marxist-Leninists, and, laying claim to leadership of the working-class movement, endeavored to form their own "workers" party in opposition to the PCP. This is a clear indication that some circles in Portugal are out to tear the working class away from the genuinely proletarian political organization that is firmly and uncompromisingly championing its interests.

The party has done much in the way of exposing leftist groups, adventurers and demagogues. We have shown that the leftists not only misrepresent the tenets of Marxist-Leninist theory about the role of the party and the working class in the revolutionary process but, in fact, conduct the same sort of divisive activity among the working people as the bourgeois parties and the right-wing social democrats. In open ideological clashes at the factories the communists have shown the true

face of those who are using the cover of concern for the working class for no other purpose than to make political capital for themselves. This struggle has yielded results. At the latest presidential elections the leftists suffered an overwhelming defeat — their slogans were rejected by the working people. It is indicative that those who called themselves "champions of working-class interests" in fact came out in support of the fascist candidate for the office of president arguing that his election would create conditions conducive to unity among the left opposition forces. As a matter of fact it is typical that the stand of the left extremists and that of the ultra-rights, especially in the question of fighting the Marxist-Leninist party and countering its influence in the working-class movement, are on many points similar and coincidental.

Also, there is a difficulty of another kind. The reactionary forces in our country, the government, and the Socialist Party want to split the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People. Over the past few years steps have been taken to form a new trade-union association as a counterbalance to the General Confederation. We are categorically opposed to attempts to sow division in the trade union movement. This is a question of principle in the class struggle of the workers and all other working people of Portugal. The present GCPWP is a powerful force. It unites 93 per cent of the nation's industrial workers, 79 per cent of the transport workers, 52 per cent of the people employed in the services industry, 36 per cent of the persons engaged in art and culture, and also engineers, technicians and other intellectuals.

The party regards the struggle for unity in the trade union movement as an important element of its work. In the course of this struggle we win to our side technical specialists, cadre of the administrative apparatus and people employed at enterprises linked to agriculture. We are gradually laying the ground for setting up our organizations where they are as yet non-existent. The PCP has considerable influence in the most developed industrial regions. But even in these regions there are some small and medium enterprises where we have not yet been able to set up primary organizations.

Much remains to be done to draw members of the women's and youth movements into the party. True, the proportion of women in the PCP is steadily growing, and today stands at 21.1 per cent. One-third of the party membership are young people. In addition to the Communist Party there is the Communist Youth of Portugal, which is an independent organiza-

tion. But there is much in common between its and our aims. In spirit and tasks it is the closest to us. Moreover, it is a major source of new members of our party. For the record let me note that nearly 10 per cent of its members are simultaneously members of the PCP.

It must be noted that there is a preponderance of communists of the older generation in places where the party has enjoyed prestige among the people for a long time. In areas where our influence is only recent the composition of the party membership is younger. We should evidently reinforce our work in areas where age imbalances are to be observed in party organizations.

Feldmann. When I said work methods were not the only elements needed for successfully enlarging the party ranks I wanted to emphasize the danger of a simplified approach to this matter. The party's political guidelines, the specific methods of work employed by it, and even the objectives on which it concentrates its efforts unquestionably influence both the numerical and qualitative growth of our organizations. In this sense the program adopted by the GCP congress in Mannheim serves as a sure compass. The activities of the German Communist Party are concentrated at the factories. This is varied work. Most of the party organizations issue their own factory newspapers. These cast light on the situation at the factories, work out alternatives to management decisions and provide the arguments in support of the demands of the workers and trade unions, notably, for higher pay. Many of these are monthlies, others — bimonthlies. Moreover, tabloids are published for specific urban districts or residential areas. In these publications as well, the GCP puts forward and substantiates its recommendations on ways and means of championing workers' rights and grievances. Alongside *Unsere Zeit*, the central newspaper, these tabloids have become a major instrument in the struggle for support from the people.

By their personal example, initiatives, readiness to act and staunchness, the communists are accomplishing much in elective posts as representatives of the working people. Many communists are elected members of factory production councils, representatives of trade unions and youth delegates. They have wide opportunities for contacts with workers, can take the floor at general meetings of production collectives, and are, if necessary, able to present our stand on social issues. Here the communists address all workers and are known to them. The same may be said of meetings of trade union representatives at the factories. In

reply to the question why they wanted to join the party, many new members said that they were strongly impressed by the words and actions of our comrades at the factories. The actions of the communists and acquaintance with them are frequently the impulse that ultimately leads workers to the party.

Our comrades protest against any anti-worker actions by management, often using simple but persuasive means. For example, at one factory several workers chained themselves to their machine-tools, thereby demonstrating that they would not leave jobs subject to elimination under that factory's rationalization plan. These determined forms of protest show who are indeed selflessly fighting for workers' rights.

Party organizations strive to create a circle of sympathizers around themselves and then draw them more and more actively into their work. In the period during which these people draw closer to the party they attend our meetings and take part in our activities.

Many workers and students, notably from the Socialist German Working Youth and also from the Spartacus Marxist Students' Union, are joining the GCP. These organizations are close to our party, but their activists by no means automatically join the GCP. The young communists in the SGWY and Spartacus Union have to work purposefully to that end. Here the difficulty is that we have to deal with people who are only still looking for their road in life and are inexperienced. For instance, it is by no means clear to every young worker why workers should organize in the Communist Party. Also, we should not discount the fact that social democracy still influences the working class, shaping reformist thought and conduct. The Social Democratic Party of Germany orients the workers on "social partnership," on "class harmony," with the result that a segment of the working class believes that radical changes can be put through without a class struggle. Our aim is to enhance the influence of the GCP, give questioning workers, including young workers, accurate answers to questions advanced by society's life, and show them that the road indicated by the communists is correct.

Teixeira. To what you have said, comrade Feldmann, I should add: and show the workers and other sections of the working people how the party itself lives. The best way for this, in our view, is to hold open meetings of communists. The PCP usually invites all sympathizers and supporters to such meetings. These consider specific political situations and the actions of the party cell concerned. Sympathizers thus have the opportunity to see the

vinist circles catering for the interests of monopoly capital.

Way to unity

The communists' line of uniting all those who oppose military gambles, the seizure of the territories of others, national oppression and trampling of democratic freedoms is not a tactical move but a fundamental line stemming from an in-depth analysis of the concrete realities in Israel.

That line was most vividly embodied in the establishment over four years ago of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, on the Communist Party's initiative. The theses of the CPI's 19th congress noted that the emergence of the DFPE was "a new socio-political phenomenon in Israel, the beginning of a new alignment of forces . . ."⁹

The Front has been able to reach across to the Jewish masses, introducing a fundamentally new element in the streets of Jewish towns and villages. The comrades we talked to frankly admitted that the communists found it much harder to work among the Jewish population than among the Arabs, with whom their standing was much higher. The reasons are clear: the strong pressure of Zionist ideology, anti-Arab chauvinism, militarism and anti-communism still hold considerable sections of Israeli Jews in spiritual captivity. Another factor making itself felt is directly described in Lenin's words: "To a certain degree, the workers of the oppressor nations are partners of their own bourgeoisie in plundering the workers (and the population) of the oppressed nations" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 56).

The Front helped to breach the wall of isolation with which the Zionists are trying to surround the Jewish population. The wall, it must be said, is also being shaken from the other side as well. The Black Panthers, which became the CPI's partner in the Democratic Front, are active in the poor quarters inhabited mostly by Jews of Asian and African extraction, or sefarim, as they are called.¹⁰ The Black Panthers' leader, Charlie Biton, whom we met in Jerusalem, told us how his organization was set up, about its goals and methods. We also touched upon the widely, somewhat scandalously, known Black Panthers' actions such as the free distribution of expropriated milk to the poor or the capture of a colonial settlement in the occupied territories. Driving home his words with gestures, Biton said:

"For us it is above all an expression of protest, a way to attract attention to the plight of the slum dwellers. We want people to understand that their enemies are not the Arab workers and

fellahin but the big capitalists, who profit from war and the occupation. So long as the Arabs are discriminated against, so long as their rights are being violated, the Jewish poor cannot hope for a better deal. All the deprived have the same enemy. We must act together. That is why we have so readily responded to the Communist Party's call to form a Democratic Front."

In the struggle for peace and democracy, the communists seek to cooperate with all who can and want to take part in it, whatever their ideology. This also applies to the adherents of the Zionist ideology in the "Peace Now" movement, the United Workers' Party (MAPAM), and other groups. The Front is not an ideological but a political organization. "That does not mean," the Israeli comrades explained, "that we avoid ideological disputes within the Front. The Marxist-Leninist world view is incompatible with the ideology of Zionism. But regardless of ideological differences there can be unity of action of the Democratic Front on the basis of its program."

Its dedicated pursuit of this line has enabled the Front to unite the most consistent Jewish supporters of the interests of the working class and the other working people, some progressive-minded students, intellectuals and members of the petty bourgeoisie. Among the Arabs, the Front commands the allegiance of a sizable part of the working class, the peasantry, students, intellectuals, the middle strata and some members of the bourgeoisie, in short, a majority of the people.

"The Front's winning of dominant positions among the Arab population has an objective basis," said Tawfiq Zayad. "The social class structure of that section of the population has undergone radical changes in a short period, in just over three decades. Because the Arabs have been forcibly stripped of their land, the share of wage workers among them has sharply increased: in Arab villages and towns today it is well above 70 per cent. Hence the steady erosion of the narrow clannishness which has given way to a feeling of belonging to a wider entity, the Palestinian Arab people."

The fact that the communists play the central role in the Front does not mean that it is merely a front for the CPI, as bourgeois propaganda sometimes maintains. For example, as a result of the 1978 municipal elections the DFPE got 19 of its candidates elected mayors of municipalities, but only seven of them were communists. Of DFPE's five seats in the ninth Knesset, the Communist Party had three. And in the latest parliamentary elections, the third candidate of the Front's list was Charlie Biton, who

was elected to the Knesset, where the DFPE won four seats.

The communists are the best organized and most dedicated force within the Democratic Front. They have to work a great deal, and it is exceedingly hard work. This is what we were told by Ahmed Saad, member of the municipal council of the Abu-Snan village and CC Secretary of the Young Communists of Israel:

"All our comrades, whatever their party duties, are constantly in the thick of the masses. Every day we talk to people, argue with and persuade them. We must be active, organized and convinced of the justice of our cause if we are to win the hearts of others, to win them over to our side."

Work within the front has required some change not only of the practical methods but also mentality. Some old stereotypes which worked in dealings with like-minded people but were unsuitable in relations with allies had to be broken. These adjustments did not and do not come easily.

"The main danger we have to combat today," says Jamal Musa, alternate member of the CC Political Bureau CPI, and Secretary of the Acca Party organization, "is the sectarian trend, the inability and unwillingness to find common ground, to arrange cooperation without displaying ossified intolerance of the views of others, something that puts off potential allies."

Elaborating on the idea, Nimr Murkus says: "We must approach those who are outside the Front for the time being not in terms of their political past but with an understanding of the fact that in the present complex and dangerous conditions it is imperative to achieve unity on the broadest possible basis in order to counter

the sway of chauvinism and militarism."

Imbued as they are with a sense of responsibility for the fate of their country, the communists reach out to all those who, in spite of different ideologies and political sympathies, see the sinister threat engendered by the ruling circles' policy and are prepared to fight against it. This is the thrust of the party congress' slogan: "The Way Out: Israeli-Palestinian Peace. The Way to it: the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality." It sums up the CPI's genuinely patriotic and consistently internationalist policy. Combining faithful service to the class interests of the working people and tireless struggle for the democratic demands of the people, it is blazing the trail toward a future free of hostility, hatred and bloodshed.

1. Meir Vilner. "Peace in the Middle East: a sheet anchor for Israel." *WMR*, April 1977; Tawfiq Toubi, "Paving the way to equality and progress," *WMR*, July 1981.

2. *Al-Ittihad*, May 5, 1981 (in Arabic).

3. 1 dunam = 1,000 sq. m.

4. Property allocated under Islamic law for religious or charity purposes.

5. Deputy General Secretary of the CPI CC Tawfiq Toubi is an Arab by nationality.

6. *Al-Ittihad*, March 3, 1981 (in Arabic).

7. The millionaire deputy of the ninth Knesset was convicted, in *absentia*, by a French court on charges of financial machinations. In the spring of 1981, the district court in Jerusalem sentenced him to nine months imprisonment for bribing voters. Even so, his name was again on the list of candidates in the latest parliamentary elections.

8. RAKAH (The New Communist List) — the name under which the CP Israel at one time carried on its election campaigns.

9. Theses of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, 1981, p. 77.

10. Sefardim, who account for more than half the country's Jewish population, are the victims of cruel discrimination in jobs, education, housing, etc.

End arbitrary acts!

Since May of this year, Turkey has been swept by a wave of arrests among members of the progressive forces, including members of the Communist Party and its sympathizers. Reports of these arrests have been carried by the major bourgeois newspapers. According to these reports, between 1,400 and 2,000 persons have been arrested as a result of a police operation code-named "Red Lantern." The military authorities also made an official announcement of these arrests. According to them 172 members of our party have been arrested in Adana, 254 in Kocaeli, 34 in Istanbul, 206 in Ankara, and 46 in Antalya and Balikesir.

More and more reports have been reaching the public about torture in the prison cells. In 14 cases, this had to be recognized by the National Security Council. Among those tortured to death is Ahmet Hilmi Feyzioglu, a young lawyer of the Metal Workers' Union and an active fighter for peace. Only in the past few months, hundreds of prisoners have been forced, under torture, to sign prepared "testimony" which "confirms" their membership of the CPT, a party now under ban for 59 years.

A ban has been imposed on the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Trade Unions (DISK), which has more than half a

million members. Its leaders now face death. Members of the board of the Central Association of Peasant Cooperatives (KOY-KOOP) are being put on trial merely for representing the interests of 2,380 cooperatives with more than 2.5 million members — and the authorities intend to jail them for terms of between 8 and 15 years. At the trial of 64 leaders of the Teachers' Union (TÖB-DER), with nearly 200,000 members, the military prosecution has demanded that they should be deprived of their freedom for periods between 5 and 20 years, merely for standing up for the trade union rights of teachers. At a trial in Istanbul, 10 members of the Progressive Youth League (IGD) are faced with imprisonment for a period of up to 36 years merely for being members of that organization.

Fifty-eight repressive laws abolishing many basic rights and freedoms have been put into effect or have been drafted. Prominent figures, like Behice Boran, President of the Workers' Party of Turkey, have been stripped of their citizenship. More than 100 newspapers and journals have been banned. On the anniversary

of the military coup, the National Security Council announced that within the year 10 persons had been executed, 459 had died in armed clashes with the security forces, and 70,746 persons had been detained by the police, with 20,365 of them arrested. According to the foreign bourgeois press, the number of those arrested comes to 50,000, and of those detained by the police — to 140,000.

International solidarity can play a big role in helping to put an end to the repression against the democratic forces of Turkey. Protests within the country and abroad have already forced the authorities to halve — from 90 to 45 days — the period between arrest and trial, that is, the period in which the prisoner is in the hands of his executioners without any control. This first success, however small, shows the importance of such a struggle.

An end to the torture!

Freedom for the democrats arrested in Turkey!

Kemal Kervan,
CP Turkey representative on WMR

Comrades under threat of death

On September 12 it was learned that Gerardo Cuesta, Secretary of the National Convention of Working People and Executive Committee member of the Communist Party of Uruguay, died in the Libertad prison at the age of 64.

He was always courageous in championing the interests of workers and was active in the struggle for trade union unity. In February 1976 he was imprisoned by the dictatorial regime and cruelly tortured. But he refused to renounce his ideals, remaining faithful to his class duty, people and party. Imprisonment finally broke his health. The government turned a deaf ear to the warnings that Gerardo Cuesta's life was in danger, rejecting the demand of international opinion for his release.

So another death has been added to the record of the Uruguayan dictators. A similar fate awaits many other political and trade union leaders: Alberto Altesor, who has a serious heart disease, Rosario Pietrarroia and Hector Rodriguez, who are gravely ill, General Liber Seregni, Jaime Perez, José Luis Massera, and hundreds of other political prisoners.

The communists of Uruguay call upon people of good will to declare their solidarity with the Uruguayan patriots, to demand their immediate release.

Manuel Perez,
Leadership Member,
Communist Party of Uruguay

New experience

HALLMARKS OF THE STRUGGLE FOR MASS SUPPORT

Benjamin Degen
Political Bureau Member,
Swiss Party of Labor

Q. Would you say a few words about your party's activities among workers of large factories?

The Swiss Party of Labor has always attached significance to expanding its influence among the working people, notably among workers of the nation's large-scale industry. The aims of the communists cannot be achieved without the latter's confidence, without their active support. The question of the party's links to the working class is especially acute today in view of the deep crisis of capitalist society.

Over the past 10 years, let alone 20 years, much has altered in the conditions of our struggle for the masses. The structural changes in the capitalist economy have dramatically recast the social make-up of Switzerland. There have been significant modifications in the composition of the working class. The number of wage workers is growing steadily and has already reached nearly 90 per cent of the gainfully employed population. However, of these, roughly 40 per cent are industrial workers. Further, the proportion of skilled workers is steadily diminishing at the large factories. In the 1950s, for instance, skilled workers comprised between 75 and 80 per cent of the labor force at heavy engineering facilities; today their proportion has dropped to 20 per cent. Of the roughly 1,500,000 industrial workers, one-fourth are women and one-third are foreign workers. At the big factories four out of every five workers are now either apprentices or unskilled laborers, and these are mainly foreigners. Exhausting and monotonous work and constant overtime, including on days off, have fallen to their lot. Most of them are not unionized and are denied many of the rights and freedoms enjoyed by Swiss skilled workers. We thus have a situation in which most of the personnel of big factories are virtually disinherited workers.

Take my home town of Basel, which is one of the nation's industrial centers. There are few Swiss at its factories. Most of the workers are foreigners, including French people and West

Germans from adjacent regions. They commute to Switzerland daily. Baseliens of both the younger and older generations are employed chiefly in administrative institutions, banks, insurance companies, and distributive and advertising firms. Some young Swiss work at small enterprises or workshops, where, as a rule, there is no trade union.

What caused these changes. The essence of monopoly policy is to make the largest profit by simplifying production operations and employing unskilled labor wherever possible. Moreover, this policy is aimed at eroding the struggle of the working class for its rights. At the big factories the owners oppose skilled Swiss working people, the most organized and militant section of the nation's working class, with large numbers of "temporary" foreign workers. They seek to use the enormous disparity between the wages of Swiss and foreign workers as a barrier to unity of action by them.

This policy creates considerable difficulties for the party, for its work, making it hard to extend its influence and win new members. What are we doing to cope with these difficulties? The party urges workers — regardless of nationality, sex, training and so on — to unite for their common aims. In establishing contact with foreign workers at the big factories we stress that they have to act jointly with their Swiss comrades against the arbitrary actions of the owners. Among Swiss workers we emphasize in the trade unions, at election campaigns, and during nationwide plebiscites that there must be solidarity with foreign comrades. The party press — the newspapers *Vorwärts*, *Voix Ouvrière*, and *Il Lavoratore* — is used extensively to state the party's stand in defense of the interests of foreign workers and all Swiss working people. We uncompromisingly expose those who spread chauvinistic views and sentiments among Swiss workers and who thereby aid and abet the divisive policy pursued by big capital. We attach great importance to coordinating the struggle of blue and white-collar workers for their common interests.

Although many of our efforts have not yet brought palpable results, working people are beginning to listen more and more often to the communists. One of our party's cardinal tasks is to enlarge the number of such people and win their support.

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

FORMATIVE PERIOD

"Among the foreign guests at the second congress of the Communist Party of Cuba there were representatives from the United People's Movement in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. I would like to have some information about that organization."

Raúl Garcia, Cuba

The following reply is by Renwick Rose, one of the leaders of the United People's Movement in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

The United People's Movement is a vanguard political organization adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and advocating a socialist orientation for the development of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.* The United People's Movement became a party recently, in 1980. But its emergence has a history of its own.

In 1974 several small progressive groups merged to form the Youlou United Liberation Movement, which began publishing the newspaper *Freedom*. At its first convention in 1975 the movement officially proclaimed that it was a Marxist-Leninist organization. In the following year we adopted a minimum program, which charted a course toward anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist-oriented development for the country. This program took the existing conditions into account, including the low level of economic development, the low level of the people's political consciousness, and the numerically small working class.

In a coalition with two other organizations (a small rural organization of peasants and a group consisting of people of the middle strata, intellectuals) YULIMO took part in the 1979 general elections. The coalition adopted the name of United People's Movement. Lacking material resources, it was unable to counter the massive anti-communist propaganda of the ruling Labor Party, which by fraud, bribery and violence obtained 11 of the 13 seats in the parliament (two seats were won by the opposition New Democratic Party). The election system is such that it does not mirror the actual mood of the electorate. The left-wing coalition, for instance, failed to win a seat although it got 15 per cent of the vote. However, the very fact that many of our fellow countrymen voted for it is as a big achievement and provided a sound basis for a political struggle.

*Saint Vincent and the Grenadines are a nation that became independent in 1979. Situated on Saint Vincent Island and the Northern Grenadines in the Caribbean, it has an area of 389 square kilometers and a population of 113,000 (1977). — Ed.

The alliance in our movement was strengthened after we had purged it of imperialism's agents and as a result of the reorganization in August of last year. That turned the United People's Movement from a coalition into a close-knit party.

The UPM consists mainly of young workers and peasants, some intellectuals, and also people working in the services industry. Despite innumerable obstacles we have significantly enlarged the party's social base. It is structured according to groups formed in each of the 13 constituencies. Each group has two or three representatives in the party's General Council, which meets three times a year to review what has been done and draw up plans for the future. The National Executive Committee, the party's central organ, consists of 10 members. It meets once a month. Day-to-day work is supervised by a Coordinating Committee consisting of four leading officials.

Formerly in our country there were no political parties functioning permanently as political organizations. They were formed only for the period of elections. The UPM was the first to function on a permanent basis. It is a small party, but some mass organizations are linked to it, notably the Women's Democratic Organization and the Vanguard Youth. Quite a few of our comrades hold leading posts in trade unions.

The UPM believes that in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines elections are at present the main avenue of struggle. While we do not rule out other methods, we employ peaceful, legal means. We engage in the most diverse forms of work. We regularly sponsor public meetings and arrange wide discussions of national problems with the involvement of people from all over the country. We regard protest actions as an important way of mobilizing people to fight for their demands. An example is the campaign, sponsored by us, to compel the government to send relief to areas hit by a devastating hurricane. In this campaign we organized demonstrations and pickets and conducted explanatory work among the people.

Generally speaking we attach great significance to agitation and propaganda. Our activists go to the most remote villages to show the people the causes of the economic troubles facing them and the ways of overcoming these. The UPM publishes the daily newspaper *Justice* and puts out leaflets.

A right-wing bourgeois government came to power two years ago when Saint Vincent and the Grenadines became independent. The nation still enjoys some democratic freedoms and

we are trying to take full advantage of this. However, we have no illusions about the government and its links to imperialism. Nor is there any guarantee that as the political struggle intensifies the government is not going to become repressive.

The situation in the Caribbean is a very complex one. After the Grenada and Nicaraguan revolutions a tide of progressive changes swept across our region, particularly in the Eastern Caribbean. The democratic Labor Party came to power in Saint Lucia. The dictator Patrick John has been deposed in Dominica. In this situation imperialism and its minions began an offensive. On the eve of the 1979 elections the right-wing forces in our country received considerable foreign financial and propaganda support, which enabled them to win the elec-

tions. The same thing was done in Dominica and Antigua, and then, on a larger scale, methods of "winning" elections were employed in Jamaica.

Lately, the right-wing forces have strengthened their positions here and there. However, the revolutionary movement has large potentials on many Caribbean islands. It is growing increasingly obvious that the pro-imperialist governments are unable to solve the problems confronting the peoples. We think that the 1980s hold many prospects for the liberation struggle in the Caribbean. There has always been mutual solidarity among the revolutionary movements of our region. However, there is a pressing need for closer cooperation among the progressive and democratic forces in the Caribbean for we have a common enemy.



Concerning the dialectics of categories

International Study Group

The methodology used to obtain a knowledge of social life is of essential importance in the present-day ideological struggle, and the acute nature of the theoretical clashes in this sphere is understandable. After all this involves a special type of cognition, one which affects not just the truth, but also the interests of all the classes. The results of such cognition are necessarily determined by its party orientation and the choice of one of two philosophical world outlooks: the scientific ideology of the working class, and the bourgeois system of views.

However, the sphere of methodology relating to the uniformities and logic underlying the formation of new knowledge in science and the role of the various cognitive techniques used in research is a highly special one. That is why it is hardly accidental that the bourgeois mass media prefer to attack that aspect of the methodology of scientific cognition which appears in forms that are more accessible to the everyday consciousness. Battles are joined over problems which apparently have a bearing above all on terminology: the "true meaning" of categor-

ies reflecting various aspects of social life, what are and what are not "democracy" and "dictatorship," "revolution" and "reform," "internationalism" and "nationalism," "intervention" and "aid," "civil society" and "the state," "military bloc" and "nonalignment" and so on and so forth. The content with which the participants in the ideological polemics invest such concepts is so different that one frequently has the impression that they have totally different phenomena and processes in mind.

However, behind the arguments about terms and words one cannot but discern the urge of bourgeois ideology to discredit and to destroy the conceptual apparatus of modern social science or to infiltrate diverse preconceptions about the categories used in science, by distorting their content. Here, some ground is occupied by obscurantism which is at the basis of the innumerable myths and clichés which bourgeois propaganda seeks to implant.

The communists devote attention to methodological problems, including the theoretical instruments of cognition, consist-

ing of the categories worked out by social science, not only as a part of the task of ideologically enlightening the masses and safeguarding and spreading scientific, Marxist knowledge. Another important reason for their concern with these problems is also the present state of the Marxist-Leninist science. It is not just an aggregation of its theoretical results, but also a ramified international social institution carrying on research on the broadest front and concentrated in many independent centers across the world.

The requirements of social practice have confronted Marxist scientists with the need to analyze the new and original facts and trends in social development and the peculiar situations in various countries. This involves facts, trends and situations which are very important and which relate — as the experience of scientific creative endeavor shows — to fundamental conclusions in theory implying its further development. In the comprehension of the new historical material, questions and difficulties also arise which are connected with the application of the conceptual apparatus of theory to the analysis of concrete reality. Inability to cope with these could result in inadequately grounded inferences and even in altogether erroneous conclusions capable of slowing down the progress of science and producing negative social consequences whenever such conclusions are taken as reference points for political action.

Socio-political categories, which reflect and establish various aspects and uniformities of the whole huge superstructure arising out of economic social relations, have a special place within the conceptual apparatus of social theory. These categories are more directly connected with the practice of the class struggle and the activity of the parties. For that reason in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism they naturally come to the forefront, both of the ideological contest and of scientific research probing for strategies of revolutionary transformation.

The WMR Commission for General Problems of Theory has held a methodological seminar by an international study group on the subject: "Concerning the Nature of Socio-Political Categories." Among those who took part in the discussion were: *Roland Bauer* (SUPG), *Samuel Behak* (CP Uruguay), *Raul Valdes Vivo* (CP Cuba), *Georgi Girginov* (Bulgarian CP), *Manuel Delgado* (PVP Costa Rica), *Kemal Kervan* (CP Turkey), *Jeronime Carrera* (CP Venezuela), *José Lava* (CP Philippines), *Thomas O'Flaherty* (CP Ireland),

Leonardo Paso (CP Argentina), *Vusizwe Seme* (South African CP), *Cezar Perez* (Dominican CP), *Felipe Rodriguez* (CP Bolivia), *Clement Rohee* (PPP Guyana), *Ahmed Salem* (CP Sudan), *Agamemnon Stavrou* (AKEL), *Satiajaya Sudiman* (CP Indonesia), *James West* (CP USA), *Robert Francis* (CP Belgium), and *Zaki Khairi* (Iraqi CP). Below are some of the results of their exchange of views as prepared by the Commission's working group.

I

The class approach to the study of social phenomena is organic to the Marxist-Leninist methodology. It is not something that is external to it; nor is it determined by the researcher's subjective aspirations. This approach springs from the specifics of the subject-matter — the class society — and is also determined by the nature of the conceptual apparatus being used in its analysis: in contrast to natural science categories, socio-political categories have a class content.

But this qualitative specific does not at all lie on the surface. The establishment of the class content of socio-political categories is an intricate problem. Thus, it turns out that the isolated study of a phenomenon or a process, however detailed and exhaustive it may be (and that is a necessary element of cognition) does not yet help to show its class content. The point is that this approach leaves apart the connections of the phenomenon or process with the concrete whole, with the actual social system within which it alone acquires the qualitative peculiarity, the concrete historical, class content. Lenin remarked that "the individual exists only in the connection that leads to the universal" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 361).

Hence the prime and most important requirement established by the Marxist methodology: the class content, the meaning, the function of socio-political categories can be comprehended only if each of these is not taken by itself, in isolation, but in reference to the fundamental concept of socio-economic formation underlying the Marxist theory of society.

Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that as a given formation develops, the diversity of social relations, processes and phenomena are subordinated to the concrete whole which it represents. They enter into interdependencies conditioned by that whole and are transformed in accordance with the laws determining its functions and development. In consequence of this "subordination," all the elements of the society in effect acquire the class specifics

determined by each concrete formation.

Unless they are based on a real social system, a concrete formation, socio-political categories can and do actually become objects of manipulation: they are mechanically combined, disjointed and joined in the most diverse combinations and transferred from one social system to another. But in that case, the categories lose their substantial connection with the whole and cease to be instruments of scientific research. Indeed, their arbitrary combinations produce a distorted copy of the reality.

The most typical departure from this methodological rule is the treatment of socio-political categories as some kind of absolute entities purged of transient and historically rooted specific features and existing over and above the existing socio-economic formations. That is the origin, for instance, of the category of "democracy in general" characterizing the form of political rule independent of the class content of the state (participation by citizens in elections and administration, their equality before the law, the juridical formalization of the individual's rights and freedoms, etc.). This most general and formal concept is, of course, of some cognitive value, whenever it is considered in the context of concrete historical conditions. But it fails to show precisely the most substantial aspects of democracy, whose real content is bound up with the nature of the social system, of the formation.

Moreover, when such an abstract concept is taken as the basis of theoretical constructs from which an effort is made to derive its properties, all the actually existing democracies appear as modifications of that abstraction but deprived of their class substance. That is the origin, for instance, of the notions about a "non-bourgeois state under capitalism."

In methodological terms, such notions return us to the speculative philosophy which science has long since overcome. Briefly, its substance was the presentation of things existing in reality as simple forms of the existence of some "substances." For instance, the "substance" of the apple and the pear is the "fruit in general." Exposing the underlying meaning of operations by speculative philosophers, Marx wrote that "the apples, pears, almonds and raisins which we rediscover in the speculative world are nothing but semblances of apples, semblances of pears, semblances of almonds and semblances of raisins, for they are moments in the life of 'the Fruit,' this abstract creation of the mind, and therefore themselves abstract creations of the mind."¹ The "supra-class state" and similar notions are likewise abstract products of the mind, similarly illusory

institutions originating from the "democracy in general" abstraction existing only in the imagination.

One has to recall the mysteries of the speculative construction because its products keep penetrating into the working-class movement. One example coming to the fore lately is the concept of "employer" invented by bourgeois propaganda. Its initial purpose was to prevent the workers from comprehending the exploitive relations in capitalist production by presenting the capitalist as a benefactor who provides jobs. It was subsequently taken up by the ideologists of counter-revolution seeking to distort the content of labor relations under socialism. This concept is now designed to smear the socialist state, presenting it as an institution allegedly ranged against the interests of the workers.

Such operations are also performed with categories which characterize international phenomena. Take the problem of the confrontation of the two military-political blocs — NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Their antithetical class nature is clearly brought out by the nature of the alliances (aggressive and defensive), by their membership (imperialist powers, on the one hand, and socialist countries, on the other), and also by their political purposes, as expressed in their diametrically opposite foreign-policy lines and strategies. What is more, the very confrontation of these blocs is not merely a product of the class struggle in the international arena, but is a specific form of it. It is specific, first, because it involves efforts by socialism to avert a world war by checking the aggressive moves of imperialism through a strengthening of the socialist countries' defense capability and their armed forces. It is specific, second, because this form of struggle has itself been imposed by imperialism. Socialism, having been forced to accept it, wants and seeks to switch the class struggle into other forms which rule out military confrontation and entail disarmament.

This view is countered by the suggestion that countries which are members of blocs, regardless of their class purposes, are guided in their actions above all and chiefly by motives of security and the urge to prevent the other side from attaining military superiority or even to ensure such superiority for themselves. In short, the claim is that they are guided by "bloc policy" or by "bloc logic." It is easy to see that use is made here of the technique of killing the concrete class content of phenomena which was considered above. This kind of reasoning is again based on some abstract substance — "security motives generally" — and from it are

derived "blocs" stripped of their antithetical qualities. But was the NATO bloc set up and does it continue to exist because its members face some military threat? Is not talk about such a "threat" mere camouflage designed to vindicate the aggressive alliance? And do not the interests of real security dictate the dissolution of all military organizations and the need to struggle against NATO? One need merely ask these questions to realize afresh that only a class approach helps to evaluate correctly the existing blocs, their role in world politics and their dynamic, and to work out an appropriate attitude to them.

II

Another key methodological guideline in operating with socio-political categories is *their relation to the concept of social revolution*, which shows the specific features of social progress that is no longer effected on the basis of this or that formation but in the process of replacement of the bourgeois society by the socialist society. There are specific aspects of the study of these processes. They are connected with the origination of social phenomena which no longer belong to the outgoing formation, but which have yet to become elements of the new formation, that is, phenomena which are *transient and interformational*. The elements of the outgoing formation itself acquire transitional features: the conditions in which it functions appear simultaneously as prerequisites for its destruction, and for the creation of the new formation. Accordingly, fresh vigor is infused into socio-political categories which reveal hitherto unknown aspects, are filled with another content and become unusually dynamic, fluid and mutable.

All of this tends to produce methodological difficulties and problems in determining the class content of many social phenomena which occur in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Let us add that these are difficulties and problems created by real processes. The nature of these problems is indicated by concepts which have been accepted in scientific use. They primarily present the negative characteristics of phenomena like "non-capitalist," "anti-monopoly" and "anti-socialist." They bring out the "general democratic" in contrast to the "imperialist" and in distinction from the "socialist." They are reflected in the discussions on the social nature not only of individual phenomena and processes but also of some states and even aggregations of social orders established in some countries.

These difficulties and problems produce the

illusion that socio-political categories are purged of class content and that, accordingly, the class approach tends to lose its importance, when dealing with categories like "national" and "international," "interference" and "assistance," etc. The obverse of such illusions is that which can be called the "class oversimplification," as expressed in the attempts to emphasize the pragmatic benefit a phenomenon could yield for the "class," instead of revealing its class substance. But this kind of approach tends, in effect, to establish the same illusions: it turns out that social institutions and structures are in themselves neutral in class terms, that they stand over and above class, like technology which can equally serve to intensify the workers' exploitation and to ease their labor.

In this context, it is necessary to analyze how the changes in the content of socio-political categories in the transition from one formation to another occur. The main thing here is that in the epoch of social revolution *other determinants of the historical process* (as compared with the periods of the evolution of socio-economic formations) tend to appear. Marx shows that these spring "from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production."² It is under the impact of this conflict and the struggle for its resolution that the revolution in every sphere of social life takes place, being also reflected in the change of the content of categories.

According to the general historical rule, the break-up of the whole huge edifice of the capitalist formation starts from its upper tiers and ends with the laying of a new foundation: socialist relations of production, which then provide the basis for the structuring of a new superstructure determined by these relations. From the standpoint of the problem we are here concerned with, this means that the change in the socio-political categories proceeds in the process of the break-up of the formation, and does not follow the transformations of the economic basis but precedes them.

In many conceptions implying a theory of social change on the way to socialism the stumbling block turns out to be the problem of showing the *mechanism of change in the class content of socio-political categories*. This is exemplified, in particular, by the "democratic socialism" conception, which expresses the theoretical notions of present-day right-wing social democracy.

The central point of this conception is the specific concept of democracy. This is seen not just as a form of political power or state but also as the "beginnings" of a new society originat-

ing and maturing within the bosom of capitalism. Since the theorists of "democratic socialism" claim that socialism is "consummate democracy," they reduce the difference between socialism and democracy to the extent to which this "element" is consummated and developed and to the extent to which it ranges over the spheres of social life. Hence the substance of the establishment of the new social state is seen as a movement from political democracy to social democracy, as a growing of this "social democracy" into capitalism, which is seen — to the extent to which it is clad in democratic garb — as a system of equality, freedom, justice and solidarity.

It will be easily seen that the basic ideological and political postulate of this conception consists in the unconditional adherence to bourgeois democracy, outside whose context socialism is simply inconceivable. But the view of democracy as a means for attaining socialism cannot in any way be tied in theoretical terms with its bourgeois, class character. After all, the bourgeois "way" will not lead to a socialist "goal." That is why the bourgeois nature of democracy is here simply ignored in the same way as the fact that only a movement with a *proletarian* class nature leads to socialism.

Besides, a contradiction will be found in the structure of this theory itself even under an extra-class interpretation of democracy. It is evident that the unconditional adherence to democracy does not square with the notions of it as an "instrument," because in the hierarchy of goals and means the latter, at any rate, do not appear as a value of a higher order for the sake of which the "goal" can be abandoned. This contradiction is eliminated in the concept of "social democracy." It was introduced by the theorists of "democratic socialism" not as a synonym of socialism or as its euphemism. It simultaneously encompasses both the new social state and the way to it. But in theoretical terms this altogether does away with the problem of transition from capitalism to socialism. The latter has now been dissolved in the concept of "social democracy," and this can be attained under capitalism. Thus, the logic of departure from the class view of democracy leads to an abandonment of the very idea of socialism.

Consequently, the change in the content of socio-political categories, as viewed by the theorists of social democracy, appears as a process in which the "general" interest gradually comes to predominate. But that does not entail a negation of the "special" interests of each social group. On the contrary, it is on the basis of the latter that a "general consensus" is at-

tained. The emphasis here is on class collaboration and partnership, and it is this that is regarded as the motive force in realizing "social democracy." What is more, in this case the "general consensus" formula merely goes to obscure the fact that the introduction of a new social state, be it socialism or "social democracy" is ultimately made dependent on the consent of the bourgeoisie. After all, this reformist conception has no intention at all of encroaching on its "special" interest. Consequently, here no other socio-political thrust except the urge to disorganize the working-class movement will be discovered.

Theoretical conceptions resting on the concept of "hegemony" display another approach to this problem. Here, the change in the content of social forms is regarded as a consequence of the class struggle, under whose impact the common interests of the popular forces are asserted through these forms in contrast to the interests of the bourgeoisie. This, then, is supposed to produce a "general consensus" among the people concerning the implementation of socialism.

But in theoretical terms, the proposed solution runs up against the problem of gradualism (the emergence of a new quality through quantitative additions). Starting from the premise that the class content of categories (bearing in mind that behind them stands the real dominance of a class in the society and the state) tends to change gradually, by way of evolution, the theorists of the Second International, once vainly trying to solve the problem, could offer nothing better than a "crucial percentage." This suggests, in fact, that 49 per cent of "hegemony" does not yet change the old content of the category, while 51 per cent already transforms it. But is it at all right to liken the change in the content of categories to the logical paradox formulated by Eubulides of Miletus over 2000 years ago, which gives an idea of the conundrums of gradualism: how many hairs does a man have to lose to be classified as bald?

Conceptions of the change in the class character of categories only through a change in the "hegemon" (leader) fail to take account of the fact that the demarcation line running between the "bourgeois" and the "socialist" does not dim because of the "popular" coming to stand between them. In the movement toward socialism there is always a crucial dividing line between the "bourgeois" and the "popular" which needs to be overcome to invest social forms with a *qualitatively* new class content, and *this line can be overcome only by means of revolution*. In these conceptions, revolution

appears to evaporate in the concept of "hegemony." This happens because the concept of "hegemony" is extended to the relations of class antagonists, whereas it discloses the establishment and realization of the leading, supreme, governing role of class among the social forces united round a common even if only temporarily identical interest. Thus, under present-day capitalism, the working class exercises hegemony in the revolutionary movement, regardless of whether it is on the upswing or in a period of temporary decline or even retreat. But to assume that the working class can exercise hegemony in a capitalist society is tantamount to expecting the bourgeoisie, in possession of political and economic power, to start cooperating with the workers as a "guided partner."

There is no doubt that not only political power but also hegemony throughout the whole complex system of social, spiritual, cultural and ideological relations under capitalism encompassed in the concept of the "civil society" is the key aspect of the bourgeoisie's class domination. In this sense it is theoretically correct to analyze the specifics in eliminating the class domination of the bourgeoisie as applied both to the state and to the civil society. But it would be wrong either to separate the civil society from the state or to merge the two. This kind of separation provides the basis for notions that the civil society could become "non-bourgeois," while the bourgeoisie retains political power and economic domination. Conversely, the premise of a complete coalescence of the civil society and the state is used to infer the negation of the need for breaking up the state machine since, it is said, it becomes possible gradually to take possession of it from "inside" the civil society which allegedly merges with the state. In methodological terms, all these notions proceed from the assumption that the change in the class content of categories (at any rate, of those of them which characterize various aspects of the civil society) occurs without a qualitative leap known as revolution. In practice, this amounts to a line leading to a denial of the revolutionary way.

It goes beyond the terms of reference of the study group to analyze the problem of eliminating the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. Let us merely point out that the solution of the problem, as experience shows, begins with the emergence of the scientific ideology of the working class and the formation of its political party, and is completed after its assumption of political power in the course of socialist transformations in the economic basis, whose character ultimately determines the hegemony

of this or that class in the society. Even after the winning of state power, this process is effected in the course of the class struggle carried on not only within the structures of the civil society, but also within the state, within the working class and its party. In some situations, what comes to the fore is the need to pre-empt or defeat attempts by the anti-socialist forces to take over the party or the state "from inside," so as to make use of the instruments of dictatorship to deprive the working class of its leading status in the society. In other situations, the central issue is to resist the urge of the counter-revolution to separate the society from the state, and the class from the party, to undermine the leading role of the working class by splitting it up into sections ranged against each other, and then to mount an offensive against the state. Consequently, the dialectics of the change in the class content of socio-political categories also implies the need to reckon with the possibility of reverse qualitative transitions. Such knowledge helps to work out the ability to defend the revolution by cutting short the activity of its enemies in the practical class struggle resolutely, effectively and in due time.

What has been said shows the inadequacy of the approach to the study of social phenomena which does not go beyond the recognition of the differences in class interests and the struggle of classes. It goes without saying that recognition of this is a necessary component of the scientific social theory. But that is not its distinctive feature. The main thing in the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, in its methodology is the establishment and clarification of the fact that social antagonisms can be resolved only by way of revolution, which is an inevitable continuation of the class struggle. The class approach which is not organically based on a recognition of revolution proves to be a highly imperfect methodological instrument. Unless theory is oriented upon revolution³ it is incapable not only of serving to transform the world, but even of giving a correct explanation of it.

III

The class substance of socio-political phenomena and processes is not always brought out directly in empirical experience, for it is not merely obscured but very frequently also distorted. Nor does this merely relate to the conscious mystification practised by the ideologists of the ruling class and the powerful ideological machine of the bourgeois state. The false appearance which seems to deny the class substance of phenomena as revealed in scientific categories takes shape objectively; it cor-

responds to the actual picture of outward reality in the capitalist society.

The class dictatorship of the bourgeois state is far from always self-evident. Indeed, in the situation of relatively "calm" class struggle, the "majority" principle itself, constituting the formal mark of any democracy, appears to rebel in the bourgeois everyday consciousness against the Marxist conclusion that the political system of bourgeois democracy expresses the class will of a "minority," of the monopoly bourgeoisie. That is the breeding ground for the illusions and totally erroneous notions about the nature of the bourgeois state. Nevertheless, the class dictatorship becomes visible and tangible even for the empirical experience, especially in periods of political crisis, when the democratic trappings under which it used to function are dropped, and when the "majority" discovers that state terrorism, repression and physical violence against political opponents are a hallmark not only of fascist regimes.

Let us note, by the way, that the category of "bourgeois democracy" expresses its two-fold character: the contradiction between its true, class content, and the objective empirical appearance, or semblance. Lenin says that "semblance also is objective, for it contains one of the aspects of the objective world" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 98). That being so, it is hardly possible to deny that the specific capability of bourgeois democracy to appear to millions of people as a "supra-class" institution is a semblance that is objective and not someone's flight of fancy. But it is, nevertheless, a false semblance of its class substance, which is used by bourgeois ideologists for their deliberate mystifications.

In scientific research, the apparent discrepancy between the empirical semblance and theoretical propositions is resolved with the special concept of "inverted form" which was introduced by Marx.⁴ But such a discrepancy can also provide an indicator of the need to specify a scientific category in the light of new facts and trends. It is all the more important to determine the kind of discrepancy the analyst has to deal with when operating with socio-political categories, because the general line in the change of their content during the transition to socialism consists in what could be called the "removal of mystification." Socialist democracy, for instance, is not only an expression of the will of the popular majority in semblance. It is the will of the majority in substance. Lenin says: "The activity of man, who has constructed an objective picture of the world for himself, changes external actuality ... and thus removes from it the features of

Semblance, externality and nullity, and makes it as being in and for itself (=objectively true)" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 217-218).

In the period of crisis and collapse of the capitalist formation, the actual contradictions in the content of socio-political categories are initially discovered in the appearance of ties between these categories and the interests not only of the ruling but also of the other classes. Thus, the contradictory nature of democracy under imperialism is evident in the fact that it is not only adapted to the needs of the ruling class, the monopoly bourgeoisie, but also sustained and maintained by the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses as their important socio-political gain. While remaining a form of the political system which ensures the preservation of the economic foundations of capitalism, democracy provides a basis for the other classes for an offensive against imperialism and makes it possible to build up a preponderance of the popular forces for the advance to new frontiers in the class struggle.

In short, present-day democracy as a form of class struggle in the capitalist world, has undergone substantial changes as a result of the socio-political gains of the masses wrested from imperialism and also in consequence of the latter's adaptation to the new conditions. What is the substance of these changes? In terms of historical roots, this democracy is not just a distant echo of bourgeois revolutions, but is above all the tradition which sprang from the people's great victory over fascism; its present social basis consists of the aspirations of large masses of people for an enlargement of the front of democratic transformations going beyond the framework of purely political relations and spreading to the socio-economic sphere, and also to the sphere of international relations. There is also no doubt about the long-term trend in its consistent development, which is advance to the establishment of socialism.

But for all that, democracy retains its bourgeois substance because preponderance still belongs to the ties which ensure the political and economic domination of monopoly capital, and because — and this should be emphasized once again — they can be broken only by revolution. Only by overcoming monopoly capital is it possible to win a qualitatively new democracy. At the same time, the above-mentioned changes serve even further to obscure the class substance of democracy. The example of democracy shows that *the filling of socio-political categories with a new class content is, in principle, limited by a boundary which can be removed only with the resolution*

vinist circles catering for the interests of monopoly capital.

Way to unity

The communists' line of uniting all those who oppose military gambles, the seizure of the territories of others, national oppression and trampling of democratic freedoms is not a tactical move but a fundamental line stemming from an in-depth analysis of the concrete realities in Israel.

That line was most vividly embodied in the establishment over four years ago of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, on the Communist Party's initiative. The theses of the CPI's 19th congress noted that the emergence of the DFPE was "a new socio-political phenomenon in Israel, the beginning of a new alignment of forces . . ."

The Front has been able to reach across to the Jewish masses, introducing a fundamentally new element in the streets of Jewish towns and villages. The comrades we talked to frankly admitted that the communists found it much harder to work among the Jewish population than among the Arabs, with whom their standing was much higher. The reasons are clear: the strong pressure of Zionist ideology, anti-Arab chauvinism, militarism and anti-communism still hold considerable sections of Israeli Jews in spiritual captivity. Another factor making itself felt is directly described in Lenin's words: "To a certain degree, the workers of the oppressor nations are partners of their own bourgeoisie in plundering the workers (and the population) of the oppressed nations" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 56).

The Front helped to breach the wall of isolation with which the Zionists are trying to surround the Jewish population. The wall, it must be said, is also being shaken from the other side as well. The Black Panthers, which became the CPI's partner in the Democratic Front, are active in the poor quarters inhabited mostly by Jews of Asian and African extraction, or sefarim, as they are called.¹⁰ The Black Panthers' leader, Charlie Biton, whom we met in Jerusalem, told us how his organization was set up, about its goals and methods. We also touched upon the widely, somewhat scandalously, known Black Panthers' actions such as the free distribution of expropriated milk to the poor or the capture of a colonial settlement in the occupied territories. Driving home his words with gestures, Biton said:

"For us it is above all an expression of protest, a way to attract attention to the plight of the slum dwellers. We want people to understand that their enemies are not the Arab workers and

fellahin but the big capitalists, who profit from war and the occupation. So long as the Arabs are discriminated against, so long as their rights are being violated, the Jewish poor cannot hope for a better deal. All the deprived have the same enemy. We must act together. That is why we have so readily responded to the Communist Party's call to form a Democratic Front."

In the struggle for peace and democracy, the communists seek to cooperate with all who can and want to take part in it, whatever their ideology. This also applies to the adherents of the Zionist ideology in the "Peace Now" movement, the United Workers' Party (MAPAM), and other groups. The Front is not an ideological but a political organization. "That does not mean," the Israeli comrades explained, "that we avoid ideological disputes within the Front. The Marxist-Leninist world view is incompatible with the ideology of Zionism. But regardless of ideological differences there can be unity of action of the Democratic Front on the basis of its program."

Its dedicated pursuit of this line has enabled the Front to unite the most consistent Jewish supporters of the interests of the working class and the other working people, some progressive-minded students, intellectuals and members of the petty bourgeoisie. Among the Arabs, the Front commands the allegiance of a sizable part of the working class, the peasantry, students, intellectuals, the middle strata and some members of the bourgeoisie, in short, a majority of the people.

"The Front's winning of dominant positions among the Arab population has an objective basis," said Tawfiq Zayad. "The social class structure of that section of the population has undergone radical changes in a short period, in just over three decades. Because the Arabs have been forcibly stripped of their land, the share of wage workers among them has sharply increased: in Arab villages and towns today it is well above 70 per cent. Hence the steady erosion of the narrow clannishness which has given way to a feeling of belonging to a wider entity, the Palestinian Arab people."

The fact that the communists play the central role in the Front does not mean that it is merely a front for the CPI, as bourgeois propaganda sometimes maintains. For example, as a result of the 1978 municipal elections the DFPE got 19 of its candidates elected mayors of municipalities, but only seven of them were communists. Of DFPE's five seats in the ninth Knesset, the Communist Party had three. And in the latest parliamentary elections, the third candidate of the Front's list was Charlie Biton, who

was elected to the Knesset, where the DFPE won four seats.

The communists are the best organized and most dedicated force within the Democratic Front. They have to work a great deal, and it is exceedingly hard work. This is what we were told by Ahmed Saad, member of the municipal council of the Abu-Snan village and CC Secretary of the Young Communists of Israel:

"All our comrades, whatever their party duties, are constantly in the thick of the masses. Every day we talk to people, argue with and persuade them. We must be active, organized and convinced of the justice of our cause if we are to win the hearts of others, to win them over to our side."

Work within the front has required some change not only of the practical methods but also mentality. Some old stereotypes which worked in dealings with like-minded people but were unsuitable in relations with allies had to be broken. These adjustments did not and do not come easily.

"The main danger we have to combat today," says Jamal Musa, alternate member of the CC Political Bureau CPI, and Secretary of the Acca Party organization, "is the sectarian trend, the inability and unwillingness to find common ground, to arrange cooperation without displaying ossified intolerance of the views of others, something that puts off potential allies."

Elaborating on the idea, Nimr Murkus says: "We must approach those who are outside the Front for the time being not in terms of their political past but with an understanding of the fact that in the present complex and dangerous conditions it is imperative to achieve unity on the broadest possible basis in order to counter

the sway of chauvinism and militarism."

Imbued as they are with a sense of responsibility for the fate of their country, the communists reach out to all those who, in spite of different ideologies and political sympathies, see the sinister threat engendered by the ruling circles' policy and are prepared to fight against it. This is the thrust of the party congress' slogan: "The Way Out: Israeli-Palestinian Peace. The Way to it: the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality." It sums up the CPI's genuinely patriotic and consistently internationalist policy. Combining faithful service to the class interests of the working people and tireless struggle for the democratic demands of the people, it is blazing the trail toward a future free of hostility, hatred and bloodshed.

1. Meir Vilner. "Peace in the Middle East: a sheet anchor for Israel." *WMR*, April 1977; Tawfiq Toubi, "Paving the way to equality and progress," *WMR*, July 1981.

2. *Al-Ittihad*, May 5, 1981 (in Arabic).

3. 1 dunam = 1,000 sq. m.

4. Property allocated under Islamic law for religious or charity purposes.

5. Deputy General Secretary of the CPI CC Tawfiq Toubi is an Arab by nationality.

6. *Al-Ittihad*, March 3, 1981 (in Arabic).

7. The millionaire deputy of the ninth Knesset was convicted, *in absentia*, by a French court on charges of financial machinations. In the spring of 1981, the district court in Jerusalem sentenced him to nine months imprisonment for bribing voters. Even so, his name was again on the list of candidates in the latest parliamentary elections.

8. RAKAH (The New Communist List) — the name under which the CP Israel at one time carried on its election campaigns.

9. Theses of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, 1981, p. 77.

10. Sefardim, who account for more than half the country's Jewish population, are the victims of cruel discrimination in jobs, education, housing, etc.

End arbitrary acts!

Since May of this year, Turkey has been swept by a wave of arrests among members of the progressive forces, including members of the Communist Party and its sympathizers. Reports of these arrests have been carried by the major bourgeois newspapers. According to these reports, between 1,400 and 2,000 persons have been arrested as a result of a police operation code-named "Red Lantern." The military authorities also made an official announcement of these arrests. According to them 172 members of our party have been arrested in Adana, 254 in Kocaeli, 34 in Istanbul, 206 in Ankara, and 46 in Antalya and Balikesir.

More and more reports have been reaching the public about torture in the prison cells. In 14 cases, this had to be recognized by the National Security Council. Among those tortured to death is Ahmet Hilmi Feyzioglu, a young lawyer of the Metal Workers' Union and an active fighter for peace. Only in the past few months, hundreds of prisoners have been forced, under torture, to sign prepared "testimony" which "confirms" their membership of the CPT, a party now under ban for 59 years.

A ban has been imposed on the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Trade Unions (DISK), which has more than half a

million members. Its leaders now face death. Members of the board of the Central Association of Peasant Cooperatives (KOY-KOOP) are being put on trial merely for representing the interests of 2,380 cooperatives with more than 2.5 million members — and the authorities intend to jail them for terms of between 8 and 15 years. At the trial of 64 leaders of the Teachers' Union (TÖB-DER), with nearly 200,000 members, the military prosecution has demanded that they should be deprived of their freedom for periods between 5 and 20 years, merely for standing up for the trade union rights of teachers. At a trial in Istanbul, 10 members of the Progressive Youth League (IGD) are faced with imprisonment for a period of up to 36 years merely for being members of that organization.

Fifty-eight repressive laws abolishing many basic rights and freedoms have been put into effect or have been drafted. Prominent figures, like Behice Boran, President of the Workers' Party of Turkey, have been stripped of their citizenship. More than 100 newspapers and journals have been banned. On the anniversary

of the military coup, the National Security Council announced that within the year 10 persons had been executed, 459 had died in armed clashes with the security forces, and 70,746 persons had been detained by the police, with 20,365 of them arrested. According to the foreign bourgeois press, the number of those arrested comes to 50,000, and of those detained by the police — to 140,000.

International solidarity can play a big role in helping to put an end to the repression against the democratic forces of Turkey. Protests within the country and abroad have already forced the authorities to halve — from 90 to 45 days — the period between arrest and trial, that is, the period in which the prisoner is in the hands of his executioners without any control. This first success, however small, shows the importance of such a struggle.

An end to the torture!

Freedom for the democrats arrested in Turkey!

Kemal Kervan,
CP Turkey representative on WMR

Comrades under threat of death

On September 12 it was learned that Gerardo Cuesta, Secretary of the National Convention of Working People and Executive Committee member of the Communist Party of Uruguay, died in the Libertad prison at the age of 64.

He was always courageous in championing the interests of workers and was active in the struggle for trade union unity. In February 1976 he was imprisoned by the dictatorial regime and cruelly tortured. But he refused to renounce his ideals, remaining faithful to his class duty, people and party. Imprisonment finally broke his health. The government turned a deaf ear to the warnings that Gerardo Cuesta's life was in danger, rejecting the demand of international opinion for his release.

So another death has been added to the record of the Uruguayan dictators. A similar fate awaits many other political and trade union leaders: Alberto Altesor, who has a serious heart disease, Rosario Pietrarroia and Hector Rodriguez, who are gravely ill, General Liber Seregni, Jaime Perez, José Luis Massera, and hundreds of other political prisoners.

The communists of Uruguay call upon people of good will to declare their solidarity with the Uruguayan patriots, to demand their immediate release.

Manuel Perez,
Leadership Member,
Communist Party of Uruguay

New experience

HALLMARKS OF THE STRUGGLE FOR MASS SUPPORT

Benjamin Degen
Political Bureau Member,
Swiss Party of Labor

Q. Would you say a few words about your party's activities among workers of large factories?

The Swiss Party of Labor has always attached significance to expanding its influence among the working people, notably among workers of the nation's large-scale industry. The aims of the communists cannot be achieved without the latter's confidence, without their active support. The question of the party's links to the working class is especially acute today in view of the deep crisis of capitalist society.

Over the past 10 years, let alone 20 years, much has altered in the conditions of our struggle for the masses. The structural changes in the capitalist economy have dramatically recast the social make-up of Switzerland. There have been significant modifications in the composition of the working class. The number of wage workers is growing steadily and has already reached nearly 90 per cent of the gainfully employed population. However, of these, roughly 40 per cent are industrial workers. Further, the proportion of skilled workers is steadily diminishing at the large factories. In the 1950s, for instance, skilled workers comprised between 75 and 80 per cent of the labor force at heavy engineering facilities; today their proportion has dropped to 20 per cent. Of the roughly 1,500,000 industrial workers, one-fourth are women and one-third are foreign workers. At the big factories four out of every five workers are now either apprentices or unskilled laborers, and these are mainly foreigners. Exhausting and monotonous work and constant overtime, including on days off, have fallen to their lot. Most of them are not unionized and are denied many of the rights and freedoms enjoyed by Swiss skilled workers. We thus have a situation in which most of the personnel of big factories are virtually disinherited workers.

Take my home town of Basel, which is one of the nation's industrial centers. There are few Swiss at its factories. Most of the workers are foreigners, including French people and West

Germans from adjacent regions. They commute to Switzerland daily. Baselians of both the younger and older generations are employed chiefly in administrative institutions, banks, insurance companies, and distributive and advertising firms. Some young Swiss work at small enterprises or workshops, where, as a rule, there is no trade union.

What caused these changes. The essence of monopoly policy is to make the largest profit by simplifying production operations and employing unskilled labor wherever possible. Moreover, this policy is aimed at eroding the struggle of the working class for its rights. At the big factories the owners oppose skilled Swiss working people, the most organized and militant section of the nation's working class, with large numbers of "temporary" foreign workers. They seek to use the enormous disparity between the wages of Swiss and foreign workers as a barrier to unity of action by them.

This policy creates considerable difficulties for the party, for its work, making it hard to extend its influence and win new members. What are we doing to cope with these difficulties? The party urges workers — regardless of nationality, sex, training and so on — to unite for their common aims. In establishing contact with foreign workers at the big factories we stress that they have to act jointly with their Swiss comrades against the arbitrary actions of the owners. Among Swiss workers we emphasize in the trade unions, at election campaigns, and during nationwide plebiscites that there must be solidarity with foreign comrades. The party press — the newspapers *Vorwärts*, *Voix Ouvrière*, and *Il Lavoratore* — is used extensively to state the party's stand in defense of the interests of foreign workers and all Swiss working people. We uncompromisingly expose those who spread chauvinistic views and sentiments among Swiss workers and who thereby aid and abet the divisive policy pursued by big capital. We attach great importance to coordinating the struggle of blue and white-collar workers for their common interests.

Although many of our efforts have not yet brought palpable results, working people are beginning to listen more and more often to the communists. One of our party's cardinal tasks is to enlarge the number of such people and win their support.

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

FORMATIVE PERIOD

"Among the foreign guests at the second congress of the Communist Party of Cuba there were representatives from the United People's Movement in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. I would like to have some information about that organization."

Raúl García, Cuba

The following reply is by Renwick Rose, one of the leaders of the United People's Movement in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

The United People's Movement is a vanguard political organization adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and advocating a socialist orientation for the development of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.* The United People's Movement became a party recently, in 1980. But its emergence has a history of its own.

In 1974 several small progressive groups merged to form the Youlou United Liberation Movement, which began publishing the newspaper *Freedom*. At its first convention in 1975 the movement officially proclaimed that it was a Marxist-Leninist organization. In the following year we adopted a minimum program, which charted a course toward anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist-oriented development for the country. This program took the existing conditions into account, including the low level of economic development, the low level of the people's political consciousness, and the numerically small working class.

In a coalition with two other organizations (a small rural organization of peasants and a group consisting of people of the middle strata, intellectuals) YULIMO took part in the 1979 general elections. The coalition adopted the name of United People's Movement. Lacking material resources, it was unable to counter the massive anti-communist propaganda of the ruling Labor Party, which by fraud, bribery and violence obtained 11 of the 13 seats in the parliament (two seats were won by the opposition New Democratic Party). The election system is such that it does not mirror the actual mood of the electorate. The left-wing coalition, for instance, failed to win a seat although it got 15 per cent of the vote. However, the very fact that many of our fellow countrymen voted for it is as a big achievement and provided a sound basis for a political struggle.

*Saint Vincent and the Grenadines are a nation that became independent in 1979. Situated on Saint Vincent Island and the Northern Grenadines in the Caribbean, it has an area of 389 square kilometers and a population of 113,000 (1977). — Ed.

The alliance in our movement was strengthened after we had purged it of imperialism's agents and as a result of the reorganization in August of last year. That turned the United People's Movement from a coalition into a close-knit party.

The UPM consists mainly of young workers and peasants, some intellectuals, and also people working in the services industry. Despite innumerable obstacles we have significantly enlarged the party's social base. It is structured according to groups formed in each of the 13 constituencies. Each group has two or three representatives in the party's General Council, which meets three times a year to review what has been done and draw up plans for the future. The National Executive Committee, the party's central organ, consists of 10 members. It meets once a month. Day-to-day work is supervised by a Coordinating Committee consisting of four leading officials.

Formerly in our country there were no political parties functioning permanently as political organizations. They were formed only for the period of elections. The UPM was the first to function on a permanent basis. It is a small party, but some mass organizations are linked to it, notably the Women's Democratic Organization and the Vanguard Youth. Quite a few of our comrades hold leading posts in trade unions.

The UPM believes that in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines elections are at present the main avenue of struggle. While we do not rule out other methods, we employ peaceful, legal means. We engage in the most diverse forms of work. We regularly sponsor public meetings and arrange wide discussions of national problems with the involvement of people from all over the country. We regard protest actions as an important way of mobilizing people to fight for their demands. An example is the campaign, sponsored by us, to compel the government to send relief to areas hit by a devastating hurricane. In this campaign we organized demonstrations and pickets and conducted explanatory work among the people.

Generally speaking we attach great significance to agitation and propaganda. Our activists go to the most remote villages to show the people the causes of the economic troubles facing them and the ways of overcoming these. The UPM publishes the daily newspaper *Justice* and puts out leaflets.

A right-wing bourgeois government came to power two years ago when Saint Vincent and the Grenadines became independent. The nation still enjoys some democratic freedoms and

we are trying to take full advantage of this. However, we have no illusions about the government and its links to imperialism. Nor is there any guarantee that as the political struggle intensifies the government is not going to become repressive.

The situation in the Caribbean is a very complex one. After the Grenada and Nicaraguan revolutions a tide of progressive changes swept across our region, particularly in the Eastern Caribbean. The democratic Labor Party came to power in Saint Lucia. The dictator Patrick John has been deposed in Dominica. In this situation imperialism and its minions began an offensive. On the eve of the 1979 elections the right-wing forces in our country received considerable foreign financial and propaganda support, which enabled them to win the elec-

tions. The same thing was done in Dominica and Antigua, and then, on a larger scale, methods of "winning" elections were employed in Jamaica.

Lately, the right-wing forces have strengthened their positions here and there. However, the revolutionary movement has large potentials on many Caribbean islands. It is growing increasingly obvious that the pro-imperialist governments are unable to solve the problems confronting the peoples. We think that the 1980s hold many prospects for the liberation struggle in the Caribbean. There has always been mutual solidarity among the revolutionary movements of our region. However, there is a pressing need for closer cooperation among the progressive and democratic forces in the Caribbean for we have a common enemy.



Concerning the dialectics of categories

International Study Group

The methodology used to obtain a knowledge of social life is of essential importance in the present-day ideological struggle, and the acute nature of the theoretical clashes in this sphere is understandable. After all this involves a special type of cognition, one which affects not just the truth, but also the interests of all the classes. The results of such cognition are necessarily determined by its party orientation and the choice of one of two philosophical world outlooks: the scientific ideology of the working class, and the bourgeois system of views.

However, the sphere of methodology relating to the uniformities and logic underlying the formation of new knowledge in science and the role of the various cognitive techniques used in research is a highly special one. That is why it is hardly accidental that the bourgeois mass media prefer to attack that aspect of the methodology of scientific cognition which appears in forms that are more accessible to the everyday consciousness. Battles are joined over problems which apparently have a bearing above all on terminology: the "true meaning" of categor-

ies reflecting various aspects of social life, what are and what are not "democracy" and "dictatorship," "revolution" and "reform," "internationalism" and "nationalism," "intervention" and "aid," "civil society" and "the state," "military bloc" and "nonalignment" and so on and so forth. The content with which the participants in the ideological polemics invest such concepts is so different that one frequently has the impression that they have totally different phenomena and processes in mind.

However, behind the arguments about terms and words one cannot but discern the urge of bourgeois ideology to discredit and to destroy the conceptual apparatus of modern social science or to infiltrate diverse preconceptions about the categories used in science, by distorting their content. Here, some ground is occupied by obscurantism which is at the basis of the innumerable myths and clichés which bourgeois propaganda seeks to implant.

The communists devote attention to methodological problems, including the theoretical instruments of cognition, consist-

ing of the categories worked out by social science, not only as a part of the task of ideologically enlightening the masses and safeguarding and spreading scientific, Marxist knowledge. Another important reason for their concern with these problems is also the present state of the Marxist-Leninist science. It is not just an aggregation of its theoretical results, but also a ramified international social institution carrying on research on the broadest front and concentrated in many independent centers across the world.

The requirements of social practice have confronted Marxist scientists with the need to analyze the new and original facts and trends in social development and the peculiar situations in various countries. This involves facts, trends and situations which are very important and which relate — as the experience of scientific creative endeavor shows — to fundamental conclusions in theory implying its further development. In the comprehension of the new historical material, questions and difficulties also arise which are connected with the application of the conceptual apparatus of theory to the analysis of concrete reality. Inability to cope with these could result in inadequately grounded inferences and even in altogether erroneous conclusions capable of slowing down the progress of science and producing negative social consequences whenever such conclusions are taken as reference points for political action.

Socio-political categories, which reflect and establish various aspects and uniformities of the whole huge superstructure arising out of economic social relations, have a special place within the conceptual apparatus of social theory. These categories are more directly connected with the practice of the class struggle and the activity of the parties. For that reason in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism they naturally come to the forefront, both of the ideological contest and of scientific research probing for strategies of revolutionary transformation.

The WMR Commission for General Problems of Theory has held a methodological seminar by an international study group on the subject: "Concerning the Nature of Socio-Political Categories." Among those who took part in the discussion were: *Roland Bauer* (SUPG), *Samuel Behak* (CP Uruguay), *Raul Valdes Vivo* (CP Cuba), *Georgi Girginov* (Bulgarian CP), *Manuel Delgado* (PVP Costa Rica), *Kemal Kervan* (CP Turkey), *Jeronime Carrera* (CP Venezuela), *José Lava* (CP Philippines), *Thomas O'Flaherty* (CP Ireland),

Leonardo Paso (CP Argentina), *Vusizwe Seme* (South African CP), *Cezar Perez* (Dominican CP), *Felipe Rodriguez* (CP Bolivia), *Clement Rohee* (PPP Guyana), *Ahmed Salem* (CP Sudan), *Agamemnon Stavrou* (AKEL), *Satijaya Sudiman* (CP Indonesia), *James West* (CP USA), *Robert Francis* (CP Belgium), and *Zaki Khairi* (Iraqi CP). Below are some of the results of their exchange of views as prepared by the Commission's working group.

I

The class approach to the study of social phenomena is organic to the Marxist-Leninist methodology. It is not something that is external to it; nor is it determined by the researcher's subjective aspirations. This approach springs from the specifics of the subject-matter — the class society — and is also determined by the nature of the conceptual apparatus being used in its analysis: *in contrast to natural science categories, socio-political categories have a class content.*

But this qualitative specific does not at all lie on the surface. The establishment of the class content of socio-political categories is an intricate problem. Thus, it turns out that the isolated study of a phenomenon or a process, however detailed and exhaustive it may be (and that is a necessary element of cognition) does not yet help to show its class content. The point is that this approach leaves apart the connections of the phenomenon or process with the concrete whole, with the actual social system within which it alone acquires the qualitative peculiarity, the concrete historical, class content. Lenin remarked that "the individual exists only in the connection that leads to the universal" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 361).

Hence the prime and most important requirement established by the Marxist methodology: the class content, the meaning, the function of socio-political categories can be comprehended only if each of these is not taken by itself, in isolation, but in reference to the fundamental concept of socio-economic formation underlying the Marxist theory of society.

Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that as a given formation develops, the diversity of social relations, processes and phenomena are subordinated to the concrete whole which it represents. They enter into interdependencies conditioned by that whole and are transformed in accordance with the laws determining its functions and development. In consequence of this "subordination," all the elements of the society in effect acquire the class specifics

determined by each concrete formation.

Unless they are based on a real social system, a concrete formation, socio-political categories can and do actually become objects of manipulation: they are mechanically combined, disjointed and joined in the most diverse combinations and transferred from one social system to another. But in that case, the categories lose their substantial connection with the whole and cease to be instruments of scientific research. Indeed, their arbitrary combinations produce a distorted copy of the reality.

The most typical departure from this methodological rule is the treatment of socio-political categories as some kind of absolute entities purged of transient and historically rooted specific features and existing over and above the existing socio-economic formations. That is the origin, for instance, of the category of "democracy in general" characterizing the form of political rule independent of the class content of the state (participation by citizens in elections and administration, their equality before the law, the juridical formalization of the individual's rights and freedoms, etc.). This most general and formal concept is, of course, of some cognitive value, whenever it is considered in the context of concrete historical conditions. But it fails to show precisely the most substantial aspects of democracy, whose real content is bound up with the nature of the social system, of the formation.

Moreover, when such an abstract concept is taken as the basis of theoretical constructs from which an effort is made to derive its properties, all the actually existing democracies appear as modifications of that abstraction but deprived of their class substance. That is the origin, for instance, of the notions about a "non-bourgeois state under capitalism."

In methodological terms, such notions return us to the speculative philosophy which science has long since overcome. Briefly, its substance was the presentation of things existing in reality as simple forms of the existence of some "substances." For instance, the "substance" of the apple and the pear is the "fruit in general." Exposing the underlying meaning of operations by speculative philosophers, Marx wrote that "the apples, pears, almonds and raisins which we rediscover in the speculative world are nothing but semblances of apples, semblances of pears, semblances of almonds and semblances of raisins, for they are moments in the life of 'the Fruit,' this abstract creation of the mind, and therefore themselves abstract creations of the mind." The "supra-class state" and similar notions are likewise abstract products of the mind, similarly illusory

institutions originating from the "democracy in general" abstraction existing only in the imagination.

One has to recall the mysteries of the speculative construction because its products keep penetrating into the working-class movement. One example coming to the fore lately is the concept of "employer" invented by bourgeois propaganda. Its initial purpose was to prevent the workers from comprehending the exploitive relations in capitalist production by presenting the capitalist as a benefactor who provides jobs. It was subsequently taken up by the ideologists of counter-revolution seeking to distort the content of labor relations under socialism. This concept is now designed to smear the socialist state, presenting it as an institution allegedly ranged against the interests of the workers.

Such operations are also performed with categories which characterize international phenomena. Take the problem of the confrontation of the two military-political blocs — NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Their antithetical class nature is clearly brought out by the nature of the alliances (aggressive and defensive), by their membership (imperialist powers, on the one hand, and socialist countries, on the other), and also by their political purposes, as expressed in their diametrically opposite foreign-policy lines and strategies. What is more, the very confrontation of these blocs is not merely a product of the class struggle in the international arena, but is a specific form of it. It is specific, first, because it involves efforts by socialism to avert a world war by checking the aggressive moves of imperialism through a strengthening of the socialist countries' defense capability and their armed forces. It is specific, second, because this form of struggle has itself been imposed by imperialism. Socialism, having been forced to accept it, wants and seeks to switch the class struggle into other forms which rule out military confrontation and entail disarmament.

This view is countered by the suggestion that countries which are members of blocs, regardless of their class purposes, are guided in their actions above all and chiefly by motives of security and the urge to prevent the other side from attaining military superiority or even to ensure such superiority for themselves. In short, the claim is that they are guided by "bloc policy" or by "bloc logic." It is easy to see that use is made here of the technique of killing the concrete class content of phenomena which was considered above. This kind of reasoning is again based on some abstract substance — "security motives generally" — and from it are

derived "blocs" stripped of their antithetical qualities. But was the NATO bloc set up and does it continue to exist because its members face some military threat? Is not talk about such a "threat" mere camouflage designed to vindicate the aggressive alliance? And do not the interests of real security dictate the dissolution of all military organizations and the need to struggle against NATO? One need merely ask these questions to realize afresh that only a class approach helps to evaluate correctly the existing blocs, their role in world politics and their dynamic, and to work out an appropriate attitude to them.

II

Another key methodological guideline in operating with socio-political categories is *their relation to the concept of social revolution*, which shows the specific features of social progress that is no longer effected on the basis of this or that formation but in the process of replacement of the bourgeois society by the socialist society. There are specific aspects of the study of these processes. They are connected with the origination of social phenomena which no longer belong to the outgoing formation, but which have yet to become elements of the new formation, that is, phenomena which are *transient* and *interformational*. The elements of the outgoing formation itself acquire transitional features: the conditions in which it functions appear simultaneously as prerequisites for its destruction, and for the creation of the new formation. Accordingly, fresh vigor is infused into socio-political categories which reveal hitherto unknown aspects, are filled with another content and become unusually dynamic, fluid and mutable.

All of this tends to produce methodological difficulties and problems in determining the class content of many social phenomena which occur in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Let us add that these are difficulties and problems created by real processes. The nature of these problems is indicated by concepts which have been accepted in scientific use. They primarily present the negative characteristics of phenomena like "non-capitalist," "anti-monopoly" and "anti-socialist." They bring out the "general democratic" in contrast to the "imperialist" and in distinction from the "socialist." They are reflected in the discussions on the social nature not only of individual phenomena and processes but also of some states and even aggregations of social orders established in some countries.

These difficulties and problems produce the

illusion that socio-political categories are purged of class content and that, accordingly, the class approach tends to lose its importance, when dealing with categories like "national" and "international," "interference" and "assistance," etc. The obverse of such illusions is that which can be called the "class oversimplification," as expressed in the attempts to emphasize the pragmatic benefit a phenomenon could yield for the "class," instead of revealing its class substance. But this kind of approach tends, in effect, to establish the same illusions: it turns out that social institutions and structures are in themselves neutral in class terms, that they stand over and above class, like technology which can equally serve to intensify the workers' exploitation and to ease their labor.

In this context, it is necessary to analyze how the changes in the content of socio-political categories in the transition from one formation to another occur. The main thing here is that in the epoch of social revolution *other determinants of the historical process* (as compared with the periods of the evolution of socio-economic formations) tend to appear. Marx shows that these spring "from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production."² It is under the impact of this conflict and the struggle for its resolution that the revolution in every sphere of social life takes place, being also reflected in the change of the content of categories.

According to the general historical rule, the break-up of the whole huge edifice of the capitalist formation starts from its upper tiers and ends with the laying of a new foundation: socialist relations of production, which then provide the basis for the structuring of a new superstructure determined by these relations. From the standpoint of the problem we are here concerned with, this means that the change in the socio-political categories proceeds in the process of the break-up of the formation, and does not follow the transformations of the economic basis but precedes them.

In many conceptions implying a theory of social change on the way to socialism the stumbling block turns out to be the problem of showing the mechanism of change in the class content of socio-political categories. This is exemplified, in particular, by the "democratic socialism" conception, which expresses the theoretical notions of present-day right-wing social democracy.

The central point of this conception is the specific concept of democracy. This is seen not just as a form of political power or state but also as the "beginnings" of a new society originat-

ing and maturing within the bosom of capitalism. Since the theorists of "democratic socialism" claim that socialism is "consummate democracy," they reduce the difference between socialism and democracy to the extent to which this "element" is consummated and developed and to the extent to which it ranges over the spheres of social life. Hence the substance of the establishment of the new social state is seen as a movement from political democracy to social democracy, as a growing of this "social democracy" into capitalism, which is seen — to the extent to which it is clad in democratic garb — as a system of equality, freedom, justice and solidarity.

It will be easily seen that the basic ideological and political postulate of this conception consists in the unconditional adherence to bourgeois democracy, outside whose context socialism is simply inconceivable. But the view of democracy as a means for attaining socialism cannot in any way be tied in theoretical terms with its bourgeois, class character. After all, the bourgeois "way" will not lead to a socialist "goal." That is why the bourgeois nature of democracy is here simply ignored in the same way as the fact that only a movement with a proletarian class nature leads to socialism.

Besides, a contradiction will be found in the structure of this theory itself even under an extra-class interpretation of democracy. It is evident that the unconditional adherence to democracy does not square with the notions of it as an "instrument," because in the hierarchy of goals and means the latter, at any rate, do not appear as a value of a higher order for the sake of which the "goal" can be abandoned. This contradiction is eliminated in the concept of "social democracy." It was introduced by the theorists of "democratic socialism" not as a synonym of socialism or as its euphemism. It simultaneously encompasses both the new social state and the way to it. But in theoretical terms this altogether does away with the problem of transition from capitalism to socialism. The latter has now been dissolved in the concept of "social democracy," and this can be attained under capitalism. Thus, the logic of departure from the class view of democracy leads to an abandonment of the very idea of socialism.

Consequently, the change in the content of socio-political categories, as viewed by the theorists of social democracy, appears as a process in which the "general" interest gradually comes to predominate. But that does not entail a negation of the "special" interests of each social group. On the contrary, it is on the basis of the latter that a "general consensus" is at-

tained. The emphasis here is on class collaboration and partnership, and it is this that is regarded as the motive force in realizing "social democracy." What is more, in this case the "general consensus" formula merely goes to obscure the fact that the introduction of a new social state, be it socialism or "social democracy" is ultimately made dependent on the consent of the bourgeoisie. After all, this reformist conception has no intention at all of encroaching on its "special" interest. Consequently, here no other socio-political thrust except the urge to disorganize the working-class movement will be discovered.

Theoretical conceptions resting on the concept of "hegemony" display another approach to this problem. Here, the change in the content of social forms is regarded as a consequence of the class struggle, under whose impact the common interests of the popular forces are asserted through these forms in contrast to the interests of the bourgeoisie. This, then, is supposed to produce a "general consensus" among the people concerning the implementation of socialism.

But in theoretical terms, the proposed solution runs up against the problem of gradualism (the emergence of a new quality through quantitative additions). Starting from the premise that the class content of categories (bearing in mind that behind them stands the real dominance of a class in the society and the state) tends to change gradually, by way of evolution, the theorists of the Second International, once vainly trying to solve the problem, could offer nothing better than a "crucial percentage." This suggests, in fact, that 49 per cent of "hegemony" does not yet change the old content of the category, while 51 per cent already transforms it. But is it at all right to liken the change in the content of categories to the logical paradox formulated by Eubulides of Miletus over 2000 years ago, which gives an idea of the conundrums of gradualism: how many hairs does a man have to lose to be classified as bald?

Conceptions of the change in the class character of categories only through a change in the "hegemon" (leader) fail to take account of the fact that the demarcation line running between the "bourgeois" and the "socialist" does not dim because of the "popular" coming to stand between them. In the movement toward socialism there is always a crucial dividing line between the "bourgeois" and the "popular" which needs to be overcome to invest social forms with a qualitatively new class content, and this line can be overcome only by means of revolution. In these conceptions, revolution

appears to evaporate in the concept of "hegemony." This happens because the concept of "hegemony" is extended to the relations of class antagonists, whereas it discloses the establishment and realization of the leading, supreme, governing role of class among the social forces united round a common even if only temporarily identical interest. Thus, under present-day capitalism, the working class exercises hegemony in the revolutionary movement, regardless of whether it is on the upswing or in a period of temporary decline or even retreat. But to assume that the working class can exercise hegemony in a capitalist society is tantamount to expecting the bourgeoisie, in possession of political and economic power, to start cooperating with the workers as a "guided partner."

There is no doubt that not only political power but also hegemony throughout the whole complex system of social, spiritual, cultural and ideological relations under capitalism encompassed in the concept of the "civil society" is the key aspect of the bourgeoisie's class domination. In this sense it is theoretically correct to analyze the specifics in eliminating the class domination of the bourgeoisie as applied both to the state and to the civil society. But it would be wrong either to separate the civil society from the state or to merge the two. This kind of separation provides the basis for notions that the civil society could become "non-bourgeois," while the bourgeoisie retains political power and economic domination. Conversely, the premise of a complete coalescence of the civil society and the state is used to infer the negation of the need for breaking up the state machine since, it is said, it becomes possible gradually to take possession of it from "inside" the civil society which allegedly merges with the state. In methodological terms, all these notions proceed from the assumption that the change in the class content of categories (at any rate, of those of them which characterize various aspects of the civil society) occurs without a qualitative leap known as revolution. In practice, this amounts to a line leading to a denial of the revolutionary way.

It goes beyond the terms of reference of the study group to analyze the problem of eliminating the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. Let us merely point out that the solution of the problem, as experience shows, begins with the emergence of the scientific ideology of the working class and the formation of its political party, and is completed after its assumption of political power in the course of socialist transformations in the economic basis, whose character ultimately determines the hegemony

of this or that class in the society. Even after the winning of state power, this process is effected in the course of the class struggle carried on not only within the structures of the civil society, but also within the state, within the working class and its party. In some situations, what comes to the fore is the need to pre-empt or defeat attempts by the anti-socialist forces to take over the party or the state "from inside," so as to make use of the instruments of dictatorship to deprive the working class of its leading status in the society. In other situations, the central issue is to resist the urge of the counter-revolution to separate the society from the state, and the class from the party, to undermine the leading role of the working class by splitting it up into sections ranged against each other, and then to mount an offensive against the state. Consequently, the dialectics of the change in the class content of socio-political categories also implies the need to reckon with the possibility of reverse qualitative transitions. Such knowledge helps to work out the ability to defend the revolution by cutting short the activity of its enemies in the practical class struggle resolutely, effectively and in due time.

What has been said shows the inadequacy of the approach to the study of social phenomena which does not go beyond the recognition of the differences in class interests and the struggle of classes. It goes without saying that recognition of this is a necessary component of the scientific social theory. But that is not its distinctive feature. The main thing in the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, in its methodology is *the establishment and clarification of the fact that social antagonisms can be resolved only by way of revolution, which is an inevitable continuation of the class struggle.* The class approach which is not organically based on a recognition of revolution proves to be a highly imperfect methodological instrument. Unless theory is oriented upon revolution³ it is incapable not only of serving to transform the world, but even of giving a correct explanation of it.

III

The class substance of socio-political phenomena and processes is not always brought out directly in empirical experience, for it is not merely obscured but very frequently also distorted. Nor does this merely relate to the conscious mystification practised by the ideologists of the ruling class and the powerful ideological machine of the bourgeois state. The false appearance which seems to deny the class substance of phenomena as revealed in scientific categories takes shape objectively; it cor-

responds to the actual picture of outward reality in the capitalist society.

The class dictatorship of the bourgeois state is far from always self-evident. Indeed, in the situation of relatively "calm" class struggle, the "majority" principle itself, constituting the formal mark of any democracy, appears to rebel in the bourgeois everyday consciousness against the Marxist conclusion that the political system of bourgeois democracy expresses the class will of a "minority," of the monopoly bourgeoisie. That is the breeding ground for the illusions and totally erroneous notions about the nature of the bourgeois state. Nevertheless, the class dictatorship becomes visible and tangible even for the empirical experience, especially in periods of political crisis, when the democratic trappings under which it used to function are dropped, and when the "majority" discovers that state terrorism, repression and physical violence against political opponents are a hallmark not only of fascist regimes.

Let us note, by the way, that the category of "bourgeois democracy" expresses its two-fold character: the contradiction between its true, class content, and the objective empirical appearance, or semblance. Lenin says that "semblance also is objective, for it contains one of the aspects of the objective world" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 98). That being so, it is hardly possible to deny that the specific capability of bourgeois democracy to appear to millions of people as a "supra-class" institution is a semblance that is objective and not someone's flight of fancy. But it is, nevertheless, a false semblance of its class substance, which is used by bourgeois ideologists for their deliberate mystifications.

In scientific research, the apparent discrepancy between the empirical semblance and theoretical propositions is resolved with the special concept of "inverted form" which was introduced by Marx.⁴ But such a discrepancy can also provide an indicator of the need to specify a scientific category in the light of new facts and trends. It is all the more important to determine the kind of discrepancy the analyst has to deal with when operating with socio-political categories, because the general line in the change of their content during the transition to socialism consists in what could be called the "removal of mystification." Socialist democracy, for instance, is not only an expression of the will of the popular majority in semblance. It is the will of the majority in substance. Lenin says: "The activity of man, who has constructed an objective picture of the world for himself, changes external actuality ... and thus removes from it the features of

Semblance, externality and nullity, and makes it as being in and for itself (=objectively true)" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 38, p. 217-218).

In the period of crisis and collapse of the capitalist formation, the actual contradictions in the content of socio-political categories are initially discovered in the appearance of ties between these categories and the interests not only of the ruling but also of the other classes. Thus, the contradictory nature of democracy under imperialism is evident in the fact that it is not only adapted to the needs of the ruling class, the monopoly bourgeoisie, but also sustained and maintained by the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses as their important socio-political gain. While remaining a form of the political system which ensures the preservation of the economic foundations of capitalism, democracy provides a basis for the other classes for an offensive against imperialism and makes it possible to build up a preponderance of the popular forces for the advance to new frontiers in the class struggle.

In short, present-day democracy as a form of class struggle in the capitalist world, has undergone substantial changes as a result of the socio-political gains of the masses wrested from imperialism and also in consequence of the latter's adaptation to the new conditions. What is the substance of these changes? In terms of historical roots, this democracy is not just a distant echo of bourgeois revolutions, but is above all the tradition which sprang from the people's great victory over fascism; its present social basis consists of the aspirations of large masses of people for an enlargement of the front of democratic transformations going beyond the framework of purely political relations and spreading to the socio-economic sphere, and also to the sphere of international relations. There is also no doubt about the long-term trend in its consistent development, which is advance to the establishment of socialism.

But for all that, democracy retains its bourgeois substance because preponderance still belongs to the ties which ensure the political and economic domination of monopoly capital, and because — and this should be emphasized once again — they can be broken only by revolution. Only by overcoming monopoly capital is it possible to win a qualitatively new democracy. At the same time, the above-mentioned changes serve even further to obscure the class substance of democracy. The example of democracy shows that the filling of socio-political categories with a new class content is, in principle, limited by a boundary which can be removed only with the resolution

of the cardinal issue of revolution: the issue of power.

From this it does not, of course, follow that social forms with a new, non-bourgeois, socialist content cannot arise at all before this problem is resolved. On the contrary, the emergence and *simultaneous existence* of many socio-political and ideological forms correspondingly linked with the interests of *different* classes is a key aspect of the transformation of the class content of social categories. This is expressed, for instance, in the fact that a socialist ideology emerges and is asserted in social cognition alongside the bourgeois ideology and in struggle against it in the course and as a result of the revolution. This socialist ideology is merged with the working-class movement through the revolutionary party and invests the former with a socialist character. This also refers to phenomena encompassed by the concept of "dual power," the formation alongside the existing state institutions of a specific political organization constituting the embryo of a new state power or ensuring mass support for the advance of the revolution among the working class, the social forces allied with it, and in the army. Such a demarcation, which is a mark of the revolutionary transformation of social structures, is itself an indication that the class content of a social form does not lend itself to change only from "inside," through the supplanting of the old content and a gradual filling in of the new one, that it is impossible simply to borrow it, and that there is here a need for "break-up."

In the epoch of social revolution, the mounting class antagonisms permeate the whole of the social bourgeois universe. They constitute powerful poles of social attraction under whose impact socio-political categories are literally sundered and torn apart. In other such categories there are substantial shifts in the class content, these are distorted and change their specific features and functions. In other words, the picture of that universe as generally highlighted by the revolution is not only unusual but is also extremely dynamic. This requires a ceaseless analysis of all the social categories. These cannot be approached with the old, ossified or dogmatized yardsticks.

Indeed, alongside the reactionary bourgeois nationalism there arises a nationalism which expresses progressive and revolutionary aspirations in the struggle for liberation from imperialist oppression and dependence. Religions, whose conformist function used to ensure support of the old order, serve the revolution. Reform, once designed to let off the steam of social protest becomes a means for consolidat-

ing the gains of the revolution. The army rises up against militarism, and so on and so forth. Such unexpected metamorphoses will be discovered in a great mass of social facts, phenomena, interrelations and processes. It is impossible to comprehend and evaluate these for the purpose of organizing and directing otherwise than by establishing the relation of each social fact, of each category to that axis on which revolution — the wheel of history — now turns.

The participants in the international study group believe that this subject requires further studies and discussion. Mastery of the whole wealth of the Marxist-Leninist methodology is a condition for a fruitful scientific quest and creative development of revolutionary theory.

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 59.

2. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 504.

3. In the transition period the concept of social revolution does not "supplant" the concept of socio-economic formation as the basic methodological reference point. Only by relying on the latter is it possible to show the direction of historical movement and to bring out the concrete, class content of the social revolution concept itself. But the most essential methodological aspect of the analysis of phenomena in the transition period is the comprehension that the connections between socio-political categories and the concept of formation run through the medium of the social revolution concept. Unless this is taken into account, it is impossible to examine the "inner life," the dynamic of categories.

4. Karl Marx. *Capital*, Volume I, p. 537.

COMING SOON

Canada's Party of Socialism History of the Communist Party of Canada 1921-1976

photographs, index
paper \$14.95 cloth \$29.95
Special 60th Anniversary
Limited Edition \$50.00

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

New elements of economic mechanism

Emil Khristov

Member of the BCP CC and the PRB State Council

SOCIALISM: CURRENT PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT

Every communist party which comes to power and sets out to build socialism inevitably has to face a great many new problems. Before the victory of the revolution, many of our comrades expected the formation of socialist social relations to run much more simply than it actually did, for there was no foreseeing some of the difficulties which we have overcome or are still wrestling with.

Every sphere of our social life offers ample scope for theoretical research, analysis and generalization but economic organization problems are very high on the list. The fraternal parties of the socialist community countries, including the Bulgarian Communist Party, are engaged in a persevering quest for more effective incentives to advance production, raise its efficiency, intensify its every aspect and perfect the economic mechanism.

This is a consideration of some of the main principles of our party's current economic policy, which attaches particular importance to the balance between centralism and decentralization, between economic and administrative methods of management. We believe that these are the key element which is connected with intricate problems like specifying the optimal size of industrial and territorial units and the limits of effective concentration of production and centralization of management, on the one hand, and solving many economic and socio-political problems, on the other. This includes, for instance, the perfection of planning, establishment of the right balance between territorial and industrial principles of management, stimulation of the economic initiative of enterprises, creation of a more effective system of material incentives, improvement of the state of the home market, development of democracy in the production sphere, and so on.

Let us note from the outset that the BCP has invariably adhered to the principle that it is impossible to strike an ideal balance between

centralism and decentralization once and for all. The optimum we seek is a historical category. It cannot remain unchanged throughout the whole period of the revolutionary transformation of the society, but is shaped under the influence of a wide range of objective and subjective, internal and external conditions of development. To find such an optimum in each country for each stage of socialist construction is a challenging task, and the extent to which it is accomplished is an indication of the Marxist-Leninist party's creativity and maturity.

It is apparently natural that after the revolution, when the new power has won politically but has yet to consolidate itself economically and train its own cadre, centralism and administrative methods tend to predominate over decentralization and economic instruments. As the revolutionary state is consolidated, as the socialist economy grows more successfully, as economic relations gain in complexity, and cadre are trained more effectively, the development of democracy, decentralization of management and application of economic methods become ever more necessary and possible.

In recent years, our party has followed a policy of extending the powers and increasing the responsibility of economic units,¹ putting them on a self-sustaining basis, more broadly substituting economic methods of management for administrative methods, and eliminating subjectivism. These principles are at the root of the new approach to economic management evolved by the BCP CC under the guidance of General Secretary Todor Zhivkov. The main aspects of the proposed approach were discussed by CC plenums and national conferences of party activists and economic executives. They were included in the CC theses on Bulgaria's development in the period ahead and recently approved by the 12th party congress after a nationwide discussion and with the requisite amendments.

One of our party's priority tasks today is to introduce the economic approach into the production sphere and the service sector at the national and local levels.

What is the substance of this approach?

¹Another in our series on perfecting the economic mechanism in the CMEA countries. See *WMR*, January, February and June 1981.

First principle: *Economic organizations are being put on a self-paying (self-financing) basis.* In other words, they must organize their economic and social activity in such a way as to be able to cover all expenses out of their own earnings, form the requisite funds and deduct the established amounts to the state budget.

Second principle: *In deciding on the quantity, quality and range of products, these organizations must take account of market demand or they will be unable to finance their operations.* Those who turn out products that do not sell will incur material loss. The higher-ranking organization or central planning organ issuing orders to turn out unwanted products will have to purchase them at market prices. No plan or contract can make a consumer accept low-quality or non-standard products. A buyer who does accept them is entitled to demand a rebate. The economic approach also implies that production outlays remain within the limits which the society regards as normal in fixing the price of the commodity. Mismanaged outfits will have to incur losses; in particular, this will have an effect on the pay both of the management and the workers. Higher productivity and cost-cutting naturally make for bigger profit; deductions into the state budget increase, but this goes hand in hand with an increase in the funds of the enterprise and in the wages of workers, and this provides a direct incentive for the staff to strive for high economic performance.

Third principle: *Economic efficiency, expressed in profitability becomes the main criterion of performance, the main source of financial resources, a factor for stability and a condition for the further development of economic organizations.*

It would be wrong to see orientation to the consumer as a concession on the part of the socialist economy to "market models" or the rules on which capitalist enterprises operate.

The new approach to management does, indeed, imply that the home and foreign markets exert a stronger influence on the economy of enterprises, and that self-sufficiency, profit and profitability, as fundamental criteria of economic efficiency, play a greater role. At the same time, it is also marked by a strengthening of the principle of centralization, "since the importance of central planning is not only maintained but is in fact increased from the standpoint of the scientific soundness and depth of managing processes. How does this new quality of planning express itself?

In a socialist economy, where social property is predominant, the market serves primarily to ascertain, develop and meet the people's

requirements according to plan. Their main aspects are reflected in long-term programs for raising the working people's standard of living. In Bulgaria, such a program was adopted by the Central Committee in December 1972. The 12th congress extended and amended it. It provides, among other things, for the attainment by 1990 of rational physiological consumption norms for meat, milk and eggs, and for coming close to such norms for fruit and vegetables. The party has also worked out standards and formulated long-term objectives in other spheres of material and spiritual life on which the people's well-being depends.

The long-term goal-oriented program for raising the people's standard of living is the starting point in drafting the five-year plans, including the current one. It follows that drafting starts from social guidelines, and this makes our plans not just economic but socio-economic in the full sense of the word. Production development is entirely geared to the attainment of social targets, for our society and its economy serve the interests of man.

To carry out long-term goal-oriented programs and ensure the production of basic consumer goods in adequate quantities and of proper quality, enterprises are given binding assignments in terms of kind instead of value. Accordingly, in physical terms, trading organizations are assigned tasks in purchasing foodstuffs and selling them to the population; transport, in carrying passengers and freight; the building industry, in erecting production capacities; and research, experimental and designing organizations, in evolving new techniques and technologies for realizing investments.

Thus our economic organizations have to do with a market which differs radically from the market underpinning the capitalist economy and which some theorists are now trying to foist on us. Under socialism, the market is an instrument serving primarily to steadily raise the people's well-being and guaranteeing conscientious producers the sale of their output both now and in the future. The consumer can similarly rest assured that thanks to the long-term plans, the earmarked goods will be produced and delivered, trading organizations will be guaranteed deliveries and so a definite turnover, transport will have enough to carry, the building industry enough contract, and so on.

However, economic organizations have to operate on both the domestic and the foreign market. Bulgaria has an "open" economy. It participates in the international, primarily socialist, division of labor and sells a substan-

tial part of its product to other countries (from 80 to 90 per cent in some industries). Exports on such a scale are naturally paralleled by sizable imports.

Socialist Bulgaria's foreign market is also basically regulated by plan and is only partially influenced by the elemental workings of the world capitalist economy. We conclude long-term inter-governmental agreements on specialization, cooperation and reciprocal deliveries not only with socialist or developing countries but also with capitalist countries. The fulfillment of Bulgaria's commitments to these countries is guaranteed by directive plan assignments to enterprises. When operating outside official agreements, our economic organizations come up against free and open markets which are subject to short-term fluctuations, crises, and inflationary processes with speculation on money markets and commodity exchange. It is necessary to adjust to these spontaneously shaping conditions, at every moment and over the long term so as to hold one's ground in competition.

Lately, most of Bulgaria's foreign trade enterprises have been put under the control of economic organizations. When concluding deals with foreign partners, they are allowed to freely choose an agent to act on behalf of their own foreign-trade enterprise and any one of the specialized foreign-trade enterprises of other economic organizations or ministries. Major economic units have the right to sign contracts with foreign partners directly.

It is clear that higher competitiveness of products and so greater efficiency of production and the self-sufficiency of enterprises depend to a great degree on *scientific and technological progress*. Until recently, the technical and technological level of production in Bulgaria was described rather loosely as "world level," "average world level," "above" or "below the world level." These have now been replaced by new, highly precise criteria. When it comes to quality, the merits of design and main parameters of an article, the standard is the most perfect product of the given type, irrespective of where it was produced or by which firm. The merits of technology, too, are assessed by comparing it with the world's most productive technologies.

The State Committee on Science and Technological Progress submits to the central planning bodies long-term programs of scientific and technological progress in the strategic sectors of the Bulgarian economy and main economic organizations. These documents are also used in drafting the five-year plans.

Technological progress and high production efficiency require a high degree of specialization and the construction of enterprises with optimal batch production and optimal proportions of technological lines, shops and complexes as well as a developed system of cooperation. Social property in the means of production makes it possible to pursue a policy of specializing enterprises and developing cooperation ties between them on the scale of the national economy as a whole. A planned approach to the problem at the state level can be twice or three times as effective as in the case of specialization and cooperation under capitalism, where these face the handicaps and constraints of private property. This policy necessitates careful analysis of every sector of production in terms of the possibility of unifying and standardizing parts, units, and so on, all the way to the finished product. A high substitution factor paves the way for numerous combinations and modifications and for a great variety of finished products.

Over the past three or four years, these matters have been elaborated in every economic sector. They are known in economic practice as the "multiplier approach." The initiative and the main ideas here have come from comrade Todor Zhivkov.

And so, the more important lines of our economic approach are based on perfecting planning techniques in economic management, which is becoming more scientifically grounded thanks to serious preparations, including the drawing up of the pre-plan documents mentioned above. This makes it possible to improve markedly the centralized planning of the main national economic proportions. Our party regards such planning as one of the key advantages of the socialist system that should not only be preserved but also used to the utmost. The planned definition of the main proportions which makes it possible to carry out long-term programs is a most important aspect of the Bulgarian economic mechanism.

What opportunities for initiative and autonomy does this approach offer to the enterprises? What kind of correlation does it establish between centralism and decentralization in the nation's economic management?

It noticeably increases the autonomy of economic organizations in internal planning and the establishment of market ties, enhances the responsibility for production results, and the interdependence of these results, on the one hand, and the size of enterprise funds and wages, on the other.

Enterprises now get from the center only a minimum of indicators in kind ensuring the

main balances of the economy and guaranteeing the fulfillment of long-term programs. There are three indicators; they establish the volume of basic output (in pieces, tons, liters, etc.), the amount of profit, and that of foreign exchange earnings (in absolute figures) if the enterprise exports its output. After limiting the number of directive assignments, the state has moved on to more active regulation of economic activity by means of limits and norms.²

To reach directive plan targets, the enterprise only uses part of its capacities; as for the rest, it may use them at its discretion by producing any volume of any product, provided it meets the varied and continuously changing demand. The enterprise is also allowed to choose its contractors and sign contracts for the supply of raw and other materials and the delivery of finished articles. The products turned out by an enterprise on its own initiative do not necessarily have to accord with its specialization; we have not only lifted all restrictions on product mix but, in fact, encourage production of additional or side products that go to expand the consumer goods market.

These measures are aimed, in particular, to solve a problem which exists not only in Bulgaria: to prevent goods in short supply from being distributed through the "back door," which leads to unearned incomes for some population groups and so to a secondary redistribution of the national income, a practice which cuts across the principles of socialism. As we see it, effective reward of an enterprise for turning out extra products for which there is high demand, and so for improving the state of the home market, should have a beneficial effect on the whole social climate in this sense as well.

Economic organizations are no longer handed down assignments "from above" for volume of output, growth of labor productivity, costs, profitability, individual wages, new capital construction, and so on. They plan all this by themselves, with due regard for obligatory indicators, limits and norms, and also for their relations and contracts with their partners.

While allowing enterprises greater freedom of action, we ponder the ways and means of preventing any possible negative effects of this step. Some enterprises hold a monopoly position in their field, that is, not legally but by virtue of the fact that they are the only ones in the country to produce this or that item or provide a definite service. This "monopoly" is, of course, a concomitant of increasing specialization, particularly in small and medium countries. How are we to counter manifestations of

this kind of monopoly? How are we to bar the speculative making of unwarrantedly high profits from the exclusive standing of an enterprise in its production sphere or the scarcity of a given commodity?

The alternative to monopoly is competition. While striving to avoid this kind of exclusiveness and offer a choice of partners, we come up against the following new problem: is competition between socialist enterprises a good or bad thing?

The practice of rigidly attaching some enterprises to others (such as attaching one enterprise to other cooperating enterprises, designers, builders, transport or building organizations) has been ended in Bulgaria. Where a field of activity has not been de facto monopolized and there is an opportunity for choice, economic organizations have a right to use the opportunity. The monopoly of specialized foreign trade enterprises³ has also been abolished, while the state monopoly of foreign trade remains.

In perfecting the economic mechanism, the party raises a question of great social significance: how is it possible effectively to curb the bureaucratic practices of which public servants are often guilty? How are we to overcome the conservatism and dogmatism among managers some of whom get into such a rut that they cease to appreciate new management approaches and techniques? Subjectively, they remain honest men, but objectively, they are a drag on the dispatch of business.

By introducing the economic approach, we tangibly extend the administrative autonomy of economic units. We have eliminated or are going to eliminate intermediate bodies (various committees, directorates, etc.). We have substantially limited the operational functions of ministries.

Our party has systematically extended and deepened democracy in economic management. It has worked to introduce the practice of contest and election in filling managerial posts. Party documents recognize the advisability of ensuring that in the future leading personnel ranging from team leader, shift supervisor, shop, plant or combine manager, and all the way up to the general director of an economic organization are elected by the staff, directly or through their representatives, depending on the size of the collective. This also applies to the heads of the main functional departments.⁴ Collective self-management bodies — general meetings of workers, elected economic committees and councils — are being granted greater powers. The workers are to exercise more vigorous control over the decisions and activity

of the management, whose members must account periodically to the staff. The responsibility for the decisions being taken and the publicity of the decisions are being enhanced.

This means that the party is improving the moral climate, in which toadying and the root of this evil — efforts by some executives to build up their personal power — are definitely contra-indicated. It also means that the party is combating manifestations of money-grubbing and corruption, which still regrettably tend to occur not only among those who sided with the revolution after its victory, but in our own ranks as well.

The BCP attaches fundamental importance to measures promoting democracy in the production sphere and will persevere in them with the greatest consistency. But we do not at all imagine that we have solved all the problems in this sphere once and for all. Indeed, Bulgaria's communists are concerned with a number of serious questions. One of these is how to maintain an atmosphere in which people can criticize the shortcomings of leaders openly and without fear and yet see to it that counter-revolutionary forces do not come by any "trump cards" in the process and that criticism benefits society by fostering its further progress.

Closely linked with the autonomy of enterprises in regard to planning, finance and management is the new principle of remuneration of labor on the basis of the so-called residual wages. The substance of this innovation is that the wages of enterprise collectives will no longer be guaranteed by anyone. Their amount will depend on the production results or economic performance, and will be determined in a procedure worth describing in some detail.

The enterprise must first draw on its earnings to make up for material expenditures, pay off its debt to credit institutions, pay taxes to the state, and make mandatory deductions to its own funds (reserve, expansion and development, and social funds). The rest is what the collective may distribute in the form of wages. If at the end of the financial period it turns out that spare funds are left after the preliminary payment of wages, the collective may use them at its discretion to increase the remuneration of labor, the social fund, or the expansion and development fund. Where all the extra funds or the bulk of them are used for increasing pay or collective consumption, a progressive tax comes into effect. Now for an important detail. The state establishes for a definite period what it regards as a normal correlation between the growth of the social productivity of labor and wages. As long as wages in an economic

organization grow within those limits, the extra amounts going into consumption are exempted from tax.

The introduction of residual wages turns the monthly wages of workers, specialists and managers into a kind of advance. This is true above all of enterprises with a long production cycle (as in agriculture, ship-building or construction). There, the final amount of wages can be specified only after the product has been sold and the financial relations with the state, the banks and other enterprises have been settled.

It may well be, of course, that by the end of the financial year the wage fund turns out to be smaller than the amount paid out in advance. The enterprise may even find itself lacking funds to pay the workers for the final month. That is when the problems will arise and when the economic organization will have to look about for ways to go on operating under the new system. What can it do?

The enterprise may compensate for the lack of funds by drawing on its own reserve fund and take steps to prevent the recurrence of a similar situation. If it lacks adequate reserves, it may seek gratuitous aid or a loan from the ministry's reserve fund or the special reserve fund of the state. Needless to say, an enterprise which funds itself in such a situation is rendered assistance only if it has a credible program for its recovery. If, however, it remains insolvent for a long time — say, six months — its very existence is called into question. In that case, the higher authority is entitled to deprive the enterprise of autonomy for a time, take over its management, put it under the control of another organization or close it down. Which of these solutions is chosen depends on the assessment of concrete factors. Be that as it may, economic bodies must decide on the matter in collaboration with the trade unions so as not to infringe the workers' interests.

The new economic mechanism in principle provides for a yet further variant. Where the plan binds an economic organization or enterprise to produce a certain type of product which is important to the society but which is unprofitable for objective reasons, it may be allowed a temporary price increment or bonus. That is, in effect, a form of state subsidy. It is, in principle, regressive, which means that it is allocated at the beginning of the five-year plan period and then reduced from year to year. In any case, loss-making enterprises must submit a program of measures for reducing and gradually dispensing with state subsidies.

The new economic approach and the mechanism of its application I have described

were first introduced in agriculture and the food industry at the beginning of 1979, and throughout the economy, including the social services (with due modifications), in 1980. What are the results so far?

Last year's plan for the growth of national income was fulfilled with an increase making roughly 5 per cent, and that for profit, approximately 9 per cent. Gains have also been registered this year: in the first half-year, the national income grew by 13 per cent as compared with the same period of 1980, and profit by 20 per cent. Labor productivity has showed a marked increase, much greater than that in the average wages. The production has become more rhythmical and financial accounts between enterprises are being settled faster. The country has a positive balance of trade.

While our new economic approach has not yet been sufficiently tested to warrant any final conclusions, the results achieved to date fully entitle us to persevere in applying its funda-

mental principles and perfecting the mechanism of its application. The 12th BCP congress confirmed the soundness of the new approach, and we are continuing to introduce and improve this economic system.

1. Here and elsewhere: economic organizations and enterprises.
2. Limits are set for labor power, fuels, raw and other materials in short supply, and foreign exchange for purchases abroad. Besides, enterprises must adhere to obligatory norms, such as the standard state rates of payments into the budget, an obligatory minimum of deductions from profits for their own funds, the share of the enterprise's income which the individual workers or the collective as a whole may receive for good performance, and the distribution of depreciation allowances.
3. I have said that a number of major economic entities have the right to operate on the foreign market autonomously while others may freely choose among foreign trade enterprises contractors that suit them.
4. For the time being and by way of exception, heads of economic organizations and enterprises are to be appointed by order of the higher body but their candidacies must receive the approval of the collective in the course of a contest.

Our view of the specific ways of revolution

Jagannath Sarkar
Central Executive Committee member and
National Council Secretary,
Communist Party of India

In recent years the left-wing forces in India have been widely discussing the country's possible roads to socialism. Taking part in the discussion are leading political figures, active members of mass organizations, and scientists who in principle agree that the country has a socialist perspective. The most diverse conceptions are advanced which are not only different but at times mutually exclusive. The question is raised of the specific Indian features which may influence the advance to socialism and of how to apply the Marxist-Leninist theory to the specific conditions of India. At the same time, the tenets of that theory are checked once again. Our party has made a major contribution to the ongoing discussion and has stimulated it by summing up, at its latest congress, the considerable experience of the national revolutionary movement, not only the positive but also the lessons of our omissions.

This discussion involves not only a comprehensive study of the concrete situation in India and the tendencies of India's social, economic and political development. We are having to

look into questions of general methodology linked to the elaboration of the ways and means of putting revolutionary transformations into effect. Moreover, it is growing obvious that in order to direct the study and discussion into the correct channel and scientifically substantiate their findings it is vital to be clear about the general methodological requirements laid down by Marxism-Leninism for studying the problem we are discussing. This accentuates the significance of Leninism, which gives us the theoretical, methodological key to understanding the present revolutionary process.

Paradoxically, we have constantly to note the fact that Leninism, unlike doctrinaire interpretations, including the interpretations of its adversaries, does not link the transition to socialism to any hard and fast way. On the contrary, recognition that in every country there is a specific way for the socialist revolution is typical of the Leninist system of views as is the necessity of taking general laws into account.

In this context, it is important to note that it

was none other than Lenin, who, in the footsteps of Marx, upheld and amplified the idea of the diversity of the revolutionary process. In a rebuff to dogmatic doctrinairism soon after the Great October Revolution he wrote: "Our European philistines never even dream that the subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly display even greater distinctions than the Russian revolution" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 480). Thus, our theory orients us on a quest for ways and means of transition to the new society specific to a given country, making the point that these may cover a larger range than known to historical experience.

At the same time it should be borne in mind that although every revolution has features of its own, the diversity of the ways along which it can lead to success is not inexhaustible. There are ways (and there are many of them, as we know from the experience of the working-class and national liberation movements) that lead nowhere, that do not, regardless of subjective intentions, allow arriving at socialism. More, there are ways leading to deformations that undermine confidence in the very idea of socialism. However that may be, the adherents of ways of this kind strive to justify them ideologically on the plea that they are original, that the situation is novel, that there are new possibilities, and so forth. By insisting that the general laws of the revolution should be taken into account, Leninism provides a scientific criterion, which, by means of a concrete analysis, allows identifying realistic ways of revolution from false ways in the sea of diversity. This is the basis on which we look for our solution.

Another methodological requirement of Leninism is that it is indispensable to consider the question of the ways of the revolution against the background of history. We feel that this requirement is sometimes seen so one-sidedly that, as a result, the essence of the problem is reduced to, so to speak, "geographical" distinctions, to local specifics. However, a visible imprint is also made by what may be called "historical time." This is taken to mean conditions that change in the course of a given country's social, political and economic evolution, and also under the impact of changes in the alignment of class forces on the national and the international scene.

These are the points of departure in our discussion on the specifics of the ways of the revolution. Insofar as any socialist revolution is a people's movement, it is profoundly national. In this context, it is quite proper to elaborate a

specifically national way of the revolution, for instance, the Indian way.

However, account must be taken of the fact that as the socio-political and economic situation changes, something new that we know nothing of at present will not only possibly but inevitably arise. This new may upset our most thoroughly tested and entirely scientific assumptions about the probable course the revolution will take, making it necessary not merely to correct former views but also to be prepared to adopt a different way dictated by the logic of the country's actual development. A general methodological requirement is that one should not cling to the orientations and potentialities of yesterday, that one should also keep his finger on the pulse of social life. This is particularly important in India, where, as we shall show in this article, there are increasingly more striking indications that the revolutionary activity of the masses is taking a new direction. Generally speaking, I should like to note that the class struggle, the mass movements are full of surprises and that they are constantly bringing to light what had earlier been unknown. Of course, they ignore "models of development." In short, it should not be forgotten that precisely the revolutionary process itself is our principal teacher. That is why the *determination of the ways of revolution is a constant quest on the basis of an unceasing analysis of the changing situation.*

Thus, we proceed from the fact that diversity ranges beyond the national way. It is implicit in the processes of revolution in every country. We see as unfounded any aspiration to "standardize" the national way, to turn it into a stereotype suitable for all time and excluding the very possibility of *different ways of implementing social transformations on one and the same specifically national soil.* Needless to say, history is not made twice, and from the possible variants for effecting the transition to socialism the practice of the class struggle will ultimately select only one. But to ignore multivariant development would mean to narrow the boundaries of these possibilities, to tie one's hands beforehand with a set timetable for future history.

In our discussions the general methodological question has been raised of whether the concept "national way" boils down to taking account solely of national features? There are two aspects to this question.

One is linked to the application of regularities to national conditions, as we have already noted. Our general conclusion is that if it is taken without account of regularities, of the dynamics of class relations, the national-

specific may prove to be no more than secondary. The national-specific touches on what is essential only when it is considered in dialectical unity with what is law-governed. This consists of inseparable characteristics of one and the same actual process, and it is only on the basis of this unity that it becomes possible to work out a national way serving as the orientation in the struggle between classes and helping to make fuller use of the potentiality implicit in that struggle. In other words, the law-governed in actual life does not exist outside and apart from the national-specific, and vice versa.

The other aspect of the same question is the place of the national-specific in the totality of concrete-historical conditions of the revolutionary process. Lenin's analysis of the ways of the Russian revolution made in the period of the preparations for the October Revolution shows that they depended essentially on factors that were not derivatives solely from the national way of life.

In fact, relative to the course of the revolution in Russia Lenin evolved a theory of two possible ways: an armed uprising and a peaceful take-over of power by the working people. Neither possibility was by any means made conditional exclusively on the national specific of Russia. Each arose out of a special combination of class relations, which, as the experience of subsequent revolutions has borne out, tends to repeat itself on other national soil.

This example shows why it would be wrong to identify the national way of the revolution with some definite form of struggle, with this or that means of establishing the power of the working class. The very opposite is true: along the national way of the revolution we cannot renounce any of the forms of struggle engendered by the popular movement.

We thus see that the national-specific is only one of the components of the concrete-historical conditions, on which the way of the revolution in the given country depends. Its peculiarity goes far beyond the purely national.

This peculiarity depends largely on the alignment of class and state forces on the world scene, on the international situation. Moreover, the international induces us not merely to make additional corrections in a definite way of the revolution but influences the entire concept of the way of the revolution.

Thus, hardly any Marxist will deny that the very possibility of transition to socialism (through several intermediate stages) in pre-bourgeois countries and also in countries with a low level of capitalist development appeared in our epoch as a result of the emergence of

existing socialism, of the formation of the socialist world system. And the fact that today the road to socialism is objectively not closed to any people makes the primary conditions, modes and means of achieving this aim much more varied than before.

Today the revolution is linked not with world war, as happened twice (although Marxism-Leninism does not see war as an inevitable cause of revolution, and experience has borne this out), but with peaceful coexistence of states and with the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe. The need to curb imperialism's aggressive ambitions and also its counter-revolutionary sorties presupposes close coordination of the national way of the revolution with the principles of proletarian internationalism.

In this question we sometimes encounter the view that interaction between the revolutionary forces of different countries "must" be reduced basically to the objective, spontaneous processes taking place on the world scene under the impact of the struggle of each people for socialism in its own country. The significance of the subjective factor, the importance of coordinating the efforts of the revolutionary forces, is here clearly underrated. In practice this evolves into a "restrictive internationalism." What characterizes it? A joint struggle on the international scene is permitted — but only for democracy and progress, not for socialism. Solidarity is also allowed but only if it is general democratic, not class solidarity.

One can understand this attitude when it is adopted by people who are not yet prepared to fight for socialism or do not accept revolution. We are far from accusing these people of "class inconsistency." On the contrary, we support and share their aspiration to see a democratization of international relations and the observance of universally accepted norms of democracy in relations between states, explaining that this is hindered by nobody except imperialism. This goes without saying.

Objections arise when the standpoint of various non-revolutionary political forces is presented as adequate for the socialist movement of the working class, and especially when bans are imposed on internationalist support for a people defending the achievements of its revolution. To agree to such bans is tantamount to ignoring class criteria and independence, to leaving such a people to the mercies of the imperialists.

In criticizing primitive, banal notions of the ways of the revolution, Lenin wrote that the proponents of these notions "are complete strangers to the idea that while the development of world history as a whole follows gen-

eral laws it is by no means precluded, but, on the contrary, presumed, that certain periods of development may display peculiarities in either the form or the sequence of this development" (Coll. Works, Vol. 33, p. 477).

In our view, Lenin's idea about the peculiarity of the forms or the sequence of development cannot be given a narrow interpretation, for example, as relating exclusively to developing countries. This interpretation may give the impression that today the general regularity in world history is embodied by industrialized capitalist powers. But this is not the case in an epoch witnessing the continued transition from capitalism to socialism. On the one hand, the formation of the socialist world system and the downfall of colonial empires have immensely widened the framework of world history, of which all humanity has become the subject for the first time. On the other, the development of the state-monopoly system has led to such an "over-maturing" of capitalism that a "purely" proletarian-socialist revolution is becoming less and less probable in the industrialized capitalist countries themselves. The peoples of these countries are faced with the problem of finding their own pattern of development linked to the accumulation of a huge number of democratic issues waiting to be resolved, for without this there sometimes cannot be a direct transition to socialist transformations.

In our discussions the view was stated that since under present-day capitalism a certain "levelling" of socio-economic conditions is taking place in various countries, it is becoming possible to work out definite types of ways of the revolution, say, for developing countries, or for some of them that have similar levels of economic development.

We see typology as a factor of understanding both the laws and the peculiarities of the revolutionary process. However, today, alongside the trend toward the levelling of the objective and subjective prerequisites of revolution, the operation of the law of uneven economic and political development is growing increasingly more visible. For that reason it may be assumed that there will still be considerable distinctions in the forms, rate, stages and the sequence of revolutionary changes, even if revolutions were to commence more or less simultaneously in a group of countries.

Ultimately, in determining the national way of the revolution it is of the utmost importance to research how the specific features of a country are refracted through the prism of class relations and, in this connection, to ascertain the political behavior tendencies of the various

classes in the obtaining situation. For India, because of its present peculiarity, it is of paramount importance to assess the role and potentialities of the national bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

One of the features of Indian society's development over the past few decades has been that the policy of the bourgeoisie, that headed the nation following its liberation from British rule, reflected partially the aspirations of all patriotic social forces, including the working class. I am speaking of the aspirations to consolidate political independence, ensure the nation's economic sovereignty, lay the foundations for modern industry, promote agricultural production by modifying outdated agrarian relations, put an end to poverty, form a political system founded on universal adult suffrage and parliamentary democracy, and consolidate national integration.

We see the positive results of this policy. In order to ensure independence, India has taken the road of nonalignment and the promotion of closer relations with the socialist world. Assistance from socialist countries has helped to build the foundations of modern industry. Agricultural development has delivered India from dependence on imports of food. However, advancement has been slow and contradictory because the general direction of advance was sought along the path of capitalist development. From the outset it was seen that national forces were unable to unite all the peoples of the Indian subcontinent and oppose pressure from imperialism. This led to the country's division into India, Pakistan and subsequently, Bangladesh. But the main thing is that the capitalist path along which the bourgeoisie has been taking the country has triggered a crisis of Indian society.

In analyzing the reasons for this, note must be made of the following. The public sector of the economy has been placed in the service of the development of capitalism in the country and, as a result, although it has demonstrated immense potentialities in rebuilding the national economy and effecting positive social changes, it has proved to be incapable of countering the monopolies, which have strengthened their positions in the country, much less of ousting them from various sectors of the economy. The ruling circles have done nothing to create the resources for socio-economic development through efficient management of the public sector in the interests of the people, limiting the profits of the monopolies, and curbing the black market that emerged as a result of the enrichment of capitalists and landowners. The banks were nationalized, but the

bulk of the credit was advanced to the monopolists. A huge sum of black money, as large as the white money, is circulating in the country like a parallel economy. India's socio-economic evolution has led to the estrangement of some classes, including some sections of the bourgeoisie, from the ruling circles, to a deepening of class antagonisms. Unemployment is running at a high rate. The rate of inflation continues to be high and is growing and more and more are finding themselves pushed below the poverty line. Faced with these problems the ruling class is giving concessions to multinationals seeking assistance from the International Monetary Fund and trying to promote a so-called export-oriented economy. It is also seeking to ban strikes. It is a welcome sign that the working class has begun to unite on a nationwide level to repulse the new attacks. Mass disaffection is spreading. This is making the issue of a change of class leadership more and more vital.

This change can be effected by the Indian working class — not independently but in alliance with other classes and strata, especially with the peasantry, including well-to-do peasants, and together with the mass of the petty-bourgeoisie and semi-proletarians of both town and countryside. It should be noted that although this signifies the removal of the bourgeoisie from the leadership of the nation, there is the possibility of acting in alliance with some of its sections. The foundation of such an alliance is not merely an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist but also an *anti-monopoly* program.

To some extent traditions make it hard to consolidate the worker-peasant alliance. Ever since the movement for independence, the Indian peasantry has been influenced by bourgeois leaders. Anti-feudal reforms, despite their inconsistency, and also state assistance, which contributed to the development of agriculture and the creation of its infrastructure, have benefited the peasants, particularly the well-to-do peasants. There is growing differentiation among the peasantry. A powerful class of rural bourgeoisie has emerged and its conflict with the agricultural laborers and poor peasants has intensified. Momentum is currently being acquired by a new long-term factor that is significantly influencing the attitude of the peasants. This is the *growth of the capitalist market* under the impact mainly of the monopolies. The relations between agricultural and industrial production are beginning to prejudice the peasants. This is generating spontaneous protests by them against the monopolists, against wholesale traders. As a result, the possibility is opening for drawing

the peasants into the struggle for the implementation of a wide-ranging democratic program, envisaging, in particular, balanced and fair prices for farm products and manufactured goods. We are aware that not all the peasants will go along with us and that they may even act against us if the workers do not help them to resolve their economic problems.

A lack of a realistic alternative, that can only be produced by a worker-peasant alliance, in many cases induces the peasants to isolate themselves in castes and to strive to obtain concessions only for themselves or to try and find compensation for what has been lost as a result of pressure from the monopolies at the expense of farm laborers and the rural poor. The growth of capitalism in agriculture is leading to a new type of casteism. The rural bourgeoisie belonging to the intermediate caste is trying to strengthen its position by pleading "backwardness;" the section belonging to the upper caste is doing this by claiming "caste superiority." Here the objective is to gain control over the panchayats (local self-government) and other administrative institutions. In this process the toiling masses are being divided. Menacing forms are being assumed also by other tendencies that must be surmounted in order to unite the peasants and other democratic sections of the people with the workers. Religious communalism and regionalism springing from uneven development, the hostility of the local population to "newcomers" and separatism engendered by neglect of the aspiration for tribal nationalism are some of the channels along which the mass dissatisfaction of the people, particularly of the peasants, is finding expression.

However, we believe that a volatile mass disaffection may explode into a turbulent revolutionary situation, in which an alliance of the working class with the peasants and all democrats will lead to the abolition of the bourgeois monopoly of state power and to a radical democratic restructuring of Indian society. This is a real social prospect. In this connection the question is being raised in our discussions of whether the present ruling class of India will permit a change of power peacefully, as the working class would like? Will parliamentary democracy not be abolished before this possibility is realized?

Past experience has shown that it is not at all simple to destroy parliamentary democracy in India. In comparing this with the situation in most of the neighboring countries, where such democracy has been suppressed, we see it as a specific Indian feature. Of course, there are sinister signs in India as well. And this is caus-

ing serious alarm: I am referring to the state of emergency, the intention to establish a presidential form of administration and to introduce legislation that would pare down democratic and trade union rights, the attempts to make legislation dependent on the executive, rig elections, and so on. However, the masses of India, including those influenced by the bourgeoisie, are determined to keep parliamentary democracy intact. The efforts to limit or abolish it are strongly resisted. The ruling class has on several occasions been compelled to retreat from its attempt to undermine democracy. If the democratic changes I am talking about are supported by the broad masses, the ruling class will be unable to suppress democracy and thereby hinder these changes. However, we should not rule out the possibility in future of a non-peaceful way, which our people will have to take in the event democracy is destroyed.

Thus, the specific character of our formation of the question of ending the bourgeois monopoly of power and changing the class leadership of the nation is that in view of the democratic political system in India we orient ourselves on a peaceful way. It must be emphasized that precisely because the maturing social tasks are democratic they can be carried out democratically. Not only is this way preferable, we favor it because, among other things, in the present situation it is the only possible way conforming with the will of the people. However, we are far from harboring illusions in our assessments of the likely political behavior of the class adversary and of his resources for opposing the people's will.

The guarantees of the peaceful way lie by no means either in the "prudence" of the ruling circles, or in the country's alleged "traditions of non-violence," or in any parliamentary combinations. These guarantees are the ability of the masses to use every form of class struggle and defend democracy, their strength and organization, and their capacity to overcome disunity generated by caste, religion or ethnic differences, and broad popular support for a program of democratic changes. This is precisely why in India there is now the possibility of preventing the ruling class from moving from democracy to a dictatorship. While bearing this possibility in mind, it should not be forgotten that today the ruling classes have the means not only of democracy but also of dictatorship, that

"pure" democracy without a class dictatorship is an illusion conflicting with political realities. Consequently, the peaceful way may be considered assured only when the ability of the ruling classes to turn state violence against the people is paralyzed. This can only be done by a nascent revolution.

When we speak of urgent democratic changes in India, we mean a special, transitional stage in socio-economic and political development. In our country it may, in all likelihood, precede direct socialist changes, serve as their prologue and even give them a start but, of course, it cannot eclipse or replace them. Much less, then, are there grounds for playing off the features of this transitional stage against socialist changes, or for identifying it with socialism. In our view, this sort of abstract juxtapositioning and identification is a primary methodological error leading, for instance, to a negation of the general features and regularities of the socialist revolution on the grounds that we are able to uncover and understand some regularities of a democratic — for its aims and means — revolution. Of course, in practice democratic and socialist changes closely intertwine, fuse and evolve into one another. The borderline between them is extremely mobile. However, failure to see it or to take it into account may lead to a dislocation of the historical prospect, to illusions and, in the final analysis, to unrealistic programs.

In the tradition of Leninism, when one looks for one's own course of the revolution, one draws upon the experience of the class struggle not only in one's own but also in other countries, especially upon the experience of consummated revolutions. It is quite apparent that far from hindering the quest for new ways, the ways to socialism that have already been blazed help this quest, that they provide an irreplaceable means of checking and asserting hypotheses and surmises long before the practice of the class battles in one's own country passes final judgment on them. It is also in the Leninist tradition to assimilate every experience critically, in a revolutionary manner. This has nothing in common with thoughtless, mechanical repetition of past experience. By seeking to embrace the entire diversity of accumulated experience to the fullest possible extent and make the utmost use of its wealth, our theory helps practice to work out the most expedient ways and means of struggle.

A unique monthly source of theory and information from the communist and workers' parties of the world.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

— *now with larger print*

INFORMATION BULLETIN

— *now bigger, brighter and easier to read*

Until the end of 1981 subscriptions for the two journals will remain \$7.50. As of January 1, 1982, subscriptions for the two will be \$12.50 (institutions, double rate).

Subscribe now and save \$5.00

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS
320 West Ohio Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

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., \$7.50 a year. Other countries, \$11.50. Institutions, double rate.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, 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'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Éditions,
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: Aikakaulehti 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 Política,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

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

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

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

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhâp,
Khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam