WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

January 1979, Vol. 22, No. 1 $1.00

Afghanistan/103

Interview with Fidel Castro/4

Threat to peace in the South Atlantic/122

The party and the intelligentsia/70

Nazi wave on West German market/136

Democratic Yemen/19

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

January 1979, Vol. 22, No. 1

Features

3 Embarking upon the third decade

4 Marxism-Leninism and the Cuban revolution
F. Castro Ruz

19 A new vanguard party
A.F. Ismail

Party experience

30 The Argentine working-class movement today
A. Fava

39 Leninism and the international aspect of the fight for socialism in Britain
B. Ramelson

51 Report at first hand. Second day
V. Moyev

Exchange of views

70 The party and the intelligentsia
WMR Round Table

91 The agrarian question and the peasantry's role in developing countries
International Conference

Viewpoints

103 Afghanistan: the beginning of a new era
S.M. Zeray

110 Struggle for revolutionary and democratic renewal
H. Safari

113 The question of confidence
G. Kade

Continued next page

Continued

122 Threat to peace in the South Atlantic
J. Laborde, E. Pahad

The press

134 A fundamental work
O. Duyos

136 Nazi wave on the West German market
E. Mayer

143 Where the party began
H. Schneider

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

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

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

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

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

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

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

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

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

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

feature

Embarking upon the third decade

Dear Friends,

As the *WMR* steps into the year 1979 it leaves behind a significant milestone — the 20th anniversary of its publication and circulation. In connection with the anniversary the journal has received over a hundred messages of congratulation from leaders and Central Committees of fraternal parties, from their Marxist centers, institutes and press organs, from leaders of revolutionary-democratic parties, national-liberation movements and international democratic organizations. The Editorial Board, Editorial Council, and our international collective wish to express their gratitude for the high assessment of the journal's work in these messages and the sincere wishes of further success.

We address our gratitude first of all to the fraternal communist parties for it was by their will that the *WMR* was founded, and their concern is a great help in the work of the journal as a collective communist tribune of which the fraternal parties are equal and voluntary members. On the initiative of communists in various countries the journal gives increasing space to materials on exchanges of party experience, discussions of complex and pressing problems, Marxist-Leninist theory, the building of socialism and communism, the strategy and tactics of the class struggle in the broad spectrum of conditions in different countries and regions. The journal's growing influence is thus an indication of the onward march of the international communist movement and the world revolutionary process.

We address our gratitude to our many friends throughout the world, to our contributors, to those responsible for publication and circulation, and to our subscribers and readers. Thank you for your interest, your suggestions and comments, and your help. We would appreciate receiving more letters, more articles, and material on what claims the attention of the communists today, and what they fight for at the head of the working people.

As for the journal's plans they spring from the tasks defined by the fraternal parties, the comments and recommendations made by the 1977 Conference on the Work of the Journal, and in the anniversary

greetings. In our efforts to improve the journal we shall be guided by the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, by the revolutionary experience of history, the lessons of the parties' struggle today, and the new conclusions in theory and practice. As always, the journal will be a reliable assistant of the fraternal parties in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism, for closer international solidarity of communists and of all progressive forces.

We shall continue our policy of publishing articles by party leaders, prominent scholars, public figures, and personalities of the world of culture. Subject lines in which readers have shown an interest will cotninue and new series on current problems will appear. Topics prompted by the times will be the subject of international discussions, conferences, symposia, round tables, etc., organized by the journal.

As we embark upon the third decade of our work, the Editorial Board, Editorial Council and international collective sincerely wish you happiness, good health, and success in your struggle and in your work, and a very happy new year!

Marxism-Leninism and the Cuban revolution

Fidel Castro Ruz
First Secretary, CC CP Cuba,
Chairman, State Council,
Council of Ministers
of Republic of Cuba

January will see the 20th anniversary of the Cuban revolution, which turned a small semi-colonial country into America's first free territory that is successfully building the new, socialist society. On the eve of that glorious anniversary *WMR* correspondent and member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia Luis Padilla met with Fidel Castro in Havana.

Castro took an interest in the journal's work and structure and in its circulation in the world, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. He noted the substantial progress made by the journal in the course of the 20 years since its foundation, declaring that the Communist Party of Cuba would continue to help disseminate the journal and promote its influence. The possibility of publishing the journal in Cuba was discussed.

Below is a somewhat abridged text of the interview with Fidel Castro.

Q. Comrade Fidel Castro, a question frequently raised by our journal is that of the correlation — in the light of Marxism-Leninism — between the specific conditions of development obtaining in one country or another and the regularities of the historical process. What is Cuba's experience in this context?

A. I can tell you (and it is my firm opinion) that we would not have accomplished the revolution if in our struggle we had not based ourselves on Marxist-Leninist propositions. I believe that these are universally applicable propositions. The task of any revolutionary group, of any genuinely revolutionary forces is to interpret and apply them correctly to the specific conditions in a given country. Of course, there can be no question of renouncing these propositions. We have never denied the significance of Marxism-Leninism.

As everybody knows, a revolutionary should have definite qualities, chiefly, uncompromising intolerance of the existing unjust order, and a spirit of rebellion and justice. However, this is not all, for only revolutionary theory can turn a person into a revolutionary. We, concretely I, are a case in point. Revolutionary theory combined with a definite type of character and qualities were what made me a revolutionary. For this I shall always be grateful to Marxism-Leninism.

I am a witness of how throughout these 20 years Marxist-Leninist ideas have spread ever wider in all the continents. And today in the so-called Third World, not only in the developed capitalist countries, no progressive movement and no progressive-minded person ignores the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. I can say confidently that Marxism-Leninism is the most widespread teaching on our planet. It is now a fact that many people, even bourgeois, acknowledge its scientific value. However, in this respect some progressive political leaders are more consistent than others. And, it is a reality of our day that the ideas of Marxism-Leninism have spread widely in the world.

Needless to say, if we in Cuba had not based our analysis on the principles of Marxism-Leninism we would never have accomplished a revolution. This is the main thing I should like to underscore. It is my profound belief that without thorough theoretical training we would have been unable to chart a correct and victorious strategy. Had we not had a sound theoretical foundation we would have come only to democratic, progressive and not revolutionary ideas: without a revolutionary strategy we would not have carried out deep-going social reforms in our country and would never have shaken off imperialist domination.

Q. You have touched upon the problem of the spread and interpretation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. . . .

A. I feel that we should speak of the application and not of the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. A great many people partake of the fruits of Marxism-Leninism, that great upheaval in the science of society; sometimes even enemies have recourse to its values and endeavor to use them against the revolution.

I believe that Marxism-Leninism can and should be interpreted and applied as a guide to action, but its essence should not be rejected. He who denies its essence ceases to be a Marxist-Leninist and a revolutionary. On the whole, it may be said that the present progressive movements of the Third World are gravitating toward Marxism-Leninism.

For us Cubans life has proved that this teaching should be interpreted and applied to specific conditions, but that none of its general principles should be ignored or rejected. Had we not been true, had we not been consistent in this respect, had we renounced the essence of these principles, had we abandoned a single one of these principles we would not have accomplished the revolution, we would not have held our own during these 20 years and withstood the blockade and imperialist aggression.

It was our application of these principles that brought us to the assumption of revolutionary power. This was obvious even when we had not yet focussed on socialist ideals, when we still did not speak of Marxist-Leninism. In the period of our struggle with tyranny, of our struggle to establish revolutionar power we did not set socialist aims but adhered to an advanced platform, the Moncada Program, which today may be called the program of the national-liberation, democratic and people's revolution. As we see it, under the conditions obtaining in Cuba at the time it was impossible to speak of socialism as an immediate aim. This aim could be set theoretically, as it was set by the then existing Marxist associations and the People's Socialist Party (PCP), a Marxist organization. However, that organization, which operated under conditions of the cold war and imperialist domination in our country, had little chance of winning over the majority of the people and surmounting the enormous difficulties on the road to the socialist revolution.

In other words, it was the Movement of July 26 that was able, long before the masses became politically conscious and acquired a certain understanding of politics, to direct their profound disaffection, their discontent with the existing order and with destitution and poverty into the needed channel. It should be remembered that Cuba was a Yankee semi-colony where all the mass media were controlled by

imperialism and reaction, that to some extent managed to isolate the Marxist-Leninist party.

In the country a huge number of people was disaffected, brutally exploited, disgusted with the existing state of affairs, and ready to fight despite their bewilderment and political confusion. I believe that a merit of the Movement of July 26 was that it was able to champion the hopes of these people, who were a potentially revolutionary force despite the inadequate level of their political consciousness; that it was able to rouse this mass to fight for concrete aims — the overthrow of tyranny, the establishment of a people's system, the eradication of corruption and injustice, the fulfillment of the demands of the peasants, workers, and all other working people, in other words, aims that had as yet not acquired the shape of a socialist program. I believe that it was a major achievement on our part when we set these concrete aims, although in effect we were Marxist-Leninists already then and, needless to say, thought in the appropriate manner. The substance of what we accomplished was that we assessed the potentially revolutionary situation in our country correctly and in good time, and on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideas we drew up a program that expressed the aspirations of the broad mass of the people and oriented them on the revolutionary road, chiefly, on the conquest of power.

Q. In your choice of the path of revolution what were your criteria or what criteria underlay your analysis?

A. This is shown eloquently by the Moncada Program. For instance, unemployment was running very high in our country — there were more than half a million unemployed among a population of only five and a half million.

In the countryside the situation was desperate: most of the peasants had neither land or work, or had to pay a high rent for land. The exploitation rate of the workers (mainly agricultural, because the nation's entire economy depended on the sugar industry) was extremely high. The cultural level of the population was low, illiteracy was rife, and there was a shortage of schools. The hygienic conditions of life were catastrophic with frequent outbreaks of epidemics and all sorts of diseases: in many families the death of two or three children was common. The housing situation was deplorable, and corruption, abuse of authority, theft, prostitution, and gambling endemic.

The vast majority of the people blamed unemployment, poverty and the shortage of schools and hospitals not on the system but on corruption.

It was Marxism-Leninism that taught us that we had to change the situation, set the social forces in motion, and start a struggle of the exploited masses against the exploiters. This was perfectly clear to us. Our entire strategic design for the conquest of power in these

circumstances was that the workers and peasants should be mobilized first against the government and then against the system. To work out this conception we had to base ourselves on theory. For us that theory was Marxism-Leninism.

We won revolutionary power and are applying Leninist principles in practice. We crushed the bourgeois state and with the support of the workers and peasants created a new state. This was the threshold and indispensable condition of the socialist revolution.

For us the ideas of Marx and Lenin are unquestionably an absolute value. We have established a revolutionary dictatorship of the people, a revolutionary dictatorship of the workers and peasants. Without it we would not have smashed the bourgeois structures and put an end to bourgeois rule and ideology. It must be understood that the bourgeoisie retains power not only with the aid of the armed forces but also through its monopoly of the means of production and absolute control of the nation's economic resources. It retains power through the bourgeois state with the support of international imperialism, particularly bourgeois ideology that has been implanted in the course of centuries. We therefore had to destroy the bourgeois state, expropriate the property of the bourgeoisie, landowners, and international imperialist monopolies, chiefly of the USA, which owned a large proportion of our country's wealth. We had to abolish the bourgeois army, which we did by creating an army of workers and peasants. Moreover, we started a massive ideological battle. This took place in a country, where nearly 90 per cent of the population was influenced by bourgeois ideology, by bourgeois preachings spread widely through the mass media, particularly after the triumph of the October Revolution.

How did we gain the upper hand in the ideological struggle?

We won with the aid of revolutionary achievements. Revolutionary reality changed the people's way of thinking, and revolutionary ideas were translated into revolutionary deeds. This accelerated the process.

However, for some time, during the first phase of the revolution, nothing was said about socialism, much less about communism, because this would have estranged large segments of the people. An interesting situation took shape. The masses had always regarded the state as something standing apart from them, as something alien and oppressive. After the revolution triumphed and the army of the workers and peasants was formed, the people received weapons into their own hands for the first time, won power for the first time, and saw for the first time that state institutions belonged to them and were serving their interests. Weapons were now no longer directed against the people, but were in their hands. This was one of the first blessings

received by the working masses as a result of the revolution's victory.

Q. What was the reaction of the bourgeois parties?

A. Naturally, the bourgeois parties took action. During the first few months they adopted a wait-and-see attitude, but as the process became increasingly more radical and revolutionary, they began dissociating themselves from the revolution and acting against it.

At a definite moment we had to expropriate the mass media. This step was of the utmost significance toward fostering socialist consciousness among our people.

And then the class struggle began growing acute. On the one hand, there was disaffection and opposition on the part of the exploiting classes and, on the other, support and readiness to defend revolutionary laws on the part of the people: the workers, peasants, and most progressive elements of the middle strata. I must say that the middle strata split: one part supported the rightist forces, and the other sided with the revolution. For instance, a segment of doctors, engineers, and architects sided with the rightist forces, and another segment adopted a left stand. The revolution brought certain blessings to the middle strata, passing, for example, an urban reform law. Whereas formerly rents were exhorbitantly high and many people had no housing, the new law gave housing to them. These strata react sensitively when they are treated with respect. For that reason a large proportion of them supported the drive against prostitution, gambling, drug addiction and other vices. It should be remembered that a person's attitude depends not only on economic measures. Although these are of decisive signficance, they are are many moral, cultural, and spiritual factors by which many people can be won to the side of the revolution. If the revolution stands for justice, honesty, public morals, and administrative ethics, these slogans attract large segments of the people to its side. Thus, it comes forward not only for social justice: on its banner are also inscribed slogans that were regarded as liberal in the past.

It will be recalled that the slogans of liberty, equality and fraternity were advanced by the French revolution, but it is only the socialist revolution that embodies and translates them into reality. It is this moral aspect — the spirit of liberty — that is cherished by the people. I do not mean only that somebody is freed from taxes, given a plot of land and a house, and has begun to live better materially. The revolution not only improves the living standards of the people. From the very outset it bolsters their morale. All these factors are of great importance for the revolutionary process.

I'll give you an example. An opinion poll taken among peasants in districts that had made the greatest headway after the agrarian reform (roads and schools were built, the peasants received loans, all sort of

material benefits, and so on) showed that what they like most in the revolution is that it makes all of them equal. Of course, the peasant is beginning to live better materially, but above all he feels he is a personality in society. Formerly, he was in the backyard of society, a third- or fourth-rate citizen, with whom nobody reckoned and whom everybody cheated, oppressed, and scorned. The peasant had grown accustomed to always having many masters. And now he is suddenly beginning to feel an equal of others, in other words, he is acquiring a sense of his own dignity and becoming a personality in society. This aspect is of very great significance.

To all this we must add international factors. After the victory of the revolution imperialism has been blockading the country, unleashing acts of aggression against it, and trying to crush it with all the means at its disposal. At the same time, the USSR and other socialist countries are supporting the revolution, helping Cuba to withstand the blockade, supplying it with fuel, granting it credits, buying its goods, and providing it with weapons to defend itself against aggression. All this has brought about a truly unparalleled growth of the nation's consciousness.

I consider that one of the most dramatic achievements of the revolution is the development of advanced consciousness among a formerly oppressed people who were under a tighter imperialist ideological rule than any other Latin American nation. In Cuba there were strong militant patriotic traditions, traditions of struggle for independence, but no mass socialist consciousness.

What then explains the growth of political culture and the emergence of revolutionary consciousness? They are explained by the revolutionary situation and also by the mastering of revolutionary theory. The people began to appreciate revolutionary theory after the basic revolutionary laws and measures were implemented, and the people came out in their defense. For that reason the socialist character of the revolution was proclaimed on April 16, 1961, before the invasion of the American mercenaries in the Bay of Pigs, when we buried the victims of a perfidious bombing raid. The worker and peasant masses backed up that proclamation with arms in hand and joined in the fighting in the Bay of Pigs in defense of what had become the socialist revolution.

Q. Against the backdrop of this process, could one regard the disappearance of bourgeois parties as natural?

A. It was natural and logical. They had to disappear.

Q. Thus, this is not some arbitrary measure, some administrative act, some restriction on political freedoms, as bourgeois propaganda claims?

A. That's right, we did not adopt any law banning any party. In

other words, the bourgeois parties were so weak, so shaky, so dependent on imperialism, that in our country they died a natural death. Their disappearance was natural, but it was not connected with any law, any legislative measure or revolutionary decree. This was paralleled by a unification of the revolutionary parties and forces.

Q. How did this process run?

A. I think that this is also a major lesson of the revolution. In our country, the unification of the revolutionary forces was indicative as one of the crucial factors in consolidating the revolution.

The movement we proclaimed and set up was undoubtedly the greatest force and had the greatest influence on the masses. At the same time, it was the broadest and most heterogeneous movement. Thus, being a real force, enjoying the broadest popular support, we also had a great sense of unity and arrogance, narrow egoism and sectarianism were alien to us. We were always opposed to sectarianism, because there was a danger of it at the initial stages among those who fouhgt in the mountains and on the plains. I came out against any vanity or sense of superiority being displayed by those who carried on the guerrilla war in the mountains with respect to others, as this would have been an expression of sectarianism within the July 26 Movement. Of course, various trends began to develop within our movement because of its heterogeneity. That was natural, and we had to carry out much educational work. Thus, socialism, Marxism-Leninism was adopted by those who took part in the fighting in the Sierra Mountains, and also by nearly all the fighters who carried on military operations on the plain. We were very well aware that the strength of the revolution lies in unity, which is why at the initial stages we had to carry on a persistent struggle against splinter trends and anti-communist preconceptions. Imperialism makes active use of such divisive trends and anti-communist or fear of communism for its subversive acts against revolutionary processes.

But the point is that we leaders of the July 26 Movement were Marxists, maintained close ties with the PSP, and held similar views with its members. This created the ideological basis facilitating unification. The leadership of the Revolutionary Directorate also had very progressive, near-socialist, positions. Consequently, these three organizations pursued one definite political line, although there were, of course, some exceptions.

This helped us to draw closer to each other, but I think that of the greatest importance was the fact that our movement did not take an egoistic stand. We were keenly aware that the unity of all the forces is the earnest of the invincibility of the revolution, regardless of the status and influence of each of these forces.

Besides, we have always been a cautious relative to yet another

question. There were many small organizations, but we never excluded them from the unification process, for they opposed Batista. We gave them an opportunity to join us and to take part in the common efforts. The revolution never prohibited any bourgeois party among Batista's opponents, it never closed the door to them. However, for ideological and social reasons they themselves moved away from the revolution.

Consequently, three organizations — the July 26 Movement, the PSP, and the Revolutionary Directorate — united. We worked together, increasingly coordinating our actions from day to day. I think that a very great part in achieving unity was played both by the leaders of the July 26 Movement and by the leaders of the PSP and the Revolutionary Directorate.

Of course, all these organizations had their own unsolved problems. First, there was the need to put in a great effort to convince and politically educate the masses. Of course, our movement had its setbacks, as did the other organizations. Within the PSP things were somewhat different, and that party faced other problems. At a given point, symptoms of sectarianism appeared within that party, and this did harm to the efforts to achieve unity. As the revolution was increasingly identified with socialism and Marxism-Leninism in the ideological plane, which was the result of a definite policy and definite efforts, sectarianism increasingly prevented the establishment of a climate of trust. It was necessary to come out against these trends, and sectarianism was eventually defeated.

Q. Comrade Castro, in the light of your people's tremendous effort and the achievements of the revolution, how would you characterize the present stage of socialist construction in Cuba?

A. It goes without saying that we cannot yet speak of developed socialism in Cuba. Over the past years, our people have acquired a high level of political culture, and a vast majority of them consciously, resolutely, and enthusiastically support socialism.

The Cuban revolution was forced into a life-and-death struggle, and one could say that the main task in the first ten years was to safeguard our revolutionary gains. Of course, even then some transformations were effected and certain successes scored, above all in culture, ideology, education and public health. As for the economy, that is a sphere, I must say, in which we were unable to advance at a fast pace. This situation was compounded by the inexperience of our revolutionaries and by the fact that ours was a socialist revolution carried out in an underdeveloped country.

In the second decade, when the revolution was consolidated, great successes were achieved in every field, both in the economy and in the social sphere, despite the lack of experience and the mistakes

which usually occur in the revolutionary process. We also passed through a similar stage and believed that we could do everything better than the others and differently. I say this openly so that our experience should serve as a lesson for other revolutionaries, so that they should understand that the experience of other countries should in no way be underestimated, although creativity in the revolutionary process is a necessary and important factor. With all this, there must be modesty, which is highly important for revolutionaries, because without revolutionary modesty there will not be enough creativity and the critical approach will be inadequate. If a revolutionary fails to assimilate the experience of other countries, he displays conceit.

I think that Cuba is now an important source of revolutionary experience, especially for the developing countries. I am sure that in our ties with other countries advancing along the revolutionary road, we shall have an opportunity of passing our experience on to them, and explaining our failures and mistakes, especially those made in the early years. We have never made any secret of them.

Over the past ten years, there has been rapid and accelerated economic, social and political development in our country, truly remarkable development. In material production, in the social, ideological, and political spheres, we have a firm footing, and have created the conditions for further rapid advance not only over the next 5-10 years, but also over the next 20 years.

In the first few years, for all practical purposes we did not even have annual plans. And now we are working on the 1981-1985 five-year plan, and also on a long-term plan for the period 1981 to 2000. We now feel much more confident. We have more cadres with experience and knowledge, who do their jobs with a sense of responsibility.

Of course, only socialism with its possibility of planning economic development and making rational use of all resources can have accelerated development in the economic and social spheres.

What is the main difficulty in the economically lagging countries which start building socialism? It is that they have to begin from a state of extreme poverty with an acute shortage of resources and the need to solve two major problems: economic and social development. These countries cannot use the methods to which the capitalist states resorted, and of which Marx and also Engels spoke when studying the history of the English working class. How did these countries arrive at capitalism, how did they accumulate capital? They did this by plundering and exploiting the population of the colonies, and ruthlessly exploiting the workers in the metropolitan countries. Under no circumstances can a socialist country use such methods: it cannot make the workers toil for 15 hours a day, it cannot exploit children.

On the contrary, it has to build schools for the children, display concern for them and educate them. It cannot exploit women, it cannot have slaves, it cannot have and plunder colonies. Even when it is poor, even when it has a shortage of economic resources, it must solve the problems of social development in such a way that there is no unemployment, no prostitution, and no illiteracy, and see that no sick and old people are left without support, pensions, or some other form of aid. In short, it must solve social problems humanely, while accumulating resources and investing heavily in economic development. All this is undoubtedly very important.

I would say that the question of how developing countries taking the socialist road can solve their problems needs further elaboration. In this sense, Cuba is a primary source of information in the Western Hemisphere because we have to work in the light of our own experience and are aware of the difficulties that arise, we solve all these problems in practice, and this calls for great efforts, work by the whole people, a combination of study and work, and of course, international support. Cuba has always had such support, especially from the socialist-community countries, the Soviet Union in the first place.

One could say that our revolution is now at the stage of accelerated economic and satisfactory social development. Let me give this example from the production sphere. Mechanizing the harvesting of sugar cane is a difficult and complicated problem, and it is so complicated that in 1970, for instance, we had to use the labor of 350,000 cane-cutters. At present we use 130,000, that is, we have released 220,000 persons. We have mechanized 50 per cent of the harvesting operations, and all the cane loading. I think this is the most important achievement, because when the revolution won out we had no machines for harvesting cane: gradually arrangements were made for their design, because we were unable to buy any, and had to develop them ourselves, with the Soviet Union's assistance. Today, we have a plant for making harvesters, and we have solved one of the problems which used to hold up the country's economic development.

Now I want to make a comparison with the United States. Of course, there they have a higher technical level, but we have no problem of illiteracy; we have no illiterates, but the United States has; we have no semi-literates, but the United States has. That is, we have surpassed the United States on some education indicators, and no other Latin American country can compare with Cuba. The same could be said of the indicators bearing on public health, which are the highest on the American continent. In the United States, medical care is very expensive and millions of people cannot afford it. In our country, the whole population is provided with medical care. Com-

paring Cuba with other Latin American countries, our child mortality is much lower: less than 25 of our children in every 1,000 die within the first year of life. We have eradicated diseases like swamp fever, typhus, TB and polio. We have an extensive program for the prevention of tetanus and other diseases. Immediately after the revolution the country had 6,000 doctors, and nearly all of them were in the cities. Now, despite the fact that 3,000 have left for the United States, we have 14,000 doctors. That is, we now have one doctor for roughly 800 of the population, and they have a much higher standard of medical training. More than 1,000 of our doctors work abroad. Our university medical departments train 12,000 persons. We are working to set up one medical higher school in each province, and those already set up enrol from 3,500 to 4,000 persons a year.

If we take the sphere of culture, which has been very greatly developed, we could say that the pace is now considerably higher. We now have a program for building art schools, professional and amateur, in every province. Our cinematography has scored considerable successes. The Cuban ballet is known throughout the world and is among the best. It recently marked its 30th anniversary.

As for sport, Cuba has become a sports power competing with the United States and already surpassing it in some ways. Cuban athletes have been steadily improving their results at the Pan-American and Olympic Games. In Cuba, sports are on the upgrade, we have dozens of sports schools, and virtually every province has schools for training physical culture instructors.

Q. You spoke of the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism. We think this is connected with the question of proletarian internationalism and its importance for the revolutionary process today. What is your view?

A. This is a fundamental question. We attach considerable importance to proletarian internationalism. It is a cornerstone of Marxism-Leninism. I do not think anything can justify abandonment of the principles of proletarian internationalism. I think that proletarian internationalism is the most remarkable feature of Marxism-Leninism, of socialism, and one could say the revolutionaries' most noble quality.

Marx and Engels predicted with keen insight that the earnest of the revolution's victory lies in the unity of the proletarians of all countries, which is why they concluded their *Communist Manifesto* with the words: 'Workers of all lands, unite!' And no one can be more aware of the justice of this truth than us.

Who came out against us when we carried out our revolution? Imperialism, and U.S. imperialism in the first place. Who helped U.S. imperialism to blockade Cuba? The oligarchy of the whole world, the

bourgeoisie of the whole world, the reactionaries of the whole world. In other words, the U.S. blockade could be intensified to the extent to which the United States was able to involve many bourgeois governments in Cuba's economic boycott.

And who supported us? The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the socialist community, the workers-peasant states of the world.

Let someone tell me whether without this the Cuban revolution could have survived the U.S. blockade and U.S. hostility. Where would we have obtained the weapons for our defense? No capitalist country in the world would have sold weapons to Cuba. The socialist countries alone supplied us with such weapons and gave us credits, while at a certain point the Soviet Union supplied us with such weapons free of charge.

Or take the situation when the United States stopped fuel deliveries to Cuba. Which capitalist, imperialist country could have withstood U.S. pressure and acted, say, in defiance of U.S. policy? The fuel could and did come from only one country, the Soviet Union. And which state would have purchased our sugar? Only the socialist countries were able to provide the market which the United States had withdrawn from us, but one should bear in mind that the socialist countries themselves produced enough sugar to meet all their own requirements. However, they even changed their plans for developing their sugar industry and gave us a place in their economy. Which countries sold us food and equipment? Only the socialist countries, chiefly the Soviet Union.

I can tell you from our own experience that the Cuban revolution could not have survived without international revolutionary solidarity. I say this because I know all the facts and I say this with a full sense of responsibility, to which I am entitled by the 20-year experience of our revolution. I experienced all this much too intimately not to be aware that without proletarian internationalism our revolution could not have survived. I do not think that anyone can refute this argument.

But I will give you yet another example: Angola. Without international solidarity, the Angolan revolution would have been crushed by the South African racists and imperialism. I can give you another example: Ethiopia. Without proletarian internationalism, imperialism would have drowned in blood and destroyed the Ethiopian revolution. Without proletarian internationalism, the Vietnamese could not have inflicted a defeat on U.S. imperialism.

As you see there are many such examples.

Consequently, there is virtually no country which could advance its revolution without international support, because all were in need of

it as some point. China, too, was in great need of it. China received tremendous assistance from the Soviet Union: in weapons, during the war of liberation, assistance in developing the industrial base in the early years of the revolution, and also in checking imperialist aggression, because I am sure that, but for the Soviet Union, the imperialists would have mounted an aggression against China in the early years of the revolution.

Internationalism can be expressed in various forms. When it comes to some communist party being subjected to persecution and repression, whose members are thrown into prison, abducted and killed, there is a need for international solidarity, for mobilizing world opinion to put an end to such arbitrary acts, to secure the release of the prisoners and to inspire them to struggle for establishing a legitimate and democratic system in their country. When it comes to a country which has become the object of imperialist aggression, it needs to be given another type of assistance, as was the case in Cuba, Angola, Ethiopia and Vietnam. In that event, the form of military and other support is chosen making it possible to hold its ground in the struggle against the aggressor. When it comes to a country very backward technically, it needs to be assisted both in the technical and economic fields, as we have been doing, for despite the fact that our country receives much international assistance, we, for our part, try to promote the economic development of other countries whose material and social conditions are not so good.

I think that one of the important factors in developing the internationalist consiousness of our people is the practice of internationalism. As a socialist country, Cuba, for instance, combats every form of national egoism, because we believe that even under socialism the danger, the risk of national egoism is not ruled out. Let me explain why. It is because socialism is the first real opportunity for a country to work for its people's benefit, it is its first opportunity to use its national resources; our requirements are tremendous, our economic and social needs great, and our resources limited.

For our country, socialism meant the first opportunity to get down to developing agriculture and industry, to building schools, hospitals, nursery schools, sports facilities and roads; into these we can invest all our available resources. Although socialism, I repeat, is the first opportunity for working rationally and with enthusiasm to develop one's country, it does not provide guarantees against the danger of some trends of national egoism emerging.

We are aware of this. That is why we think that given these opportunities and in defiance of the dangers we must be consistent internationalists in practice. After all, there are so many places in Cuba where there is a need to build schools, but we are, nevertheless,

building schools in Jamaica and in Tanzania. Despite the successes in public health, we still have a shortage of hospitals, but we are, nevertheless, building a hospital in Vietnam. We in Cuba are still short of roads, there are places where there are no roads at all, but we are, nevertheless, building roads and highways in Guinea and Vietnam.

The point is that there are still quite a few expressions of national egoism throughout the world. What is more, national egoism in the world is still very strong, and I think that we revolutionaries must greatly cherish the internationalist spirit.

Q. Comrade Castro, could China be cited as an example of national egoism, or is it something much more than that?

A. Of course, the main thing is that in China an opportunist, reactionary policy is being conducted along every line, there is a scandalous betrayal of revolutionary principles and overt, blatant and ever growing collaboration with imperialism and world reaction.

This policy is determined by many factors: a narrow, petty-bourgeois approach to theory but, undoubtedly, also a chauvinistic spirit and national egoism. I am not speaking about some national egoism of the Chinese people, because the Chinese are a nation of lofty revolutionary qualities, an industrious and dedicated people. I am speaking about China's leadership which holds to chauvinistic and undoubtedly great-power concepts that it preaches quite shamelessly. There are right-opportunist trends, which are now predominant. Up to a certain period, left-opportunism was there in force, but now it is right opportunism that is dominant. All of this must cause a definite reaction among the Chinese people themselves, among the Chinese revolutionaries themselves. China remains in isolation, without friends in the revolutionary camp. It has made friends with NATO, the conservative and reactionary parties of the whole world, the South African racists, the Chilean fascists, the neo-colonialist governments of the Third World, and right and other opportunists.

China has moved completely into the imperialist camp. Sooner or later, the Chinese people must become aware of this. They must see where this way leads, because it is not so easy to reverse history, and it is impossible endlessly to maintain an abnormal, absurd situation, to continue pursuing a foreign policy which is totally at variance with the people's interests.

History shows that such a policy may be conducted for some time, but that it has no future.

Q. What are the Cuban people's main aspirations on the eve of the 20th anniversary of the revolution?

A. At present, after the victory and consolidation of the people's power, we are faced with perhaps an even more complicated task. I

should say that it is much more complicated than before. In the economic plane, our country has to achieve in a few decades what took the developed capitalist countries two or three centuries.

A new vanguard party

Abdel Fattah Ismail
General Secretary, CC
Yemeni Socialist Party

The Yemeni Socialist Party (YSP) held its First Congress from October 11 to 13, 1978. A party guided by the theory of scientific socialism has been set up on the basis of the United Political Organization National Front (UPONF), a major event in the history of the Yemeni revolution, which was preceded by years of persistent struggle by the working people of democratic Yemen for national liberation, and for socio-economic and political progress.

More than 15 years ago, when the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South of Yemen [1] was set up, our country was ruled by British colonialists and their henchmen, the sultans. The working people bore the heavy burden of political oppression, economic exploitation and social backwardness. But they won national independence on November 30, 1967, as a result of the rapid growth of the national-liberation struggle, which culminated in a popular armed uprising against the colonialists and their henchmen. With the takeover by the National Front, the British military base at Aden, imperialism's biggest in the Middle East, was dismantled.

This ushered in a new phase in the life of the working people, a phase of rebuilding and reorganizing society on revolutionary, patriotic principles. The economic, cultural and social backwardness inherited from the colonial period required persistent and implacable struggle against the class forces which still held the means of production and which prevented any improvement in the people's life. The reconstruction of society called for a clear ideological approach based on the theory of scientific socialism, a clear-cut class stand, and reliance on the working people, including the revolutionary intelligentsia, as a broad social base for revolutionary development.

However, just after national independence was won, the radical wing of the revolutionary forces ran into conflict with right-wing opportunists who sought to slow down the progressive process of construction. They preached an unprincipled pragmatism in domestic

and foreign policy, and they found it all the easier to do so because they controlled most of the senior leading posts both in the political and the government apparatus. The decisions of the Fourth Congress of the National Front in March 1968 showed the way for progressive transformations. Sensing that the radical trend was gaining the upper hand, and that a line of social development meeting the working people's interests and relying on the revolutionary theory was about to be adopted, the rightists tried to stage a reactionary coup within a few days after the Congress, so showing the people that they were violating the revolutionary legality and acting as a reserve of neo-colonialism. The coup was foiled by the cohesion of the left-wing forces and the influence they commanded in the National Front itself and among the masses, the junior officers and the rank-and-file of the armed forces.

From March 1968 to June 1969, the struggle between these two opposite trends became sharper. The experiences of the first few months of struggle against the right-wing opportunists testified to the need for the tactics of revolutionary action to take into account the actual state of things and also to ensure the advance of the revolution in the future, without allowing it to degenerate or coalesce with the forces of neo-colonialism. Our left wing felt that in that period the balance of political forces still fell short of allowing it to move the country along the progressive path of development. That is why it was necessary to reorganize the ranks of its supporters and to educate the members of the National Front in scientific socialism and loyalty to the fundamental positions in social development and the daily needs of the working people.

In the tactical program for our action to eliminate the right-opportunist forces we laid emphasis on revolutionary legality, and in our efforts to strengthen it we opposed any adventurist attempts to use arms to settle ideological and political differences, while enhancing the role of the National Front as the leading and guiding force of the revolution, and of its leadership. The tactics of the progressive wing and its persistent and organized struggle on the basis of its program for completing national liberation helped to create favorable conditions for advancing the revolution. Exposure of the policy of the right-opportunist forces, which were incapable of putting through socio-economic transformations in the working people's interests, helped the progressive wing to accelerate the 'corrective action' taken on June 22, 1969.[2] This action was supported by broad masses of workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals, because it opened before the people and the revolution new and broader prospects for development, for advance and for a radical policy of struggle against imperialism and reaction. It helped to eliminate the right-opportunist

forces, to give the revolution greater depth and to raise the political level of the masses.

Our revolution found the right way for revolutionary transformations for the working people's benefit in Lenin's idea of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of the East merging with the world-wide revolutionary struggle against imperialism and colonialism, and transition to socialism, bypassing the stage of capitalist development. Successful and creative application of scientific revolutionary theory in our backward country, with the bulk of the population consisting of peasants, nomads and handicraftsmen, is a characteristic feature of democratic Yemen's multi-facted experience. Our people's great achievement is that, without stopping its struggle, it went on from the liberation revolution to consistently tackling the tasks of the national-democratic revolution. However, the main facet of our experience is the development of the liberation movement's revolutionary organization, with an ideological platform made up to petty-bourgeois rightist and leftist ideas, into a vanguard party of the Yemeni working class and all the other working people relying on the theory of scientific socialism.

Since the June 22, 1969 action, our approach to rebuilding and reorganizing society on the new principles has been determined by two factors. The first was the spread of the ideas of scientific socialism among members of the National Front, so as to carry this political organization to the higher level of the new type of vanguard party. The second was the implementation of socio-economic transformations designed to eliminate exploitative relations by converting the basic means of production into the property of the whole people. All of this had to be done while fighting the plots of imperialism and reaction against the people's power, and having at our disposal modest potentialities and experience.

The effort to set up the new type of vanguard party was a crucial element in defending and advancing the revolution. This was an important problem for consideration and action at the Fifth Congress of the National Front in March 1972. Some displayed unwarranted haste and leftist attitudes in the approach to this problem and insisted on the earliest formation of a party and establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. But the point is that it was then still impossible to set up a vanguard party of the working class in view of the weakness of its socio-political basis and the lack of the necessary set of objective and subjective conditions. In view of this, the Congress set up a special commission to continue to study the party question.

Preparation of the necessary conditions for transformation of the National Front into a vanguard party of the working class was carried on along five main lines.

In-depth study of the methodology of scientific socialism from original sources. This helped to avoid flowery ultra-revolutionary language, to re-educate the revolutionary fighters and to season them ideologically.

Development of the class struggle between the forces of the new and the old, and implementation of progressive transformations. The people's revolutionary experience was enriched in this process. In society and within the framework of the political organization there was a selection of those who were fit to be members of a party in the light of definite criteria of class and ideological attitude to the revolutionary elements, opportunists and persons who had brought themselves into disrepute by their behavior.

Let us note in this connection that the first few measure for social change in our country were taken with wholehearted sympathy for the theory of scientific socialism among the members and candidate members of our united political organization. Of course, they were not yet duly seasoned ideologically for a correct and conscious conjunction of theoretical knowledge and practical activity, but on the whole our revolutionary democratic organization increasingly moved toward acceptance of the ideology of scientific socialism. A profound understanding of this need made it possible to re-educate the members of the organization in the principles and ideas of the scientific theory of the working class. The Higher Party School of the UPONF Central Committee, its branches in the localities, the ideological education network and the sending of party members for study in the socialist countries were highly important in deepening their knowledge of the theory of scientific socialism as the revolutionary science bearing on every aspect of life.

Organization of party work on the production, instead of the territorial principle. This change was very important in enhancing the leading role of the political organization and strengthening its direct ties with the working people for a better understanding of their problems and concerns, problems in production and economic development programs. It also helped to gain a better knowledge of the activists who were truly dedicated to the cause of the revolution and progressive ideas, and to spot those who had merely adopted the revolutionary language and were capable only of issuing slogans, without setting an example to the working people in production.

Unification of the various contingents of the national-democratic movement[3] in a single political organization. This was designed to consolidate the revolutionary process in our country and create a sounder base for the vanguard party. It was impossible to set up such a party without including the other contingents of the movement taking the same ideological-class platform. There were no differences

among the participants in the national movement that warranted continued division. The convocation in October 1975 of the unity congress and the establishment of the UPONF showed that our fundamental stand here was correct. Once united, we not only went beyond the framework of the front formula, but also advanced toward the vanguard party formula.

Development and deepening of relations of friendship and cooperation on the principle of proletarian solidaridy with the socialist-community countries headed by the Soviet Union and with other contingents of the world revolutionary movement. When we faced the problem of setting up a vanguard party in early 1972, we had no close party, cultural or economic ties with the socialist countries. The reason was the lack of any clear-cut ideological stand on this matter. Up until the June 26, 1978 events, when the attempted reactionary coup was foiled, some left-opportunist elements stubbornly urged that we should display restraint in our approach to developing our relations with the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union.

We held from the outset that it was impossible to build a vanguard party guided by the theory of scientific socialism in isolation from the rest of the world, or successfully to direct the revolutionary process in our country without developing broad and deep-going relations with the socialist community. We have always regarded this question in the strategic terms of struggle between the socialist and the imperialist camp. That is the basis on which relations of friendship and cooperation were developed with the socialist countries in the party, economic and cultural fields, and this has secured favorable external conditions for deepening our revolutionary process.

All these lines in preparing the necessary conditions for setting up a vanguard party of the working class also had a direct bearing on the question of how consistent and deep the socio-economic transformations in the working people's interests were to be. We did not regard the national-democratic revolution as spontaneous, but as a balanced and well-organized process. The experience of the world national-liberation movement has shown that some independent states taking the non-capitalist way were defeated and eventually found themselves under the influence of imperialism and neo-colonialism because they had failed to adopt scientific socialism as the ideological basis of their policy, to recognize the historical vanguard role of the working class in the struggle for renewing society, and to take a principled approach to developing relations with the socialist community and the other forces of the world revolutionary movement.

Now, following the establishment of the Yemeni Socialist Party, the revolutionary transformations in our country over a period of about ten years provide a basis for our advance to a better future.

These transformations cannot be regarded otherwise than as a result of our understanding of the dialectics of progress, of the dialectical connection between theory and practice, and also as a result of the fact that the leaders of the working people have mastered the art of carrying on political struggle and organizing the progressive forces.

In the economic field, we have taken a number of measures that have hit the foreign monopolies, the comprador bourgeoisie, and the feudals, and have led to the establishment of new economic sectors in the form of state, cooperative and mixed sectors. Within eight years, two development programs were put through. Since early 1979, we have started on our third program. Our country' economy has been growing with the fruitful cooperation and selfless assistance of the socialist-community states headed by the Soviet Union. The establishment of new industrial and agricultural enterprises and the manufacture of diverse national products have been gradually helping our society to recover from the backwardness inherited from the pre-revolutionary epoch, and to increase the productive forces and the production of material goods. Our national economic development is accompanied by a numerical growth of the working class.

Our economic upswing is being directed by the YSP's balanced policy under the leadership and control of its Central Committee. Its main emphasis is on enhancing the leading role of the state and cooperative sectors. This is a necessary condition, on the one hand, for establishing the property of the whole people and cooperative property in the means of production, and on the other, for restricting and cutting short the growth of capitalist elements as the national-democratic revolution moves to the next, socialist stage.

Of tremendous importance in class and ideological terms is the fact that our efforts to build up the material and technical basis of the revolutionary transition period have gone hand in hand with struggle to be completely rid of the control by international capitalism of our national market, and with the further development of our economic cooperation with the socialist world system. We are sure that the economic, technical and trade ties within the framework of integration and fraternal cooperation between the socialist countries, which are members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and countries which have actually taken the road of non-capitalist development help accelerate economic and social progress in the latter and to successfully complete their transition to socialist construction. The most striking examples here are provided by the Soviet Republics of Central Asia, socialist Mongolia and Vietnam.

On the question of power, we relied on the ideas of Lenin, the leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution. A number of consistent and resolute attempts was made to do away with the old institu-

tions of power set up by the colonialist and feudals, and to eliminate the role of the tribal chiefs, so as to set up on the ruins of the old system a centralized national-democratic regime and a state apparatus with a new class character, which practises revolutionary legality because the principles and content of its activity accord with the interests of the working people. The adoption of legislation as an expression of the new rules and customs in the life of our people has become an integral element of the revolutionary process.

Under the colonialists and the sultans, South Yemen was divided into 24 administrative political units: the colony of Aden and 23 feudal states — sultanates, emirates and sheikdoms — dependent on Britain. Each of these had its own laws, its own armed forces, its own financial and customs systems. As the apparatus of state power was restructured, in accordance with the working people's class interests, local people's councils were set up. The Supreme People's Council was elected by free and direct ballot at the end of 1978. At the same time, there was a purge of the armed forces and a recruitment of revolutionary cadres. New instruments of national defense, like the militia and state security organs, were set up. We can say that our nation has a sound defense front relying on the working people.

In order to have the apparatus of state power in democratic Yemen function in accordance with the class interests of the workers and peasants, our party seeks to educate administrative personnel in the spirit of scientific socialism. Most of those who head government offices, public organizations and territorial-administrative units are of working-class and peasant stock, and have gone through the fighting school of revolution. The social function of the apparatus of state power is, in effect, defense of the interests of the Yemeni working people. Collective leadership, democratic centralism and faith in the working people provide a sound basis for power in democratic Yemen. These principles have been established as the basic rules of the political regime set up by the revolution, and are guaranteed by the constitution and the laws.

Among the most striking expressions of the working people's creative activity has been their participation in restructuring society and extending democratic freedoms. Since the June 1969 action the view and practice of democracy in our country have been closely tied in with the task of eradicating all exploitative relations and making democracy truly popular. Democracy for the people is embodied, in particular, in workers', peasants', young people's, women's, students', Young Pioneers', trade, writers' and other associations and unions. The working people alone are entitled to join these societies, which display concern for their interests, stand up for their political, economic and cultural rights, and give free expression to their views.

Broad democratic freedoms in our young state include every citizen's right to take an active part in various fields of life.

I should like to re-emphasize that the existence of the Yemeni Socialist Party is the crucial factor behind the revolutionary process in our country. Its emergence was natural and inevitable because of a number of objective and subjective factors, and was a logical result of the qualitative changes in ideology over the past decade, and also of the development of the militant party traditions. The ideas of scientific socialism have been broadly accepted by the members of the UPONF, and its leading role among the working people has grown. The fact that we have succeeded in securing unity of the revolutionary forces within the framework of the United Political Organization National Front, which has now been transformed into the Yemeni Socialist Party, is of key importance in our country's revolutionary history. The YSP is the guarantor of the revolution, for it represents the people's wisdom, honor and conscience, and we believe that it has the basic feature which made it a new type of party. The YSP leads and directs the process of revolutionary transformations in the light of the theory of scientific socialism and shows the working people the way to social progress. In its struggle to build a new society, the party relies on its close and organic unity with the working class and its allies — the peasantry and the other working people, whom it regards as the class basis for building the new life. The most conscious and tempered fighters come from their midst.

The YSP correctly combines theory and practice. It insists on revolutionary legality and organizational unity based on the principles of democratic centralism, collective leadership, criticism, and strict party discipline. Among the basic principles by which our party is guided is that of proletarian solidarity. Party members are educated in an understanding of the need for correctly combining patriotism with internationalism.

The YSP fulfills its revolutionary task by using the best of the rich experience gained over the past ten years in party and social construction, and also its enhanced skill in leading the masses. Our party has been tempered in the battles for freedom, national sovereignty and social progress. It is now carrying on the revolutionary transformations, relying on its strong ties with the people, and on the assistance and support of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, and the other forces of liberation and progress throughout the world. We can now say with even greater confidence than ever before that the revolution in democratic Yemen cannot be destroyed, whatever aggressive plots the forces of reaction and imperialism may concoct.

Democratic Yemen has been the object of such plots throughout

the whole period of revolutionary transformations, and their danger increased whenever we took new concrete steps in the working people's interests and strengthened our ties of militant solidarity with the forces of the world revolutionary movement. This is largely due to the fact that our country lies close to the oil-rich areas dominated by the imperialist monopolies.[4] The June 25-26, 1978 events demonstrated the hatred which imperialism and reaction have for our revolution and its political regime. On that occasion their stake was on a clique of 'left' opportunists, who were to have plunged democratic Yemen into a dark and terrible period. They wanted to do a Chile in the Arab world so as to hang and execute thousands of party and government cadres and progressive working people. Their aim was to defeat the revolution.

The counter-revolution role of the conspiratorial clique of 'left' opportunists was evidenced long before the attempted coup by various leftists and anarchist acts, by the trampling of revolutionary legality, breaches of the principles of collective leadership and democratic centralism, and acts to weaken the UPONF's leading role and to undermine the prestige of the state power. In the economic field this opportunist clique, headed by Salem Rubayi Ali, put through a number of measures and laws which had the stamp of petty-bourgeois anarchism, and this did much harm to the peasants, the small traders and handicraftsmen. The reactionary substance of the 'left' opportunists was also revealed in the fact that while paying lip service to the principle of revolutionary internationalism and the struggle against imperialism and reaction, they actually rejected the line of developing friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist-community countries.

The 'left' opportunists' clique opposed the establishment of the YSP, claiming that the Yemeni working class was still too small and its level of consciousness too low. We, for our part, believed that despite the small size of the Yemeni working class (with a population of 1.75 million, we have only about 800,000 industrial and office workers), the leading role can be ensured by a revolutionary vanguard with a clear-cut ideological platform. We know that some revolutionary parties have brought their peoples to socialism, bypassing the stage of capitalist development, in societies whose social structure consisted of cattle-breeders and farmers.

There is no doubt that the working class in our country is still in the phase of formation, and that the number of workers among party members is still small. But with socialism triumphant over a vast territory of the globe, the working-class party can (and must) be set up even before the working class matures numerically and qualitative-

ly. We believe that the opposite approach is wrong and is a distortion of scientific socialism.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin repeatedly emphasized that the stage of capitalist development is not at all inevitable for all countries dominated by feudal and semi-feudal relations. Fraternal assistance from states in which the working class has taken over would help these countries to move faster to socialism. Now, more than 60 years after the October Revolution, with the Soviet state a mighty and steadily growing power, with the socialist world system established, the transition to socialism, bypassing the stage of capitalist development, has undoubtedly become easier and has broader prospects before it.

In our approach to the revolutionary process in democratic Yemen we have relied on this analysis of Lenin's, which fully applies in our own day. We are sure that the existence of a party that has adopted scientific socialism and is fighting for the interests of the proletariat and all the other working people largely helps to compensate the negative aspects which spring from the numerical weakness of the working class in Yemen. These are also compensated by the might of the socialist world system, whose internationalist assistance creates the conditions for advancing along the non-capitalist road and for the quantitative and qualitative growth and development of the working class.

One of our basic disagreements with the Salem Rubayi Ali left-opportunist group was on the dialectical connection between the national and the international. The left-opportunist elements wanted our party, while nominally recognizing the unity of the struggle of the international working class, to refuse to work for joint action by the working people of Yemen and other Arab countries, irrespective of the regime's nature. In contrast to this, we put forward the idea that every patriot, every true son of his nation, is also an internationalist. The attitude of the 'left' opportunists was, in effect, completely in the interests of the reactionary and pro-imperialist forces. Indeed, the first to shed tears over the defeat of the 'left' opportunists were the imperialists and reactionaries, who now say that our party leadership is ultra-leftist, while the leftist elements are moderate. That is quite understandable, for 'left' opportunists ultimately always end up in the extreme right wing.

The lack of any clear-cut ideological stand increasingly pushed the left-opportunist elements into pragmatism in domestic and foreign policy. By contrast, the ideological stand of the true revolutionaries in our country has always been clear-cut. All the documents of the UPONF (now of the YSP), the decisions and directives of its con-

gresses, and party literature are based on the revolutionary theory of scientific socialism.

The experience of the international working-class and revolutionary movement shows that the extreme leftists and extreme rightists ultimately coalesce in their common hatred for the socialist community, headed by the Soviet Union. Documents at our disposal testify that the imperialist and reactionary circles demanded that the Salem Rubayi Ali clique should decapitate the UPONF's revolutionary leadership and break the relations of friendship with the socialist countries, promising to return to supply financial aid so as to convert democratic Yemen into their base.

The conspiratorial plans for a coup failed. The will of the revolutionaries, the will of the vanguard party, the guarantor of the revolution has won out. Our ranks have been purged of left-opportunists and corrupt elements, those who came from the feudal and semi-feudal families, all those who pursued a line hostile to the people and the revolution.

We believe that the First Congress of the Yemeni Socialist Party was a historic milestone in our country's revolutionary development. On the one hand, the Congress marked the end of the decade in the course of which we twice defeated the forces seeking to push the revolution off its way: first, the rightist forces, and then the 'left' opportunist forces. On the other hand, it opened a new stage in creative revolutionary activity, which, thanks to the strength and cohesion of the party and the purity of its invariably triumphant ideological positions, and also thanks to its use of the experience and economic assistance of the socialist-community countries, headed by the Soviet Union, and all the other forces of liberation, peace, progress, democracy and socialism, will — we are sure — lead to new achievements for the benefit and prosperity of the working people of our country, and will open before it a radiant future.

1. The National Front, set up in October 1963, was the most influential progressive political organization of South Yemen. In October 1975, it merged with the People's Democratic Union and the People's Vanguard Party for form the United Political Organization National Front. — *Ed.*

2. On that day. the radical wing of the National Front inflicted a defeat on the right-wing elements and removed them from the leadership of the organization. — *Ed.*

3. The National Front, the People's Democratic Union and the People's Vanguard Party. — *Ed.*

4. Primarily Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The mineral wealth of democratic Yemen, which is situated in the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula, has yet to be fully explored. — *Ed.*

Party experience

The Argentine working-class movement today

Athos Fava
Member, CC Executive Committee and Secretariat, CP of Argentina

How is the Argentine working class to fulfill its historic mission? What are the forms of organization and struggle that would enable it to lead the masses? In what way can the Communist Party of Argentina become a big mass party?

These are the problems facing the CPA,[1] which was formed in response to historical necessity, to the ideological and political maturity of the advanced workers of our country, who drew on the finest revolutionary traditions of their country and were inspired by the example of the Great October.

In Argentina as elsewhere in Latin America, the masses are unfolding a powerful movement for democracy which the U.S. imperialists, Carter & Co. would like to undermine. Posing as 'defenders' of human rights and giving their blessing to some governments while 'excommunicating' others, the imperialists, multinational companies and CIA are searching for a way out of a situation they themselves have created.

Reaction has been unable to subdue Argentine society, to silence it or force it into inaction. Internal political evolution is nearing a point where the people and their strongest force, the working class, will be able to play a decisive role if they concentrate on isolating and then defeating the political groups supported by the U.S. imperialists and their Argentine accomplices, such as the latifundium owners and big capitalists, and to win over the democratic, patriotic and progressive-minded among the military and civilians. To achieve this, the working-class movement must overcome the obstacles (to be mentioned later on) that hold back its development and prevent it from uniting and mobilizing the nation's democratic and progressive forces.

Argentina's economic policy over the past two decades has seriously worsened the condition of the working class and the people while boosting the profits of multinationals, the landed oligarchy and the big capitalists. The past two and a half years have been particu-

larly hard for the country, since it is in this period that work has been going on to implement the economic plan nominally proposed by Jose A. Martinez de Hoz, Minister of the Economy, but virtually drawn up by the International Monetary Fund.[2] Even so, the imperialists demand more. They want to impose a policy of 'shock therapy' which would lead to massive unemployment and the transfer to private hands of enterprises in the public sector set up as a result of years-long struggle in defense of national interests, and would turn Argentina into a large food factory. This kind of economic policy is at daggers with the political aims pursued by moderates in the armed forces and in the government, who seek support among the masses.

The deterioration of the working people's condition is due in no small measure to the activity of the right-wing trade union currents and leaders. These have for decades been infiltrating bourgeois ideology into the working-class movement and advocating reformism to impress the false ideas of conciliation, social partnership and cooperation on the workers' minds. Numerous workers came to imagine that they could improve their plight provided every one of them put forward none but his own demands, and that this did not necessitate a change in the existing socio-economic system.

The privileged section of society, for their part, are out to split and disorganize the working class so as to bring them to submission. To this end, they resort to political terror, reactionary legislation and black-listing, and prosecute the more enlightened and militant workers. Like the right-wing trade union bosses, they do much to indoctrinate the working people and to create a bureaucratic machinery that would peddle conservative views and call a halt to democratic practices in the trade union movement.

Whatever the Argentine working class has won, such as its political leverage in public life, is a fruit of unrelenting struggles over many years. Nor has it downed arms in today's difficult situation (marked by various bans and restrictions and by the military's interference in trade union activity). It calls strikes, presents economic demands and sends delegates to negotiate with the employers and with delegates of the military to the trade unions, of the authorities and the command of the armed forces. Besides, the workers search for new forms of struggle to uphold their gains and demand higher wages, the normal functioning of their unions and the release of leading and rank-and-file trade unionists who are being held without trial or are listed 'missing.' They do not look on the armed forces and the government as a monolith but approach their different representatives differently. This helps them win new allies.

The working class is the largest class and most dynamic social force in Argentina. Its activity and aims are expressive of the laws of social

development. It is leading the struggle for the basic interests of all classes and strata seeking a better future for our people. The past decade has seen the working-class movement achieve closer unity, become more organized and gain further experience. This is all the more important since the movement is now faced with a very strong enemy, who is more treacherous and aggressive than before — the imperialist multinationals. With the general crisis of capitalism gaining in severity, these are trying to cope with difficulties and contradictions at the expense of dependent countries. Accordingly, they destabilize regimes that are not good enough for them, stage coups where the governments offer resistance, stimulate trends toward fascism with the help of their underlings in the respective countries and, above all, do their utmost to suppress the working-class and popular movement. It was the working class that prevented fascism (which imperialism and the oligarchy have been trying to impose ever since 1930) from asserting itself in Argentina, misleading the people and making them support a dictatorship which the fascists still long to establish.

However, the numerous actions carried out by our working class are evidence of the important place it holds in society rather than of awareness of its historic mission or the role of its vanguard, the CPA. To introduce the proletariat's scientific ideology into the working-class movement and to transform it into a force leading the masses and uniting all who are opposed to monopoly and latifundium, to backwardness and dependence, is to provide the prerequisites of solving a most pressing problem of Argentine society, the problem of democracy, and of ensuring its effective functioning in the future.

The working-class movement is a complex, developing historical phenomenon. In Argentina it is growing mainly throught the influx of people from the middle strata and the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie. This lends the movement wide scope; on the other hand, it breeds new serious ideological and political problems.

As a result of the immigration since the mid-19th century of a substantial number of European workers schooled by struggles against capitalist power, the incipient working-class movement of Argentina assumed a clear-cut class and democratic character. Its reinforcement in later years with numerous working people inexperienced in class battles and handicapped by illusions and prejudices produced anarchist trends, indifference to politics, and 'economism,' all of which are encouraged by the bourgeois and advocated by reformists. The rapid growth of the working class in outlying regions in the thirties and forties, chiefly through the influx of one-time peasants, helped Peronism win recognition with the support of the masses. It is Peronism, a complex and contradictory movement, an

eclectic mix of reactionary and anti-democratic with democratic and popular elements, that has served as the social basis for bourgeois nationalism.[3] However, it is the working people who play the decisive role in the Peronist movement. The CPA has always backed worker Peronists, sharing with them the joy of victory as well as the bitterness of defeat. Under communist influence, working people committed to Peronism swung more and more to the left in their way of thinking as well as in their fighting methods. This expressed itself, among other things, in their attitude to the socialist world. They hailed the victory of the Cuban revolution and subsequently the victory of Popular Unity in Chile. They favor far-reaching structural changes in the country.

Moving farther and farther to the left, worker Peronists reject capitalism although they have yet to take a resolute enough step toward socialism. The Peronist right wing is trying to play the same role as the social democrats of Europe, except that it is particularly nationalistic. What the rightists want to implant in the working-class movement is bourgeois nationalism. Experience indicates, however, that reformism and bourgeois nationalism divide the working-class and popular movement. As for the ultra-leftists, they have shown themselves to be so many petty-bourgeois adventurers. Many of their leaders belonged to the ultra-rightist camp at one time; today they are linked with repressive agencies and the CIA and committed to outspoken anti-Sovietism and anti-communism even though they occasionally use verbal mimicry for tactical reasons.

The fact that the working people are prompted by their experience to reject reactionary policies does not always imply that they come at once to understand the new, adopt a consistent class position and so are prepared to join the ranks of the revolutionary party of their class. At times some of the workers feel disillusioned, refuse to take part in trade union or political activity, fall for the nihilist concepts of extremists, yield to spontaneity and are taken in by 'innovations' advertised by bourgeois ideologists.

The growing political maturity of Argentina's workers (including Peronists which is very important), does not mean that most of them will join automatically in conscious and resolute struggle. The party must see to it that its ideas, policies, tactics and methods of organization are understood by the people.

The basis of the working-class movement is the trade unions, which organize actions in support of specific demands and are the principal school for class education. It is in the unions that the struggle for a united and independent working-class movement begins.

Thanks to the efficiency and principled position of the more enlightened workers who are union members and of many leaders of

diverse political currents, the Argentine trade union movement retains its structural integrity almost everywhere in spite of various subversive acts. To accomplish its tasks, the working class must reinforce its ranks, muster all its forces and unite the masses. And this cannot be done without a radical change in the balance of forces in the working-class movement.

It is not a question of replacing Peronist leaders by communists. We favor the formation at all levels, from top to bottom, of a leadership committed to unity and expressing the working people's militancy and interests. This is a feasible if very difficult task. It is essential to show up the rightists and expel them from the working-class movement. To be sure, the working people will draw proper lessons as they participate directly in social struggles but the facts suggest that the masses learn from their own experience faster when helped by the Communist Party.

We have said that worker Peronists have travelled a long path of struggle along with the communists. They have learned what we want, and have come to appreciate our program, policies and tactics. This frightens the imperialists and Pinochetists, who are trying to start a 'war against subversive elements' in the enterprises and working-class districts. In this complicated situation the communists press forward their effort in the working-class movement, aiming primarily to strengthen their united front with the Peronist rank and file as well as leaders. There are objective difficulties to overcome (it would be wrong to ignore them), and there are also subjective ones. Some party members are less militant now that they have lost confidence in the possibility of achieving favorable changes in the overall situation because success is slow to come and they cannot establish closer bonds with the masses. An exaggerated notion of the obstacles facing us and the strength of the enemy, and hence underestimation of our potentialities and failure to realize the leading role of the working-class movement, especially the role of worker Peronists, give rise to sectarian sentiments. Yet the masses are particularly in need of our help.

Lenin pointed out that the masses can be won over even when the majority of the proletariat is clearly following bourgeois and reformist leaders. He said that the communist tactics should be based on a steady and systematic drive to win '*the majority of the working class*, first and foremost *within the old trade unions*' (*Coll. Works*, Vol 42, p. 320). In our country this work is being done primarily in the major production enterprises. It is there that the contrast between labor and capital is particularly sharp and that thousands or even tens of thousands of workers make common cause, realizing the tremendous importance of organization and discipline. We take a proper view of

the intricate political process under way in the country, of the movements and currents involved. We disagree with those who consider that everything is at a standstill, that people are resigned to their fate and that things will go from bad to worse. Nor do we agree with those who believe that the subsequent course of development will be determined by individuals.

Our party is doing all in its power to help the masses unite, to help them become the main factor on the political scene. At the same time, the party studies the experience of the masses, the results of popular action, and the forms of organization and struggle born of the working people's inexhaustible initiative.

There is no confining oneself to defense when reaction is carrying on a furious offensive and there is a threat of 'Pinochetism,' kept up by multinationals. The task is to resist the enemy by launching determined attacks, to discard the fatalist idea of inevitable retreat, to act and not to look forward to 'better times.' The danger threatening the country is great but then so are the opportunities that offer.

The working class and the trade union movement must become standard-bearers of the struggle for human rights, civil freedoms and democracy. This is needed to solve the vital problems of combating Pinochetism and finding a democratic way out of the present political situation. It would be wrong to count solely on the promises and professed good intentions of certain spokesmen of the armed forces and the government and to disregard the pressure of home and foreign reaction. As matters stand, the decisive factor is the scope, cohesion and strength of the working-class and democratic movement, which should be able to isolate those who practise political and economic terror, to give inspiring support to moderates and anti-fascists in the armed forces and widen the opening through which the shoots of democracy are breaking and which Pinochetism wants to close at all costs so as to promote the strategic aims of imperialism in the south of the continent.

Ours is no easy task. Reaction has always tried to divert the working class from the struggle for democracy and civil freedoms, and as for bourgeois nationalism, it 'teaches' the working people to scorn them. The CPA wants the working-class and popular movement to rise to a new stage in the struggle for the lives of thousands of kidnapped persons, for the release of those being held without trial, including heroic members of the party and Communist Youth made hostages and victims of Pinochetism, for an end to torture and the maltreatment of detainees, for the maintenance of human rights, for democracy and freedom.

The urgent need to thwart imperialist subversion and to help the workers shake off the influence of bourgeois nationalism and adopt a

class position confronts the CPA with new tasks in the ideological contest.

The indoctrination practised by the enemy for years has had its effect on numerous working people in the form of a scornful view on theory and ideas generally, narrow-minded pragmatism, *caudillismo*, and so on. To arouse the people's interest in economic and political problems, show them the cuases of the national crises and transform their spontaneous discontent and anger into keen political awareness, something more is required than appeals and slogans. Ideas will become a powerful material force only if the party and its branches help the masses find correct solutions through their own action and within the existing organizational structures, and if the masses realize the place they hold in society and the significance of the proletariat's scientific ideology and their own vanguard, the party.

Marxism-Leninism tells us that working-class policy is not only a science but an art, and that the party cannot confine its activity to working out a correct line. How effective this line will be depends in vast measure on organization aimed at arousing the militant spirit and creative initiative of the masses, and on the party's ability to bring the truth home to the masses and to mobilize them. This work must be done by every member and every party branch. One of the main principles of Leninist leadership and party work today is to establish the right proportion, one that is realistic at the moment, between the two aspects of politics — science and art.

Organization is particularly important now, and it is taking even more complex forms. We know from experience that to win over working people who are not under our influence, we need a stronger party, a greater number of strong branches capable of playing the leading role of internal commissions and delegates' committees,[4] as well as on house committees in proletarian neighborhoods, so as to establish the closest possible contact with the trade union membership (especially in the major enterprises). It is a question of enabling the party to operate in places with large concentrations of working people in conditions of repression and a generally complicated political climate. Failure to achieve this will indicate that our methods are out of keeping with our objectives.

To lead is to foresee and this calls for a study of specific pressing problems and development trends.

Corresponding to Lenin's definition of the party of the new type as the vanguard of the working class is a scientific conception of organizational principles. The highest efficiency in party leadership is attained by means of a scientific methodology enabling the party to explore and solve problems, educate its cadres and place them properly, extend inner-party democracy, strengthen discipline in party ranks

(which implies that every member must show a high degree of political consciousness) and maintain close contact with the masses. Leninist working methods help renounce a fatalist mood, dissuade members from resigning themselves to difficulties, rule out bureaucratic practices, formalism, and complacency born of success—in short, all that is incompatible with the party's organization work. The party cannot make its line effective by merely issuing directives, for every communist is responsible for the party, and vice versa.

Proper political leadership rejects the mistaken idea of the party being divided into 'active' and 'passive' members. Organizational work must be carried on in such a way as to prevent dissociation of the leadership from the rank and file and assure the normal functioning of party branches. Our duty is to be right among the workers and the people. This is why we have been trying to develop our effort wherever workers live, work, study, and take part in public life.

An earnest of success is to combine the work of party branches among the masses with supervision and assistance on the part of the relevant medium-level leading bodies, on condition that provincial committees are always in a position to guide the activity of these bodies and define their tasks. Another important requisite of efficient leadership is to follow a proper personnel policy. This should be a concern of the whole party ranging from every new comrade joining its ranks to the party branch concerned, which should think of the possibility of the comrade becoming a leader in due course.

Imperialism and reaction want to prevent the CPA from becoming the leading force of the masses. They use more and more new forms and methods of political and police provocation. We are operating in difficult conditions and so must heighten our revolutionary vigilance. We must train new cadres, inspire them with firmness and with loyalty to the party and its communist cause. We should tell them about examples of heroism and revolutionary behavior set by CPA members in the face of the class enemy, by comrades who were manhandled by fascist bands but never surrendered.

A survey of the social composition of the newly admitted has revealed that about 70 per cent of them are wage and salary earners, half of them being workers. It follows that we must make a point of forming and strengthening party organizations in the major enterprises and shop trade unions, for it is there that we take joint action with the Peronists, who come up against difficulties and complicated situations just as we do.

Our effort to bring new people into the party has produced appreciable results. Eighty per cent of the new members are young workers from among former Peronists. The party is building up its positions

especially in the main industrial centers. This means that we enjoy influence throughout the country.

Winning new members, particularly workers, is one of our primary tasks. At this stage of the political process going on in our country, we communists can become a force capable of influencing developments. This will depend on the extent to which we increase the party's numerical strength.

To encourage a dialogue between the government and the democratic forces, induce the people to join actively in today's complex political process, and bring about an agreement between civilians and military men that would pave the way for a renewed democracy, or, in other words, to effect far-reaching changes in the country, it is essential that the working-class movement draw lessons from the events of recent years, achieve unity, strengthen its ranks and become the pole of attraction for the masses.

We no longer think of the new society in terms of a dim and distant future. It is becoming reality, for there are the Soviet Union, Cuba (a Latin American country) and other socialist countries. Advanced workers realize that our party, the most well-organized and enlightened contingent of the working class and people of Argentina, is also part of the mighty and invincible worldwide movement for liberation and progress. They are beginning to feel confident that what they have always desired for themselves and their children will come true when real democracy is won, a democracy which they will carry forward to build a socialist society.

In the 60 years since it was founded, our party has been operating in the most diverse conditions; it has had to work underground, and has been persecuted and dealt telling blows. All this notwithstanding, it has never confined itself to underground work but has sought broader and broader links with the masses and earned their support. Nor has it ever allowed reaction to isolate it from the people.

The masses learn by experience that the communists champion a just cause. The working-class, democratic and popular movements are gaining strength; the struggle in defense of human rights and for the satisfaction of the people's pressing needs is expanding. People feel more and more strongly that the only positive way out of the present situation is to defeat Pinochetism for good and set up a renewed democratic system. Our party has played an important role in this process before and goes on playing it.

1. Founded on January 6, 1918.
2. Many progressive laws are being repealed, and gains in the sphere of labor relations, as well as the relative material and social benefits wrested by the workers through sustained struggle, are being nullified. The eight-hour day is practically

non-existent. To make ends meet, people now have to put in 12, 14 or even 16 hours of work a day.

3. For details on Peronism, see Rubens Izcaro, 'Vanguard of the working class, Organizer of the masses,' in *WMR*, July 1974, p. 38.

4. Trade union bodies set up at enterprises. — *Ed.*

Leninism and the international aspect of the fight for socialism in Britain

Bert Ramelson
CP Great Britain, Member,
WMR Editorial Board

When considering the prospects for the struggle to achieve a socialist Britain, cognizance should be taken of the glaring contradiction between the ripeness of some of the material prerequisites for socialism in the country, on the one hand, and, on the other, the absence or at least the inadequacies of prerequisites for a socialist revolution. Britain is a country that has long since entered the phase of state-monopoly capitalism, which is '*a complete* material preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism' (V.I. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 359). But the political conditions for establishing a socialist government in Britain do noh yet exist; they have to be won.[1]

This situation is not peculiar to Britain. The collapse of capitalism did not begin in those countries where the material potentialities for realizing socialism were well in advance of those countries where the breakthrough did take place. And it is fact that in the past quarter-century no socialist revolution has taken place in any advanced capitalist country. State-monopoly capitalism is constantly seeking, finding and institutionalizing new means for maintaining its power. It is a dangerous adversary, an adversary to be reckoned with. And this is an important reason for the difficulties facing the revolutionary process in such countries.

Such facts have helped to give currency to the view that the industrially advanced capitalist countries have leapfrogged the revolutionary phase, and this has been presented as being associated only with backwardness, with underdeveloped capitalism. Influenced by the postwar 'long boom' some 'left theoreticians' (e.g., Marcuse) argued that the proletariat in the advanced countries no longer repre-

sented the revolutionary force destined to play a key role in transforming the capitalist society into a socialist one. The new revolutionary vanguard, we were lectured, consisted of the oppressed and disadvantaged in the far-flung outposts of imperialism, alongside the declassed victims of capitalism inhabiting the urban slums of the metropolitan centers. Only after the success on the periphery of imperialism would the socialist revolution force its way to the center. This postulates the erroneous concept of the working class becoming the passive recipient of a socialist revolution brought about in the former colonial countries and imported inyo the advanced capitalist countries.

The crisis of the 70s and the eruption of class struggles in most advanced capitalist countries has considerably shaken those 'theories,' which to some extent were based on an erroneous and mechanistic conception of a proportional relation between the revolutionary process and the level of productive forces under capitalism.[2]

In the recent period, there has been a considerable shift in the balance of forces on a world scale: between the socialist and capitalist world systems; between the national-liberation movements and imperialism and also — in some advanced capitalist countries — between the organized working class and the ruling class. The working class has grown numerically and the level of its class and socialist consciousness has risen in some countries. This has, on the whole, created a more favorable situation for the development of the revolutionary process.

The purpose of this article is primarily to examine the international aspect of the problem of a developed capitalist country — Britain, in this case — advancing to socialism. These problems, in particular, will be examined: the effect of the barriers to the defeat of capitalism stemming from the particular country's role within the imperialist system; the effect on the revolutionary process of the 'unifying' trends in relations between capitalist countries; the new possibilities of socialist transformations in a developed country in an atmosphere of détente.

These problems, in my view, have implications not only for communists in Britain but in some other countries as well. The prospects in the struggle for socialism in our country which spring from an analysis of its internal situation and the arrangement of class forces are a problem which requires special treatment and is beyond the framework of this article.

Difficulties of the opening phase of the revolution

The developed capitalist countries have a special position within the

imperialist system. They have concentrations of vast forces — economic, financial, scientific, technical, military, political and ideological — which not only constitute the power base maintaining the system within the national boundaries, but also play a considerable role in maintaining the viability of the entire world imperialist system. Since the plunder of the natural resources and the exploitation of the people in less developed countries help to reinforce the power of capital in the centers of imperialism, the defeat of capitalism in the developed countries is bound to be closely interwoven with the greater, global task of the liberation of the sizable part of mankind oppressed by imperialism.

This is a particularly important factor as far as Britain is concerned. While its dominating imperialist position belongs to the past, its power to exploit some underdeveloped countries has not been completely eroded by any means. Its former imperialist supremacy still has an effect on its own economy and on the international position of its major monopoly firms, which are almost all multinational in scope. And it has also left a deep mark on the ideology of the British working class.

In considering the prospects for a social revolution in the developed countries in 1919, Lenin had this to say: 'It is self-evident that final victory can be won only by the proletariat of all the advanced countries of the world, and we Russians are beginning the work which the British, French or German proletariat will consolidate. But we see that they will not be victorious without the aid of the working people of all oppressed colonial nations' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 30, pp. 160-162).

This Leninist concept is, of course, fundamentally different from the erroneous ideas of Marcuse and company. There is a world of difference between saying that the national-liberation movement can and will help the revolutionary struggle of the working class in advanced capitalist countries, and denying the key role the proletariat must play to achieve a successful socialist revolution in the advanced capitalist countries, denying that which constitutes the substance of Lenin's conception of the interaction of the revolutionary forces. The success of the fight for national independence will help in the struggle for socialism in Britain, but we are sure that this revolution will be the result of the struggle of our working class and its allies, and not imported from anywhere.

It is important to note the historical approach in Lenin's conception of revolution. It does not predetermine, once and for all, the specific international conditions for victorious revolution in a developed country. This conception presupposes concrete analyses of the concrete situation. But at the same time it deduces theoretically

the direction in which the historical conditions are changing: expansion of the front of anti-imperialist struggle, its development into a worldwide process opens up favorable prospects for socialist revolution in developed capitalist countries. This conception also helps us to understand the role that the breaking up of colonialism and the development of the national-liberation movement can play in the liquidation of capitalism in the advanced capitalist countries.

The successful October Revolution, which gave rise to the powerful Soviet state, had vast repercussions. It unleashed a vast worldwide anti-imperialist movement, considerably weakening world imperialism; it contributed greatly to the emergence of a world socialist system; the Soviet people played a powerful role in defeating fascism's bid to dominate the globe. The Great October Revolution helped to shape the world we live in today, a world in which colonial empires have been destroyed, and neo-colonialism is being challenged. By changing the world balance of forces, it has made more likely and feasible a revolutionary strategy based on the consolidation of détente.

Britain provides an example bearing out Lenin's strategic idea for the advance of the world revolutionary process. British Marxists have always held that the fate of socialism in Britain is inseparable from that of the liberation of its colonies. It was only with the awakening of the national-liberation movements inspired by and relying on the new, socialist world and the solidarity of the metropolitan progressive forces that the possibilities for the historical fulfillment of this task, the strategy for the revolutionary process envisaged in *The British Road to Socialism,* began to materialize. The ending of British imperialist oppression of the peoples of the former vast empire is seen by British communists as a prerequisite stage in the process of the emancipation of the British people itself from capitalist exploitation.

The conditions would therefore become even more favorable and take us further on that road if, among other factors, the decolonization process were completed and an end put to British rule, occupation and exploitation of Ireland. The shaping of such conditions is also linked with our fight against the neo-colonialist policies of the British government and for the freedom of the peoples to determine their own destinies; the stepping up of the activities of the British labor movement in solidarity with the national-liberation movement, especially in South Africa, where the big British monopolies are closely associated with and constitute a main prop of the racist reactionary government; and our granting of genuine unconditional aid to the newly-liberated anti-imperialist countries.

With the collapse of the British colonial empire a powerful source

used by the capitalists to artic fically delay their defeat has begun to dry up. The superprofits made by the British capitalists through the exploitation of the colonial peoples gave them over a very long period the resources and confidence to make concessions resulting in many workers feeling they could make sufficient advances within the system. The ending of capitalism was seen as a remote aim attainable through a process of piecemeal reform. This was the basis for reformism, which still has dominant positions in the British labor movement.

No one doubts the fact that during the state-monopoly phase of capitalism the efficiency of social production is enhanced, mainly through the development and exploitation of new technology, enabling the capitalists, faced with militant struggle, to relatively improve the lot of the working people in the social sphere as well as with regard to real wages. This has averted socio-economic upheavals for the time being, but the ruling class' ability to make concessions has not and cannot eliminate the contradictions which are the objective basis for a socialist revolution, particularly the most basic of all the antagonisms — that between labor and capital. The workers' expectations are raised, their appetites for continuous and consistent improvement in their living standards are whetted. These demands, which are based on a realistic understanding of the potentialities of the productive forces, are not being met by capitalism in the new circumstances of its deepening general crisis, and this leads to a growing realization of the need to end capitalism. Indeed, in their vain efforts to stabilize the situation the ruling classes are attempting to do so at the expense of the working class, withdrawing some of the concessions.

At home, British capitalism has been unable to recover from the losses it suffered due to the collapse of its colonial system. It has attempted to regain its previous status by participating in colonial wars, pursuing neo-colonialist policies and extending the tentacles of its multinational firms. Britain became America's junior partner in the fight against the national-liberation movements and socialism. In the pursuit of such policies, she wasted huge resources on arms. All of this has had grave consequences for the country.

Britain's inability to compete on even terms on the world markets led to chronic balance-of-payment deficits, which in turn led to an artificial inhibition of economic growth: the emergence for the first time since the war of large-scale chronic unemployment, and higher-than-average inflation. The modest growth in living standards, which had been a feature of the postwar years, slowed down and stopped.

Thus many factors arising from Britain's special and privileged position within the imperialist world order, which exerted a negative

effect on the development of revolutionary consciousness among British workers, are losing their potency. It would be wrong, however, not to realize that the ruling class has by no means lost all its potentialities for muting the antagonism between labor and capital. Very formidable obstacles lie in Britain's way to socialism.

The most stubborn of these is is that far too many British workers have not as yet shed their deeply ingrained reformist ideology, still believing in somehow reforming capitalism to give it the characteristics of a vaguely conceived socialist image. Such views are widely held in most British working-class organizations. These attitudes constitute the major obstacle to the use of the potential power of the working-class movement in the struggle for socialism.

That is why we regard it as an indispensable task to strengthen, build and increease the influence of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the only British working-class party basing itself on Marxism-Leninism. Only a much stronger and bigger Communist Party would be able to play an important role in the struggle to transform the working-class movement's ideological outlook, to unite it and help forge alliances with other democratic forces. Communists know that however deep the crisis of British capitalism only with the existence of a revolutionary class capable of rallying the majority of the people in the struggle for the socialist goal and a revolutionary party can a revolution in the country be realized.

The strategy to counter the trend to 'ultra-imperialism'

Fresh obstacles have arisen in recent decades on the revolutionary road in the developed capitalist countries. They arise concretely from the fact that the chain which links these countries — their ruling circles at any rate — has assumed greater significance. The internationalization of capital has advanced by leaps and bounds. The growth of giant multinational corporations has also been accompanied by a strong trend toward inter-state economic integration. Militarism has reached unprecedented proportions, penetrating the state machine and the monopoly boardrooms. Aggressive military-political blocs were formed, one of their objectives being the prevention of any change in the status quo in any part of the imperialist orbit.

However, despite these 'unifying ' trends, it would not be right to conclude that Lenin's concept of revolution was wrong and that this trend will culminate in 'ultra-imperialism,' engulfing all the developed capitalist countries. Neither internationalization of capital, nor inter-state agreements abolish the unevenness of capitalist development or eliminate the contradictions fueling the divisive trends in the imperialist system.

A striking expression of this unevenness is the growing challenge to

the domination of the United States by other states, especially West Germany and Japan, as well as the coordinated challenge to the United States by the EEC. The growth of the multinationals is a new factor intensifying this process and reinforcing the law of uneven development. Britain offers a vivid example. The British multinationals have been responsible for a steady outflow of capital, despite Britain's desperate need for investment capital to restructure and modernize her backward and outdated industries. As a result, Britain has been lagging in economic development behind other developed capitalist countries, with the consequence, as mentioned earlier, that she has the lowest economic growth rate in Europe, the lowest rate of investment per worker of all the leading capitalist countries, and so also the lowest productivity rate. This process has been aggravated since she joined the Common Market. All control of the movement of capital within the EEC has been ruled out under the Treaty of Rome, so that the multinationals have a completely free hand. This has resulted in unprecedented deficits between Britain and her EEC partners as well as creating grave threats to the national control of the economy in general and its natural resources, in particular. The EEC is desperately trying to force itself on the decision-making process in the exploitation of North Sea oil.

However, the inter-imperialist contradictions do not evaporate as a result of the creation of inter-state regions. Our program says that 'deep-rooted differences impede the efforts to integrate Western Europe economically and politically.'[3] The experience of the EEC shows that even on a regional basis, let alone on a world scale, 'ultra-imperialism' is as unattainable today as when Lenin polemicized against this concept over half a century ago. (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 285-297).

While the thesis of the probability of a successful revolutionary process commencing simultaneously in industrially developed countries was rejected by Lenin and other Marxists decades ago as incompatible with the conditions of imperialism (See *Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 339-343) some still cling to the idea. That is why it is legitimate to re-examine the question in the light of the rapidly advancing integration of capital, the growth of the multinationals and the trend toward regional inter-state or supra-state institutionalization. In this connection note should be taken of the fact that in Britain there has recently been an intensification by certain Trotskyite groups of the hollow demands for a synchronized West European socialist revolution.

Particularly, is it reasonable to ask whether circumstances have not been changed so that what was previously considered an untenable thesis — the simultaneous revolutionary breakthrough in a number of advanced countries—now becomes a real possibility? Or if the

breakthrough is not simultaneous, could it not start a chain reaction with successive defeats of capitalism in all or most of the developed countries in that region? — a variation of the so-called domino theory?

Of course, such a possibility cannot be ruled out absolutely. It ought to be stated, however, that our strategy is not based on the assumption that the revolutionary process in Britain would be started by a revolutionary breakthrough in some other developed capitalist country.

Nor do we see our revolution being dependent on any advances by some economic or political regional bloc in democratizing its institutions.

While that in itself is no reason why others should not think differently, nevertheless we believe that the British assumption was a wise one, as the possibilities for a synchronized or continuous chain reaction of revolutionary processes — not only socialist but also general democratic — in developed capitalist countries are less likely than several decades ago. The economic and political blocs of the imperialist states were organized to strengthen and underpin capitalism, to adapt it structurally to the important changes within the system, and in the world arena. The new economic integrated powers are bound to be used to stop, frustrate or at least inhibit the revolutionary process in one member country, and certainly to prevent the process spreading to other countries. This would be so even if there were a change in the bureaucratic set-up of any imperialist bloc through the democratization of its institutions for more equitable relations between the capitalist countries within it. Such changes do not alter the reactionary objectives which gave rise to the formation of such blocs.

It should certainly be recognized that today world and regional crises affect all capitalist countries more or less simultaneously. But what is far more relevant to the problem we are discussing is the fact that one of the basic laws in the era of imperialism, namely, the law of uneven development, operates with even greater force in the conditions of a synchronized world capitalist crisis.

The stronger capitalist countries try to solve the crisis not only at the expense of their own working class, but also at the expense of their capitalist rivals. We can see this process now taking place on an ever increasing scale. Even the most powerful countries, hit by the crisis, are pursuing protectionist policies, sometimes dubbed 'beggar-my-neighbor policies.' Such policies, the direct consequence of the crisis, are bound to deepen the unevenness of development. Nor is the unevenness confined to general economic development. It is bound to lead to differentiation in the development rate of the revolutionary consciousness of the working classes and the relative

strengths of the ruling classes — the key factors in the maturing of conditions for the launching of the revolutionary social processes. Nor is this confined to countries with a highly developed industry. This uniformity applies equally to countries with a lower level of industrial development and even to underdeveloped countries. It is not restricted to any geographical area either. It is a universal phenomenon characteristic of our epoch and the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

Some argue that at the present stage of interdependence of world trade, particularly between developed countries, and the considerable growth in the international division of labor, the revolutionary process in one developed country would soon run into insurmountable economic obstacles. It is argued that such a country would be deprived of the advantages of specialization and joint cooperation on vast projects beyond the capacity of one single economy, while industries structured on the assembly of components produced in different subsidiaries of the multinational companies operating in a number of developed countries would come to a halt with vast problems of unemployment, shortages, etc.

This type of argument, however, is based on the assumption that the multinational firms, whether home or foreign based, are completely free agents, unconstrained by the very interdependence of the productive process and the global market. It does not take into account the fact that imperialist domination of the world economy has already been eroded by the growth of the socialist and developing countries.

We do not intend to opt out of the advantages of the international division of labor or rely on a rupture of economic ties with other countries. Interdependence is a double-edged weapon. Retaliation by a developed country starting on the road to socialism could equally disrupt the productive processes in the other developed countries within the capitalist orbit. The final sanction of nationalization without compensation (confiscation) of the foreign-based multinationals' vast investments in Britain, or the threat of a further contradiction of the global market in the era of the general crisis of capitalism and very much slower rate of growth of world trade, are powerful forces militating against such freedom of action to 'starve' Britain's revolutionary process into reverse. What is even more important, constantly expanding markets of the socialist and the developing countries are more than just 'insurance' against a possible capitalist boycott; they are also a positive encouragement in the presentation of the case for a socialist transformation of Britain. That is why we lay great stress on the development of Britain's international trade with the socialist countries.

However, we do not ignore the threats of political and/or economic ganging up against Britain by the use of institutions evolved in the process of integration or internationalization of capital. We call for Britain's withdrawal from the Common Market, as well as NATO, so that the country can be free to determine its foreign-policy and economic strategy.

The social transformation without war and the problem of 'strategic interests'

When considering the prospects for a socialist revolutionary transformation, the problem of outside intervention by imperialist forces cannot be ignored. Time and again intervention by foreign imperialist powers has strangled such revolutionary transformations or prevented them from evolving in various parts of the world, including Europe. It would be wrong to ignore the real danger of the export of counter-revolution, particularly when many capitalist countries are enmeshed in mutual 'military commitments.' Nevertheless the strategy of *The British Road to Socialism*. in view of the contemporary world situation, is based on our belief that it is possible to carry through the revolutionary process in Britain without having to face armed struggle against an external enemy or enemies.

It would, of course, be a complete misinterpretation to see this as implying that, if our hypothesis proves wrong and armed intervention does take place, there would be no option but to surrender and abandon the revolutionary process. The people would be prepared and ready to defend their chosen path by whatever means and forms of struggle that may be necessary. Britain's road lies through the fullest possible development of a broad democratic alliance in which the organized working class plays a key role. Thus it envisages the support of the vast majority of the population and its cooperation with the working class. 'The advance to socialism,' says *The British Road to Socialism*, 'can only take place through the active democratic struggle of the great majority of the British people. But because of their overwhelming potential strength, and because of the changed balance in the world, we believe that we can achieve socialism in Britain without military intervention and without civil war.'[4]

The prospect for a revolution in Britain without foreign intervention is based on a number of factors: the basic transformation of the world balance between the forces for socialism and for imperialism as a result of socialist advances; the consequent considerable constraint on imperialist freedom of action due to the rapid advances in the development of the anti-imperialist national-liberation movement; and the radicalization and growing militancy of the working class in most developed countries. These three factors, and growth of the

peace forces throughout the world, have combined to impose peaceful coexistence and détente on the imperialists, an important factor in considering the possibilities of preventing intervention. Our strategy being the logic of the concept of peaceful coexistence is obviously related to the overall world situation and the concrete social and political situation in Britain.

Considering the possibilities for achieving a socialist revolution, it is important to note that world imperialism has lost its ability to intervene, as it did, for example in Spain in the 30s. When planning intervention it has to reckon not only with the enhanced strength of the revolutionary forces, but also with the possible reaction of the USSR, the socialist world and its might. The fact that the United States has had to put up with socialist Cuba at its front door testifies to the effect of the new balance of forces in securing victory for revolution.

The prospects of revolution not coming as the result of war are also influenced by the fact that the socialist countries have no interest whatever in war, and that their rapid progress is founded on peace. The socialist countries use their by no means inconsiderable strength and influence to prevent war. By combining their efforts with the working people and other progressive forces in the capitalist countries, they have won important victories in the fight for peace. The present détente, despite the incessant attempts of imperialism to undermine it, is the first fruit of this vital struggle for the prevention of global conflict.

We lay great stress in exposing the false argument that a successful breakthrough against capitalism in a powerfully developed country such as Britain, because it is at the very center of the whole imperialist system, would destabilize the state of equilibrium between the two armed groupings and endanger peace. On the contrary, it is one of our basic premises that a successful revolution in a single developed country would infinitely strengthen the peace forces and, by weakening the imperialist camp, make the possibilities of war more remote. Our party's present policy is aimed to create conditions for the simultaneous dissolution of both the NATO and Warsaw pacts. Withdrawal from NATO would not mean allowing Britain's territory to be used for the deployment of foreign strategic or other weapons. The establishment of a comprehensive European Security System which, together with our determination to unilaterally destroy our nuclear weapons, would advance the whole cause of peace and make a great contribution to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

However, it would neither be true to say, nor would we be believed, if we were foolish enough to say it, that a Socialist Britain would be equidistant in class terms from imperialism, with its aggres-

sive policies and the socialist countries, whose consistent and continuous pursuit of peace policies is obvious to all who are not blinded by prejudice. The socialist strategy for a government on the road to socialism, while it pursues an independent foreign policy based on peaceful coexistence and support for the national-liberation movements, would be bound to cooperation with the socialist countries, for such is their policy too.

A basic assumption of the British Communist Party's strategy is that the revolutionary process could not succeed even under the most favorable international conditions, without the prerequisite internal conditions in Britain. What cannot be repeated too often is the home truth that revolutions have to be fought for in crucial battles against the ruling class and its institutions in the national arena.

In the preparation for the new edition of *The British Road to Socialism* over the past two years much theoretical work has been done by British communists on the specific features of the revolutionary process in industrially developed countries in general, and Britain in particular. An important milestone in this work has been the frank and often sharp discussions, which enriched the final edition adopted at the 35th Congress of the CPGB. We do not think that the work is complete even on the specific, international aspects of strategy dealt with here. But we are convinced of the usefulness of the approach, which is derived from the Marxist-Leninist conception of analysis of the specific features of the situation in Britain and how they relate to the rest of the world. This conviction has been strengthened by the work of evolving a strategy for transforming Britain into a socialist society.

1. *The British Road to Socialism*. Program of the Communist Party. London, 1978, p. 37.

2. Marxists exposed the weakness in these arguments long ago. Thus, when Bukharin wrote in his book *The Economics of the Transition Period* that the pace at which the revolution advanced was inversely proportional to the maturity of capitalist relations, Lenin disagreed with this categorical statement. He commented that it was a 'risky statement' and suggested a much more cautious presentation such as 'not directly proportional,' which implies a qualitatively different conception (*Leninsky sbornik*, XI, p. 398), and history has justified this warning.

3. *The British Road to Socialism*, p. 12.

4. *The British Road to Socialism*, p. 16.

Report at first hand. Second day

Vitaly Moyev
WMR staff member

WHAT THE PORTUGUESE COMMUNISTS CHAMPION, AND HOW THEY LIVE AND WORK

In the chronicle of present-day Portugal the first day was inscribed by the revolution of April 1974. It removed one of the last stains of fascism in Europe that had clung on since the days of the Brown Plague. It gave a powerful impetus to significant democratic changes in Portugal's socio-political structure, in civilian life, and in production, to changes paving the way to the transition to socialism. At the same time, the course of the Portuguese revolution proved to be tortuous: it produced further evidence that under no circumstances, under no variants of 'democratic renewal,' will the bourgeoisie ever yield its positions voluntarily. Moreover, in its rejection of revolution the bourgeoisie attacks democratic innovations, and the more tangible these innovations are the heavier its pressure becomes.

The second day of any revolution is marked by that revolution's self-assertion, by the repulsion of counter-attacks, by the mobilization of forces in defense of its gains, beach-heads, and aspirations. The second day can last long. In Portugal it is in its fifth year.

Last summer we visited that country at the invitation of Portuguese communists. We were given the opportunity of seeing their day-to-day struggles and work at first hand. The following are some of our observations.

I

From Documents of the PCP

'The agrarian reform is a key if not the most significant achievement of the Portuguese revolution. It was an historic accomplishment by the working people of Alentejo and Ribatejo organized in trade unions and acting under the leadership of their party — the Portuguese Communist Party. . . .

'One-fifth of the nation's farmland was wrested from the big landowners by the agricultural proletariat, which is organizing this major sector of the national economy, managing it, and fostering its development.'[1]

But it would be our common gross delusion to expect a fundamental reform of Portugal's agriculture to take place without any change of the general correlation of forces.'[2]

It is surprising how differently the rural world has taken shape in northern and southern Portugal, regions that are only a few hundred kilometres apart. The natural and historical contrasts are glaring. The north is mountainous, humid, and long and densely populated. Farming is fragmented down to 'minifundia,' measured in some cases not in hundreds but in tens of square metres. The geographer Pierre Birot notes that time was when in the north the king himself owned an orchard in one place and part of a meadow in another. Northerners say that cows standing in one field drop dung on the field of a neighbor.

The Alentejo south is an open and sultry expanse. It could be a rich breadbasket for the nation, but the preservation of latifundism fettered its potentialities. Enormous estates were famous hunting grounds. Huge areas lay unused, and people suffered from want of land and from want of work.

In the south the revolution was virtually an explosion. On their own and then acting on Law No. 406-A/15 1975, people occupied empty land, formed cooperatives, and started farming collectively. Leonel Malacueco became head of one of these cooperatives, christened Flower of Alentejo. He acted as our guide at the cooperative, showing us the freshly harvested wheat-fields, the fields of new-sprouted sunflowers, the water reservoir, and the meat and dairy farm.

On this tour he related that the cooperative has 276 members and 7,500 hectares of land. It is managed by a general meeting convened once a month. The permanent five-man management, like its chairman, is elected by the general meeting for a term of three years. All members, including the chairman, receive the same wage—180 escudos per diem. This is still a modest sum: approximately the same wage is paid by private farmers, but there the comparison ends. At private farms laborers have neither vacations, no days off, nor a regulated working day, but the cooperative members have an eight-hour working day, days off, and an 18-day vacation. The main thing, however, is that labor at the private farms is forced and, besides, it may be denied. At the cooperative the members are masters of what they do and of their own destiny.

Instead of going into economic results Malacueco gave us the management's official annual report — the same as was handed to each member of the cooperative. It contained all the information we needed. Prior to the agrarian reform 1,600 hectares of non-irrigated land were cultivated, today 2,600 hectares have been ploughed up;

the area of irrigated land has been increased from 10 to 111 hectares. The yield of tomatoes, rice, and corn has grown. There are now more meat and dairy cattle, the number of sheep has increased from 3,000 to 4,500 head, and the pig herd has multiplied tenfold.

In the south we visited another cooperative, called The Left Forces Will Triumph. It is somewhat larger, having 10,000 hectares of land and 467 members. It specializes in wine, olive oil and grain, its output having risen to 800,000 litres of wine (in former years it produced between 500,000 and 600,000 litres), 350,000 litres of olive oil (as against the former level of between 270,000 and 280,000 litres), and 2,500 tons each of wheat and barley. The cooperative is proud of its fleet of machines: 15 harvester combines, and 50 wheel and 12 track tractors. We got into a conversation with a couple of the tractor drivers: Manuel Caeiro, 31 and Joao Espada Cubaso, 31: both are locally born, and both had been forced to look for employment abroad prior to the revolution, one immigrating to the FRG, and the other to Switzerland. At the cooperatives thousands of young people like them felt the ground firm under their feet for the first time, acquired a sense of dignity, and saw that their income would be steady.

Flower of Alentejo is a producers' cooperative. The Left Forces Will Triumph is called a producers' collective farm. It would be hard to convey this distinction more clearly; besides it is an insignificant distinction.

'Both types of farms.' said Antonio Bica, member of the Portuguese Communist Party and Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the 1975 government, 'are in fact cooperatives. Both types are evidence of the dramatic changes that have taken place in production. In the cooperatives, where a spirit of collectivism reigns, there is no room for exploitation.'

'However,' he went on, 'it should be borne in mind that the new type of production is being carried on within the framework of the capitalist system. Hence the inevitable contradictory character and duality of assessments and trends. The relations in the cooperatives are one thing, while the relations in the system to which they belong are quite another. Under Portugal's present system sharp contradictions are inescapable between the cooperative movement and the surrounding economic environment, of which the policies of the bourgeois state are a part.'

Why are the cooperatives encountering animosity, disparagement, and hostility 'from without?' This question must be specified. Of course, one can understand the fury of those who had been evicted from the former estates. One can also 'understand' the profiteers of all kinds: the cooperatives are islands in the capitalist market with all its charms — profiteering, competition, striving to take advantage of a

partner's difficulties, and so on and so forth. But there is something else — what the Portuguese call 'social sabotage' and the 'legislative counter-revolution.' One would like to understand the mainsprings of this.

A simple cooperative is a far cry from socialism. Lenin emphatically rejected the fantastic 'plans of the old cooperators, from Robert Owen onwards,' who dreamed of a 'cooperative' reform of capitalism into socialism 'without taking account of such fundamental questions as the class struggle, the capture of political power by the working class' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 33, p. 473). Today, the experience of many countries makes it abundantly clear that capitalism easily adapts itself to the existence of cooperatives, assimilating them without the least apprehensions about its own destiny. Then what explains its extraordinary 'irreconcilability' in Portugal?

Let us take a closer look.

The cooperatives usual to the bourgeois system remain an insignificant impregnation taking shape gradually step by step, with the passage of time. No so in Portugal. The present generation of Portuguese cooperators appeared practically as a single act, rising on the crest of the social revolution as the result of the creative initiative of the people and therefore mirroring many of the genuinely revolutionary, class aspirations of the working people. The cooperatives set up in the course of the agrarian reform numbered not several score but nearly 500. Nearly a million hectares of land were placed at their disposal, and they now have more than 100,000 members.

But the main thing is that at the back of these figures there is a new quality. It is perhaps the first time in a bourgeois society that in the region covered by the agrarian reform in Portugal the cooperatives developed from a secondary or ordinary to the predominant form of production organization.

Of course, they feel the pressure of the capitalist environment, of the capitalist market, a pressure that is sustained by might and main, but under the present scale of development the cooperatives, too, evidently have new possibilities for influencing the life around them and that same capitalist market. How great are these possibilities? What is their ceiling? There neither is nor can be a ready-made reply to this. It will be given by the class struggle.

Further, the social composition of the agrarian movement in southern Portugal is also unusual. From the experience of history it is more customary to regard as cooperators those peasants who had formerly farmed separately, on small private or rented plots. Material interests and the benefits of large-scale collective production united them while other strings of the heart still played the old tune. The traditional peasant psychology was remoulded into a collectivist way of thinking

not without conflict, complicating the shaping of cooperative life.

All this is true of Portugal's northern regions. But not of the southern regions. In the south with its huge latifundia, there were practically no peasants as such. Only four to six per cent of the inhabitants farmed their own or rented plots of land. The vast majority, like Malacueco, Caeiro, and Cubaso, were farm laborers. They were not burdened by what is known as 'peasant conservatism.' the 'lure of the land,' and so forth. Their class consciousness was moulded on the pattern of that of workers, not of peasants. This made its mark on the development of the cooperatives.

For example, all the production assets of the cooperatives were, on the insistence of the members themselves, institutionalized as indivisible. Nothing was made divisible to provide for cases when somebody should resign from a cooperative. The reasoning was that this was not necessary since people had formed cooperatives without the apprehensions of peasants who had once farmed for themselves. Malacueco, Caeiro, Cubaso, and thousands like them were alien to the thought of one day having to resign.

Or take remuneration for labor. Looking at the cooperatives the small farmer thinks of a thousand things, such as what is going to happen, whether he will be at the losing end, what his income is to be like compared to what he had been making, and so on. Under these conditions it is by no means easy to establish a just system of remuneration. But in Portugal it proved to be easy, in fact, quite simple: everybody gets an equal share. Here, too, nobody forced this simplification on the cooperators. It stemmed from the spontaneous class assertion of justice and equality. Subsequently, corrections were introduced into the system of remuneration to take the quantity and quality of work into account, but in this case it was not a matter of remuneration as such but of the specific way in which the cooperatives were formed.

In the Portuguese cooperatives we saw no yen for making money for the sake of money (which would not have been too strange in a capitalist society), but we did see that the accent was placed on concern for people, for their needs, for their welfare.

In short, as we saw it, the cooperatives are a system powerfully charged with revolutionary militancy, collectivism, and socialism. Small wonder that the Portuguese communists characterize the entire agrarian reform in the south as a 'socialist' reorganization. That is what makes Portuguese capitalism so irreconcilable toward the cooperatives. What it fears are not the traditional, classical, customary elements, but the innovations brought by the fire of revolution.

The Barreto Law, passed in 1976 to replace the progressive law on the agrarian reform and in fact removing it from the protection of the

rule of law, makes clear what the adversaries of the agrarian reform are out to achieve. A return of the south to the latifundia? By no means. There is no return to the Middle Ages. This is obvious even to the diehards. The Barreto Law is aimed also against latifundism. But with a difference! Despite all objective historical realities its purpose is to replace large-scale property by a system of small private landholdings. The aim is to turn the rural laborers of the south into fragmented small peasants, to renounce large-scale collective production in favor of small, parcelled farming so as to direct rural life into the capitalist channel.

The 1975 agrarian reform law envisaged leaving a certain amount of land in the hands of landowners provided this land was cultivated and served its owners as a source of subsistence. This important provision was struck out by the Barreto Law. One can see why: to increase the size of the land subject to return from the cooperatives to the former owners and thereby reduce the network of cooperatives to safe dimensions where it would no longer be the predominant form of agricultural production, re-enter a framework harmless to the functioning of capital, and thus be easily harnessed.

All this is clearly seen by the Portuguese communists. Their agrarian policy is flexible, realistic, and based on principles. While accepting realities, they leave no possibility for championing the interests of rural workers unexplored. Relative to the north, they express the demands of small and medium landowners by their efforts to uproot the 'foro'[3] and ensure a just price and tax policy, the observance of the rent laws, the obligatory cultivation of land and the transfer of unused land to the people, ceiling on private landownership, and state aid for the formation of cooperatives. In the south the communists act consistently and vigorously to strengthen the cooperative system, develop the cooperatives themselves and, more importantly, promote mutual assistance and interaction between them to enable them to function as a socio-economic entity.

In the little town of Pias we attended a conference of secretaries of party organizations of cooperatives. It was presided over by Antonio Joaquim Gervasio, member of the Political Commission of the PCP Central Committee. What struck us was the attention that was given to uniting the entire cooperative movement. They spoke of coordinated prices of cooperative output; of the development of intercooperative services, such as repairs, which the cooperatives could use without having to depend on services in the private sector; of the creation and envigoration of territorial secretariats and specialized agencies. After we had returned from Portugal we read that a plan for the development of agriculture in the entire region covered by the agrarian reform was adopted at a conference of southern cooperators

in the town of Evora. This was the first plan of its kind in Portugal, and it was drawn up on the initiative and with the direct participation of workers in cooperated agriculture.

The Barreto Law has a legal life of somewhat over two years. Rightist elements are going to all lengths to make it operative. At the close of last year the onslaught was particularly shameless, stripped of all camouflage. The national gendarmerie units sent to Alentejo are taking land away from the cooperatives. Savage clashes are taking place. But the people continue to offer staunch resistance. The Portuguese communists are doing much to organize this resistance and defend the agrarian reform and the relevant provisions of the republic's Constitution.

II

From Documents of the PCP

'With the nationalization of key sectors approximately 1,200 enterprises — or about half of the national economy's production capacity — have come under the direct control of the state.'[4]

The defense of the interests of the working people, the establishment and intensification of workers' control, the struggle against the revival of capitalism in any form, and the promotion of various forms of coordination already approved at region level and in various industries comprise the main tasks confronting the working people's commissions.'[5]

The developments in Portugal provide further evidence that the revolution inevitably gives prominence to the question of workers' control in production. Under revolutionary conditions the first profound study of this question was made by Lenin and tested in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the Russian Bolsheviks and in other revolutions of our age. On this basis the conclusion, valid in its entirety to this day, was drawn that workers' control plays a major role in preparing for fundamental changes in the economy and in ensuring the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. That is what makes it so interesting to take a close look at the Portuguese working people's commissions, which are a potent instrument of workers' control created by the April revolution.

Let us consider what these commissions are, how they work, and what they serve.

The revolution wrought far-reaching changes in industry. Order free from the power of the monopolies was established. Key industries were nationalized and it was stipulated that private enterprise would no longer be tolerated in these industries. Following all the

changes four basic structures, according to the Portuguese communists, formed the foundation of the country's economic potential. These are the non-capitalist structure (chiefly the nationalized factories and also the cooperatives in the agrarian-reform zone); the capitalist structure (factories run by foreign and Portuguese entrepreneurs); and the mixed and small-commodity (crafts) structures. The working people's commissions operate in the vast area of three key structures (excluding the last). To put it more simply: there are commissions everywhere — at state and private enterprises in industry, agriculture, transport, and so on. They all enjoy the same formal juridical status but in fact there are distinctions between them. We shall see this later.

The Covina glass works is in the small town of Santa Iria de Azoia in the large Lisbon industrial belt, and a plaque tells us that the shares were nationalized on July 10, 1975, 'with the exception of shares belonging to foreign holders' (these, as we later learned, amounted to 20 per cent of the total). The factory employs 1,200 people.

In the office of the working people's commission there is a library of codes of law, shelves with piles of current bookkeeping accounts, and on one of the walls a diagram of the commission's make-up, roughly as follows: financial control; liaison with other factories; group for lower unitary organizations; accounts; sales; mass support group; control of work of technical specialists; study of the social climate, and so forth.

We were welcomed by Carlos Mendes, member of the commission's executive secretariat, and two commission members in workers' overalls — glass engraver Manuel Antones and loader Francisco Marques.

The present commission, they told us, was elected, as usual, by the factory workers for a term of one year. It consists of 24 people: five office employees and 19 workers. The executive secretariat consists of five persons, who are released from work in production but continue receiving their former wage. No chairman is elected; simply one person is responsible for meetings, another for the documents, still another for contacts with the management. But, as a whole, the work is done collegially. The executive secretariat works every day, and a plenary meeting of the commission is convened once in eight days.

"We discuss practically everything,' Carlos Mendes said. 'We are abreast of all that goes on at the factory. The commission controls the management at all levels and in all links. If, for example, a member of the management or a technical specialist acts in a manner puzzling the collective, we call that person in to explain his actions.'

Things are picking up at the factory. In the period from 1976 to 1978 its output increased by 20 per cent and revenues grew considerably.

Wages have doubled on the average, pensions have been raised to 1,000 escudos, and there is now a fairly large social security fund. The spacious cottages that had been a luxury retreat of the factory élite before the revolution, have turned into a kindergarten; the fee is small and all the children needing it have been accommodated. In the workshops the overalls, the milk counters, the first-aid kits, and the medical personnel had likewise been non-existent before the revolution. They have been won by the working people thanks to the commission.

However, the day-to-day life at the factory is far from idyllic. A reminder of this is an inscription painted on a shop wall: 'Comrades, be alert and vigilant because we still have reactionaries and fascists at the factory. Cooperate with all the progressive parties and expose these traitors of the working class.'

There is a surfeit of conflicts also in the relations with ministerial circles and government agencies.

'The authorities,' Carlos Mendes said, 'are making ever larger concessions to the rightist element. The state sector is under constant attack, some factories have been denationalized, and underhand moves are being made. For instance, instead of enlarging and modernizing the Covina factory it is suggested building new factories in parallel. Of course, with their up-to-date equipment the latter would threaten us with intense competition if not with ruin.'

Let us take a quick look at the private sector, specifically at Portugal's oldest publishing house, Bertrand, which is a joint-stock company with a capital of 100 million escudos belonging to anonymous share-holders.

At the publishing house we were received courteously by the commercial director, Fausto Amaro. Formerly, he told us, the publishing house did not differ from the usual capitalist enterprises. Following the April revolution there arose the question of how to continue operations. On this count there were four possibilities, which the commercial director described literally as follows:

'The first was to continue the traditional class struggle along the principle of "who beats whom;" the second — coexistence between labor and capital with employee participation (limited, of course) in management; the third — transfer of all business to employee self-management; and the fourth — a quest for the best possible relations through cooperation between the management and the working people's commission."

The fourth variant was adopted.

The commercial director left out his personal views. He simply informed us that the owners of the firm regard this course as a 'new

philosophy,' as 'socialistic,' although, he added, 'the workers' may possibly have different ideas and views about this.'

The management, he said, valued workers' control, particularly in 'regulating general policy.' 'The publishing house could have had revenue also from pornography, but then the workers would have corrected us.' However, he made no secret of pretensions either. For instance, the working people's commission was recommending making the gap between higher and lower wages no more than fourfold, but that was a utopia. If they increased workers' wages they would be ruined, and if they reduced salaries for the élite they would frighten away specialists.

We sat around a table with members of the commission Antonio Jose Pina Pegudes, Manuel Vieira, Guione de Peiva Monteiro, Candida Helena Mariana Mendet, Antonio Candido Robalo Madeira, Maria Azevedo, Rogerio Carvalho, and Elisa Mendes Simao. They spoke of what had been accomplished and what still remained to be done. Indeed, they had raised the question of narrowing the wages gap. So far nothing had been decided, but the commission was not removing the question from its agenda. The very day that we had our talk the commission had had its weekly meeting with the management and discussed a new commercial structure for the firm: here, too, they had not agreed on everything and had given the management their recommendations in order to discuss the issue later. The main thing was that they were still unable to exercise any marked influence on the output of books and on their contents. When the commission advises the management to print more books serving the true interests of the Portuguese revolution it gets the stereotype reply that this is more a matter for the sales experts, who knew the market demand better, and so on.

'Demand generates supply' — the commercial director of Bertrand did not forget to mention this old cliché in his talk with us. But he did not mention a similarly winged phrase, namely, that supply generates demand, although supply is also in the hands of experts.

But let us return to the working people's commissions.

What, generally speaking, is their place in the context of revolutionary changes? What, in the view of the communists, is their impact on the process of transition from capitalism to socialism? Who is right: those who maintain that this is the power of the working class in production required for socialism, or those who regard the commissions as a variety of 'participation' in management?

The Portuguese communists reply that the working people's commissions are neither the power nor the magical means that can 'produce socialism' simply, of itself, without the takeover of state power by the working class. As yet, this has never happened anywhere.

Therefore, the commissions are variety of 'participation?' No, again.

Although it is short (and perhaps for that very reason), the experience of the working people's commissions is manifold, diversified, and even variegated. One can even find commissions that let themselves be run by factory owners, but these are few and far between and do not make the climate.

The situation is different.

First, Portuguese business has never been a proponent, much less the initiator, of any plans for 'participation.' The working people's commission at the Covina factory, for example, traces its genealogy from the pre-revolutionary commission of unity, but the latter — that's the whole point — was an illegal, underground body. When and how had the present commissions emerged? In the period when orders were cancelled and capital was hastily transmitted abroad, and production was sliding into collapse and chaos, the workers themselves undertook to save it. They occupied abandoned factories, set up workers' control, and formed their own commissions to manage them. These commissions thus took shape as spokesmen of the common, class interests of the working people.

True, the provision on workers' control and on working people's commissions was later recorded in the country's Constitution. But this by no means turns it into a gift 'from above.' It must be regarded as an unparalleled democratic achievement. It is, therefore, not accidental that in Portugal the new legislation is received with unchanging hostility by private capital and the rightist forces. At the time of our visit the government attempted to compel the parliament to pass a resolution proclaiming the provision on working people's commissions as unconstitutional. 'This was a serious test,' relates alternate member of the PCP Central Committee Carlos Carvalhas, a communist with the longest record in government (he was a member of five cabinets) and a member of parliament. 'All our deputies turned out. The voting took place at nine in the evening. The draft was defeated.'

However, its inspirers have not downed arms. Portuguese capital refuses to get along with a partner like the working people's commissions.

Second, however varied they may be the bourgeois systems of 'participation' are full of traps. Efforts are still made to conceal the most ticklish pages of a firm's accounts from the people. Workers remain in the minority on the managerial boards to which they are admitted: they are denied recognition as the authorized and accountable representative of the work force: they are made to promise to keep silent about the secrets to which they become privy.

In different countries the communists determine their attitude to 'participation' independently, in a manner they feel is most expedient. In some cases they reject it, in others they accept it in keeping with clear-cut class aims. In the FRG, for example, the communists, together with the working people, uphold the slogan of 'glass pockets.' In other words, they demand free access to the most secret economic documents. Take, again, the Covina factory. For the commission the bookkeeping is indeed transparent and by no means because — forgive the pun — they make glass.

In Portugal the working people's commissions talk to the management as equals and not on the principle of who has more votes at the conference table. Managerial decisions must be cleared with the commission. It has access to any document and is not obliged to keep the information obtained by it secret. On the contrary, we saw the bulletins and special communiqués regularly circulated by the commissions. They convene meetings, to which they are accountable and by which they are changed. The commissions are workers' control organs, but the entire work force participates in this control.

In present-day Portugal the working people's commissions are not agencies of a 'class peace,' but an instrument of the class struggle, a vehicle uniting the revolutionary actions of the working people. The PCP attaches enormous importance to them, maintains close contact with them, gives them every assistance, and fosters their development. In Amadora, where Bertrand is located, there are 80 enterprises employing more than 50 people each. There are working people's commissions at all the large enterprises, and these have their common organ, the Council of Working People of Amadora. In turn, both in Amadora and Santa Iria de Azoia, where the Covina factory is situated, and in other localities of the central agglomeration they have set up the Council of Working People of the Lisbon Industrial Belt. In it there are 245 commissions representing more than 200,000 people.

You will agree that much of this dovetails with what was said earlier about the cooperatives: the profundity of the new democratic institutions, the great charge of revolutionary militancy, the fury of reaction, and the potentials of the emergent structures and realities. They are new. They have not sunk deep roots. And they are still threatened by bourgeois 'assimilation.' But they embody life and staunchness, and the future therefore depends entirely upon the course and outcome of the class struggle in a broad political dimension. In the event bourgeois statehood is consolidated it will signify, of course, the disappointment of the hopes for significant results. The consolidation of political power of the working people could give many vital achievements a genuinely socialist context.

III

From Documents of the PCP

'There is no political or social force in Portugal that can alone defend freedom against reaction and ensure the building of a new, democratic Portugal.

'A division among the democratic forces of the people can only benefit reaction. The PCP continues to press for political unity among all the forces that want a democratic Portugal advancing along the road of socialism.'[6]

The PCP has nearly 150,000 members, and there are 30,000 members in the Young Communist League. The party's most recent membership drive has made it the fourth largest contingent of communists in Western Europe, after Italy, France, and Spain, and the second relative to the size of the population.

In the southern region of the agrarian reform we saw for ourselves the Communist Party's predominant influence among the masses. The central industrial region is, we found, justifiably called the Lisbon Red Belt: between 70 and 90 per cent of the people working at some of the largest factories are members of the PCP. Now we were en route to the north, to Coimbra, a town that is by no means red, a town where the political forces are locked in an intricate struggle. Such is reality. And to avoid mistaken general impressions it must be viewed as a whole.

Coimbra forms a picturesque amphitheatre rising steeply uphill from the bank of the Mondego with one of its most noteworthy sights, the ancient university, overlooking it. This is a famous town: Coimbra's insignia is in the nation's coat-of-arms among five principal cities.

We looked for the party center. The first person we approached in the street shrugged his shoulders, but the second pointed it out although there was no sign at the entrance. From the street you pass through a news-vendor's and then up a narrow staircase.

For the Portuguese communists the party centers are their second home. They are full of people at any time of the day or night, even after midnight (we saw this for oursevles). There is a constant stream of people, some coming for a conference, others to discuss a problem, have a quick snack, simply take the weight off their feet, meet with comrades, or learn the latest news. One can feel the spirit of warm comradeship, an atmosphere of tremendous activity, and also an electric tension showing that people are constantly on the alert against any eventuality. The period when party centers, particularly in the north, were shamelessly raided and the communists defended them, rising and sacrificing their lives, has passed. Today even those who

are spoiling for a fight can see that the party has grown stronger and do not frequently venture to ask for trouble. But fascism has not been entirely uprooted, and the communists and all other democrats demand unremitting vigilance.

However, this does not spell out a secluded life. The party centers are, among other things, also open political and cultural clubs. In the Coimbra center we found a raffle sale of literature, and children go there along with adults, licking ice-cream cones and gazing at the exhibit of children's handicrafts arranged by the communists.

On the Portuguese political scene today the PCP is unquestionably the most highly organized party. One gets this impression from many signs. Passing through the small town of Somora Correia one sees the boarded up headquarters of the Socialist Party's local branch. We wanted to know the reason and learned that the local was dissolved because of differences with the central leadership. At the cooperatives and factories we of course met people of different party affiliation, but when we asked how they were organized we often heard in reply that only the communists had a real organization, that only they had cells.

In the structure of the PCP there are eight large provincial organizations, which in turn are divided into districts, councils, and freguesiahs. In Coimbra we were guests of the party organization of a council (which embraced 32 freguesiahs). Members of the council's leadership — Manuela Vernardino, Alfredo Prado, Jose Moto, Cristina Figuerinhas, and Jose Casao — related that prior to the revolution the local party organization was small and beset with difficulties. The local working-class contingent was new and numerically weak. There was anti-fascist feeling in it but little experience of revolutionary struggle. But during the past few years the party organization had grown in number and strength: as a result of the recent drive for members, the number of communists in Coimbra grew by 20 per cent; today there are party cells at practically all the factories and among students, white-collar workers, and intellectuals.

What sort of people join the party? How are new members admitted? And have there been cases of people dropping out of the party?

During the past few months, we were told, there has been a particularly marked growth of the number of people desiring to join the party. It could admit more people, but this had to be done selectively. It sizes up people and admits the best among them. It is not in favor of people simply signing their names and then never showing up again. New members are involved in the current work of the various cells: this work is a school of party education and a further test by deed. Of course, there are losses as well. This is unavoidable. The party is showing a steady, dynamic growth, but some unwanted people

nevertheless enter its ranks. They are spotted quickly. The PCP is a party with a clear-cut stance, a party of action. And a person joining it must choose between accepting the laws of its life or leaving. As a matter of fact, there are very few cases of people quitting.

'As a Marxist-Leninist party,' said Jose Casao, 'the PCP firmly abides by democratic centralism with its free discussions and mandatory decisions. This is a tested law of party building and it retains its significance to this day.'

The Portuguese communists faithfully abide by the norms of party democracy. 'We do not issue orders to the cells,' said Jose Casao. 'Instead, we look for ways and means that would organically serve the implementation of the party's policy. If some aspects of this policy are not understood, we spare neither time nor effort to explain them. At meetings there is usually a free and broad exchange of views and the atmosphere is one of sincere well-wishing, so that most of the decisions are passed, in effect, unanimously.'

Under these conditions discipline is thus not the antipode but a derivative of democracy.

What are the party organization's concerns today? What developments hold the attention of the townsfolk?

It would be hard to list everything.

... After April the Mondorel textile mill was abandoned by its owner, who cleared out of the town. The workers took over the management. The owner has now returned and fired 38 people; besides, people are now in danger of losing their homes. At the UNACEL transport enterprise 17 people have lost their jobs. Over and above the fact that this was an infringement of constitutional rights, none of them received even severance pay as provided for in the collective agreement. And this despite the fact that half the firm's capital belongs to the state! The communists have fought and will continue fighting injustices of this sort to the very end. They go to the trade unions and the working people's commissions, mobilize public opinion in support of victims, enlist legal assistance for workers, and appeal to the Ministry of Labor.

... A new consultative body, the municipal council, is to be set up at the municipal assembly. The preparations are being completed. Under the regulations the new body is to consist of representatives of various organizations — the patronage, the working people, and so forth. The communists are bending every effort to have the democratic organizations of the working people properly represented in the new organ. Talks are being conducted with deputies to the assembly, and the communists are cooperating actively in the Frente Eleitoral Povo Unido with the lower unitary commissions, where candidates are nominated.

... Then take the developments at Coimbra University. Reactionary lecturers and the rector himself were swept out by the revolution, However, last spring the certifying commission sanctioned the rector's reinstatement. Such is the official policy relative to institutions of higher learning. There was a storm of protest at the university. The communists gave these protests every support and helped to organize a rebuff to reaction.

... The entire town is talking and arguing about the projected national health service. This service is envisaged in the Constitution but it is being obstructed in every possible way. In Coimbra, however, the project was drawn up and it is now discussed. The rightist elements are determined to quash it, for the idea of free medical services for the people runs against their grain. On the whole, the communists support the project. At the same time, they have their own critical observations about the content, insist on a further elaboration of the project, and offer recommendations.

All this is part and parcel of their day-to-day work. 'We are fully aware that the situation is complicated. Here in Coimbra reaction is still far from having been broken. The leftist groups are sowing discord. Nevertheless, the communist party is now an effective counterweight to these forces.'

The impressions we gained in Coimbra served us as a striking illustration for the talk we had in the PCP Central Committee, where member of the CC's Political Commission Sergio Vilarigues gave us a broad picture of the party's activities.

'We consider that our principal task,' he said, 'is to defend the gains of the Portuguese revolution and champion the interests of all working people regardless of party affiliation. Our slogan calls for the defense of revolutionary positions through unity, through a broad alliance of all the democratic forces. The PCP is numerically the largest political party in the country, but we do not think for a moment of acting alone.'

Nothing is further from the truth than the assertions that the Communist Party is coming a cropper, that it is finding itself in isolation. On the contrary, it consistently urges the broadest and most diverse links with all the forces capable of benefiting the country.

'The party leadership,' Vilarigues noted, 'maintains the necessary contacts with the nation's president, the prime minister, and members of the cabinet. We criticize the government and its agencies when they back away from constitutional requirements or act against the interests of the working people. However, we are not an anti-government party. We are always prepared for a dialogue and to support progressive actions. The party is working vigorously among the masses. It may be said with confidence that in Portgual today

there is not a single mass organization or movement with which the communists are not in contact. The party is with the masses.'

Civic life is full-blooded in Portugal. The public movement has innumerable organizational forms. The social forces are in continuous flux, stratifying, and welding together, and the edges of some parties are breaking off, giving life to new independent organizations. Local movements are emerging. In Oporto, for instance, there is a new women's movement against the high cost of living. Then there is the pensioners' movement, and young people have started a movement against unemployment. Is this the antithesis of organization?

The Portuguese communists do not think so.

Their conclusion is entirely different. They feel that this is an indication of the nationwide scale of the revolutionary movement. It is attracting people, groups, and categories of the population whose class consciousness has not matured to one and the same extent, has not been levelled up by the experience of struggle, but has been awakened and demands action in forms being mastered today in order to master new and higher forms tomorrow. For that reason the communists cannot stand aloof from the people's actions no matter what shape they take. 'The party is with the masses.'

This is seen strikingly, say, in the trade union movement. Its strength and organization in Portugal is well known. Of the 3,500,000 gainfully employed people 1,700.000 belong to the Intersindical. The National Congress of Trade Unions held in January 1977 was attended also by organizations that are formally not members of Intersindical. They participated with the right to vote. 'The reactionaries,' Vilarigues said, 'shout that the communists have "seized" the trade unions. We reply: Is confidence in a party to be condemned? Do not others make an effort to win the support of the trade unions? But they are not doing so well because the trade unions believe in and know the communist workers. After all, we began working together long before the revolution, under fascist rule.'

The prestige enjoyed by the party is seen also in the work of such lower unitary organizations as the working people's commissions. We have already written a lot about them. Therefore, in conclusion it would be of interest to glance at the work of the communists on quite a different plane, at the highest level. In parliament.

The PCP parliamentary group consists of 40 persons, which is over 15 per cent of the membership of the Republic's Assembly. The mandates of the socialist and communist deputies could together have given the nation's democratic forces a firm majority in parliament. But this is not being achieved: the socialists prefer to align themselves 'on the right flank' and this spells out government instability, betrayal of the gains of the revolution, a threat of the restoration of capitalist

forces, and a further onslaught by reaction. In parliament the communists have to make every effort to counter these dangerous processes.

'We have a sufficient number of seats,' says Carlos Brito, member of the Political Commission of the PCP Central Committee and head of the communist parliamentary group, 'to form our own parliamentary faction. This is important particularly because the chairmen of factions comprise an organ of their own, the conference of parliamentary groups that is vested with important powers.'

They are indeed important. Whereas in some West European states the agenda of parliament is endorsed by the government, in Portugal this is the prerogative of the conference of parliamentary groups, in which the communists are also represented. There is something else that must be taken into account. Unlike the constitutions of many other capitalist states, the Portuguese Constitution gives the opposition parties an interesting advantage over the governing party. The latter may submit not more than four points to parliament, while the opposition can submit six. The communists thus have an important vehicle for forming the agenda of the Assembly of the Republic.

The communists are represented also in the parliament presidium, in which each of the four parliamentary factions has a deputy chairman. Moreover, the communists are active in all the 11 standing commissions of parliament. To illustrate let us take the law-making process. In the course of two parliamentary sessions the Communist Party submitted 25 bills. Four of them were passed at the last session: on communal land, on the banning of pro-fascist organizations, on the eradication of illitaracy, and on limiting contracts for the import of foreign technology. Each of these examples has an eventful and long history, which is evidence of the art of conducting a parliamentary struggle, perseverance, and consistency.

'There is not a single law passed by parliament,' Carlos Brito said, 'that has not been influenced by our parliamentary group. Even in the case of the worst bills we do our best to neutralize their negative aspects, set the needed class orientation, and uphold the interests of the people. We always strive to use parliament as a rostrum for proposing the communist alternative policy, for putting across our ideas, our policy, our vision of Portugal's future.'

The PCP's program of democratic and patriotic policy is stated lucidly in the party's 10-point platform. It calls upon everybody to defend 'democracy, national independence, the gains of the revolution, the agrarian reform, nationalization, and workers' control.' The communists press for this program's acceptance, speaking openly from the rostrum of parliament and at demonstrations, rallies, and meetings. They explain and bring home their points, polemicizing with

their opponents and winning new supporters. We know the atmosphere at such mass meetings; we were present at one of them, in the town of Alhos Vedros. It was the end of the week, late on Friday. However, the movie theatre with a seating capacity of 150 was almost entirely filled. After the speaker had finished his speech he was kept answering questions for about two hours. The questions stopped only somewhere by 1 a.m. Although, I repeat, nobody asked the people their party affiliation, and although the notice at the entrance said that anybody who liked could attend, a sea of clenched fists rose in the hall, signifying solidarity, 'Here we see the strength of unity. Here we see the strength of the PCP.'

Indeed, this strength can be seen by everybody because the communists are in the forefront of the struggle for the happiness of the country and the people.

1. *Eighth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party,* Moscow, 1977, p. 228.
2. A. Cunhal. *Portugal: Revolution on the March. Speeches and Articles 1975,* Vol. II, Moscow 1978, p. 15.
3. An archaic taxation system inherited from the monarchy, when the king empowered one of his subjects to collect taxes in a given district, — *Ed.*
4. A. Cunhal. *Chronicle of Struggle.* Moscow, 1977, p. 350.
5. *Eighth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party,* p. 169.
6. A. Cunhal, *Portugal: Revolution on the March,* Vol. II, 1978, p. 91.

A SCIENCE IN ITS YOUTH

A. Anikin. Cloth $6.55 388 pages

The history of economic theory: the ancients, medieval thinkers, Hume, Quesnay, Smith, Ricardo, Sismondi, Fourier, Owen among others. Each theory is situated in its historical-political background, giving the link between the old and modern trends and the background to the development of Marxist economic thinking.

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6

exchange of views

The party and the intelligentsia

WMR round table

This was the subject of a *WMR* round table conference of the following party officials from Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland: *Lubomir Pavlov*, Head of Culture and Arts Department, CC BCP; *Nikola Stefanov*, Head of Science and Education Department, CC BCP; *Mihaly Kornidesz*, Head of Culture and Science Department, CC HSWP; *Bogdan Gawronski*, Head of Culture Department, CC PUWP; *Halina Krysanka*, Sector Head of Science and Education Department, CC PUWP.

It was decided to discuss the following questions:

— party work among intellectuals in this period of building developed socialism;

— content, principles and forms of this work;

— party leadership and the problem of freedom of scientific and artistic creation.

A record of the discussions is given on this and the following pages.

1

Gawronski. Work among the intelligentsia holds an essential place at all development stages of socialist society, and at every stage there is a central problem that determines the character of this work.

In the early period of People's Poland, when the new social and economic structure and the institutions of new power were just being formed, the important thing was to win over the small stratum of old intellectuals; the men and women who had gone through all the hardships of the war and occupation. It was not a homogeneous group, politically or ideologically: by tradition and sentiment it was closely tied to the propertied classes and the bourgeois political groupings. It was therefore necessary thoroughly to analyze the political position of the various intellectual groups, to establish from a class and Marxist standpoint their social attitudes and subjective conceptions. Only then could we form a clear picture of their attitude to social phenomena and events, establish the possibility of over-

coming old habits and prejudices and win the intelligentsia over for the building of the new society and carrying out socialism's program in ideology and art culture. Parallel with this, the party concentrated on forming a new intelligentsia closely associated with the revolutionary movement, both by its origins and experience and in its system of values, world outlook and ideology.

In all this the party was guided by the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the role of the intelligentsia in bourgeois society and by its role in building socialism in the Soviet Union, but always taking into account specific Polish conditions. However, that is now a matter of history. Since then there have been deep-going structural changes that have given Poland a new image, converting her into an industrial-agrarian country and changing the place and role of the intelligentsia in every aspect of national life.

Polish sociologists have analyzed all the profound changes, structural and philosophical, that have taken place among the intelligentsia, and consider it necessary to give a more accurate and fuller definition of it as a stratum in present-day socialist society. An analysis has shown that while influencing the formation of the nation's intellectual culture, the intelligentsia is itself the product of socialist change. It is to an ever greater degree becoming a contingent of different professional categories and groups engaged in cultural creativity, organization of the work process, etc. In short, work requiring theoretical knowledge, mental labor, in the juridical meaning of that term. But measured by other criteria it is not far removed from manual labor (that, to cite one example, is how Prof. Jan Szczepanski treats the question). At the same time, the growth of the people's cultural standards and the greater role of science in the life of modern society tend to enhance the role of the intelligentsia. Hence, party work among the intelligentsia acquires increasing importance and the nature of this work differs from the past. In what way?

Effective use of the country's intellectual potential and complete integration of the intelligentsia with the basic classes of society becomes a priority task in the period of building developed socialist society. This is emphasized in the documents of the Sixth and Seventh PUWP congresses. The creative thought and labor of the intelligentsia, merged with the PUWP Program and policy, are essential to the building of developed socialist society.

Kornidesz. We agree that in this day and age of the scientific and technological revolution and the more organized and complex nature of social life and social processes, and with the rapid development of the educational and health services, the numerical strength, influence, and prestige of all intellectual groups increase with amazing rapidity.

In fact, most intellectual pursuits are, so to speak, becoming 'mass professions.'

In our country the intellectual community has grown tremendously over the past 30 years. There are six times more intellectuals and their professional structure has radically changed too. The legal profession no longer dominates, while the number and role of technical and agrarian specialists, economists and teachers have grown markedly. The people's democratic revolution and socialist transformations put an end to the isolation of the intelligentsia, its caste spirit. The intellectual professions are now open to all. In fact, two-thirds of our intellectuals are of working-class or peasant origin; every second non-manual specialist lives in a family that includes workers or peasants.

We attach especial importance to the fact that the intelligentsia, along with the basic classes of socialist society, has a vital interest in our economic, social and cultural aims, in the building of socialism and development of the personality. And this identity of interests determines the party's policy vis-à-vis the intellectual and also the latter's feeling of responsibility for the problems of society. As an organic part of the people, our intelligentsia is more closely identifying itself with the working class in its aims and plans. This is a positive tendency, but its development requires continued effort on our part.

The changes in the social structure and social position of the intellectual has changed his world outlook. It was not an easy process. It required implementation of the principles of Marxism-Leninism in the day-to-day practice of the HSWP, its open, sincere approach to our problems and concerns and a consistent and constantly developing policy toward its allies, to win the overwhelming majority of the intelligentsia to our social system, our democratic state, our party.

Today our aim is to apply on a wider scale and more actively the intelligentsia's understanding of its social role and the potential of its social activity in the interests of socialist society.

Stefanov. At present, about 60,000 men and women are engaged in various spheres of scientific research, and of these 19,000 are trained scientists. Is this much or little? For Bulgaria, in the past one of Europe's most backward countries, this is a tremendous achievement. Over the past 15 years the number of scientific cadres has doubled. In a short space of time we have founded such modern industries as electronics, machine-building, chemicals, energetics, etc. And we are now building on that basis by using the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution. We are making wider use of electronics, chemicals, laser techniques, etc., in all branches of the economy. The training of scientiists and technicians has therefore become a problem

of vital importance, and we are successfully coping with it. Our experience also shows that the more mature socialist society, the more tangible becomes the importance of the social sciences in consolidating the foundations of socialism. In this context the party is devoting much attention to the social sciences, having assigned some 4,000 specialists to work in this field.

We can therefore, I think, single out the following directions in party work. First, continued development of our scientific and technical cadres. Second, maintaining a harmonious and balanced structure of the intelligentsia without underestimating one or another of its contingents. In our view these tasks should be tackled with an eye to socialist integration, that is, within the framework of the entire socialist community. Third, improving the principles of planned approach in the training of our scientific and technical intelligentsia with due account to immediate and long-range interests.

Lastly, I would like to note that at this stage of building developed socialist society, we are witnessing the coming together of the working class and intelligentsia. This is expressive of the gradual erasure of essential distinctions between physical and mental labor. And this is proceeding along several lines: economic, general and social conditions, cultural-ideological and socio-psychological. The process, assisted in every way by the party, is based on the historic aims of the working class as the leading class of socialist society.

Pavlov. It is important, I believe, to examine certain problems of the creative intelligentsia. The flourishing of intellectual culture in a developed socialist society is, in my view, becoming an objective necessity, a requirement of social development, and at the same time the intellectual sphere is more and more definitely becoming an active factor of this development. Our party highly appreciates the ideological and educational role of literature and art, their inestimable contribution to the formation of the socialist personality. And this determines the role and responsibility of the artistic intelligentsia in building socialism. You will probably agree that the further society advances along this path, the more people are drawn into the world of art and the more the creative element is developed in each individual, the more exacting become demands and criteria in all spheres of culture. Our experience has taught us that satisfaction of the constantly rising interests and cultural requirements of the working people shape their aesthetic tastes and create an audience demanding changes not only in quantity but also in quality in this sphere of activity.

Under socialism, the aesthetic education of all the people is not a utopia, but a direct historical task, an inalienable element of the

party's overall ideological and educational work. Although this is a difficult task the outlook is inspiring and promising.

We know from our own experience the immense artistic, aesthetic and ideological influence a talented author, a talented work can have on the development and personality-formation of the individual. Practice has shown, however, that changes in the cultural area are much slower and much more tortuous than, say, in economics. For traditional forms of consciousness and social behavior linger on much longer and often make themselves felt in one or another form. More, we know of attempts by our ideological opponents to influence intellectuals in the socialist countries, instill the idea that their interests and aims run counter to those of our society, and thus turn the intellectuals into an opposition force. Hence, the vast importance of cultivating the consciousness of the creative intelligentsia. Hence, also, the special attention we pay to the conditions in which consciousness is formed, and to the problems of ideological education. Hence, lastly, the need for a high degree of effectiveness in all our work with the intelligentsia; effectiveness expressed, above all, in the full manifestation of the intellectual's creative potentialities.

Question to Bulgarian comrades. In view of the growing social role of the technical and other intellectuals, how do you regard the problem of 'technocratism' or the 'danger of technocratism' in socialist society?

Stefanov. Let me try to answer by citing our experience in Bulgaria.

First of all, let me say that the conception is entirely wrong that the technical intelligentsia and not the working class is destined to become the leading force of society. Naturally, intellectuals hold an important place in the management of all production and social processes (from factory to top government, economic, cultural and other levels). But this is not a technocratic stratum, not some kind of élite divorced from the people. It does not stand above the working class, but serves it and the people, helping to attain the fundamental historical aims of the working class, i.e., the building of the new society — socialism and communism.

Is there a danger of technocratism? By its very nature socialism is the antithesis of technocratism. But individual manifestations are possible. For instance, when a decision made by some authority clashes with the requirements of technical progress, the reaction of technical intellectuals could take the form of technocratism. This can also happen when a decision takes into account only the requirements of technical progress, to the detriment of social, ideological and other aspects. Lastly, manifestations of technocratism are possible where the political approach to the intelligentsia is incorrect, there is no

Marxist-Leninist ideological training, and the leading role of party bodies is disparaged. Our party is doing everything to avoid such a situation.

Kornidesz. I would like to say a few words on the technocratic problem. Our attitude is perfectly clear: the accepted leader of society is not the technocrat. Technocratic ideology in capitalist society could not conceal its basic contradiction, namely, the antagonism between the wage-worker and the capitalist. Nor could it compel society to believe that it is run not by the bourgeoisie, but by a thin layer of specialists. More and more technical intellectuals in our socialist society are appointed to leading positions, but this does not imply that they are becoming the leading force of society to the detriment of the working class (Comrade Stefanov has referred to this). I want to draw attention to another aspect of the problem: the number of persons with a higher education among executives in Hungary is still small (less than 50 per cent), and only one in three technical specialists has a university diploma. We are working to raise the standard of management, but this requires appointing more competent specialists to managerial posts.

We use the term 'technocrat' sometimes to characterize specialists with a narrow outlook, people who concentrate on their narrow professional interest. What we want is to reduce the number of such people and increase the number of specialists who appreciate the values of culture and have an active part in their dissemination.

2

Halina Krysanka. The substance of party, political leadership of the intelligentsia consists, in my view, on the one hand, in providing ample scope for creativity, providing the social conditions for optimal realization of one's creative potential and, on the other, helping to develop a feeling of responsibility to the people, the working people, a feeling of service to the people and, in this way, make intellectual activity a part of socialist construction.

It is fitting and proper, I think, to note that this Leninist stand, this socialist attitude, make for a creative and flexible approach to our work with the intelligentsia and for effective solutions of its problems. If today in Poland we have a scientific intelligentsia of which we are proud, we owe that to the party's creative approach in providing proper conditions for the work of scientists, in promoting and encouraging their initiative, respecting their individuality and following a consistent Marxist-Leninist policy without in any way departing from the principles of socialism.

Our party used two methods to bring into socialist construction scientists, the creative and technical intelligentsia: (1) giving it a

share in carrying out the rehabilitation program, the social and cultural revolution, socialist industrialization and, last but not least, solution of the problems involved in combining the technological revolution with socialism; (2) opening to the young workers and peasants, and through a system of correspondence courses and evening classes, also to politically active members of the working class, broad access to higher education and scientific work.

A question now being discussed in world literature and at scientific congresses is the possibility (and necessity) of directing the work of scientists and specialists in widely different fields. And this question, in my view, is ripe for practical solution. For one thing, scientific research involves, as a rule, considerable material expenditure, while the investment policy of any society, capitalist or socialist, determines the basic lines of research. In a socialist society the direction of scientific research in all its forms is governed by a plan and is geared to democratically defined overall social aims.

In recent years, in pursuance of the decisions of the Sixth and Seventh PUWP congresses, we have expanded our research potential and more than doubled expenditure in 1979-75 to 2.5 per cent of the national income, and by 1980 it will reach 3 per cent.

We found it necessary to encourage comprehensive research programs and organize strong inter-departmental and inter-industrial research teams. Scientists, political workers, government and economic executives have devised special programs for coal, copper, water, proteins, housing electronics and, in the social sciences, progress of national culture and its assimilation, social and production restructuring of rural communities and agriculture generally, formation of the consumption model and demographic prognostication. The Second National Scientific Congress endorsed these programs and work is now under way on another two. More, our scientists are working on 67 major and about 500 smaller (industry branch level) problems embracing not only key questions of technical progress, but also basic research that will have long-range implications. The problems chosen are the result of careful analysis and of recommendations by scientific collectives.

In addition to working out special-purpose programs, the party and the government are stimulating the work of research collectives on individual assignments. Thus, in January 1971 a committee on education was appointed and its report was made the basis for the reform program now being carried out.

In 1973 the Ministry of Culture and Art began work on a projection of cultural development up to 1990, following this up with a more detailed program for 1975-90, which was discussed by the Political Bureau of the party's Central Committee. Many scientists,

artists, writers and personalities from other branches of culture had a part in drawing up the Projection and Program.

This integrated approach to research and development has won general acceptance and there has been an actual and not merely formal integration of research collectives, though this involved overcoming resistance from departments or other organizations clinging to their particular interests and privileges. This has proved one of the strong aspects of our system. There are also weak points chiefly in combining basic research with practical aims. We shall have to put more effort into this aspect.

Considering the special role of creative cadres in the social sciences, we have established party groups in all the social and humanitarian departments of the Polish Academy of Sciences. And though there are no similar permanent party groups in the other departments, PUWP members when necessary meet to consult before taking important party or government decision pertaining to their particular branch of science. But the party group in the Academy Presidium operates on a permanent basis. The CC Science and Education Department likewise conducts systematic work with cadres in the social sciences (and not only with party members). This takes the form of annual seminars for directors of institutions of higher learning and research centers, also improvement courses for young specialists and for newcomers to the teaching of ideological disciplines.

We attach great importance to party work in the universities, the significance of which can hardly be overestimated. These higher educational units are doing much to shape the future ideological makeup of our intellectuals, tomorrow's executives; they are influential centers moulding culture and public opinion. Naturally, they have become a target of subversion by our class enemies, of attempts to engineer internal differentiation. The only effective reply to this attack is a political counter-offensive. University party branches are now an active political force. They are concentrating on creating conditions for the constructive work of scientific cadres and students, on ideological education of the new generation of socialist intellectuals, and on research closely linked with Poland's present requirements and future.

This does not mean, however, that there is a sort of 'regimentation' that tends to hold back the initiative of our scientific workers. All of the party's and the government's key decisions on education and university training are adopted only after consultation with a broad cross-section of the scientific and teaching community. The forum for such consultations are the Presidium and plenary meetings of the Academy of Sciences, its research committees, conferences of university rectors and party secretaries, and mettings of rectors' col-

legiums. In fact, the collegial organizations, such as the university senate, departmental councils, scientific and academic councils, are responsible for the promotion of research personnel. The conferring of scientific degrees, the planning of scientific research and control over it, university and public lectures are all supervised by the scientists themselves. The volunteer-based movement for science with its 160 general, specialized and regional branches has a total membership of 480,000.

Stefanov. The principles of voluntary work are being increasingly applied. In Bulgaria we have scientific-technical unions set up on the pattern of voluntary creative organizations with branches at industrial enterprises. They encourage creative thought by scientific workers divided into more than 30 sub-divisions on a professional basis. They publish and popularize scientific information, help to resolve social and other problems, etc. Representatives of these unions help in the work of state bodies and in guiding scientific and technical progress.

Kornidesz. I agree that in present-day society proper organization and direction produce the greatest effect in the creative work of the intelligentsia. But let me add that the choice of scientific research can only be made on the basis of scientific data, i.e., with due account of the work of scientists and in close contact with them. Social selection in the interests of definite classes must be fused with scientific selection, for the two are closely intertwined.

In judging and deciding key questions that influence the course of social development, the party relies on the views of leading specialists. For instance, we enlist prominent scientists and specialists to help analyze problems and draft political decisions. To cite one example: we have made it a practice to submit to social scientists major problems requiring in-depth investigation, problems that are then discussed at party congresses. Such studies cover a three- to four-year period and involve participation of research centers and universities.

I should like to cite several examples of how this works, of what problems the party assigned scientists since its Tenth Congress: how relations are likely to develop between social classes and strata; forecasts of demographic growth; the measures to be taken, both in social policy and public health, to increase the birth rate. Following the 11th HSWP Congress and the 1975 world economic recession, we asked our scientists for a more comprehensive analysis of the processes at work in the world economy, how they influence our own economy and what problems this poses. We mapped out research programs designed to provide a closer knowledge of the specific features of development of socialist society and the conditions and

tendencies in shaping the socialist way of life. In short, these were all research programs that could contribute to a scientific substantiation of political decisions.

Such procedures are important not only because concrete analyses of concrete situations and the conclusions drawn from them give us a better knowledge of the true nature of processes, their interconnections, and, in the final analysis, more accurate policy-making. I might add that more than 200 prominent scientists and specialists helped to draft the Central Committee directives on party policy toward science, and had a most active part in putting them into effect.

However, relations with the intelligentsia cannot be confined to enlisting it for working out major problems, which do not occur very often. It would be wrong if only high-placed sicentists and specialists were allowed to have a say on current and long-range issues. Contacts with wide circles of intellectuals, and assigning them a meaningful part in elaborating questions bearing on the country's social development, or on the tasks of individual enterprises, and bringing them into a joint search for rational solutions — all these are of great importance. It is our aim to put this into practice on a national and local scale. Another aspect of our relations with the intelligentsia, and one that is acquiring increasing importance, is with the scientific unions, societies, and other forms of professional organizations that can play a significant part in socialist construction.

Party policy toward the intelligentsia requires a differentiated approach. Our work will be successful only if we take into account the distinctive features of the intelligentsia as a whole, and the features of each of its groups, and also, wherever possible, of individuals.

The party pays close attention to social scientists and the formation of their ideological and political outlook. This is understandable for the work of the intellectuals in the humanities is much more closely linked with ideological questions. Moreover, many of these intellectuals are directly involved in moulding public opinion. And by the very nature of their work they exercise a greater influence on public consciousness than other groups of the intelligentsia. That is why the party's contacts with this category of intellectuals are much closer and its leadership more direct. This, I hasten to add, does not mean underestimating our work among natural scientists or technical intellectuals. Incidentally, there is a perceptibly growing interest among them in social and political problems, and we support that interest as a manifestation of civic duty and as a desire for closer understanding in this and not merely in professional questions.

Gawronski. I would like to single out this aspect of the problem: what now predominates in the life and work of the intellectual is taking deeper hold and developing not as an automatic process, but in

the struggle against political and ideological positions alien to socialism, against alien conceptions of the social role and social function of the intellectual. The development of different forms of positive ideological influence, and also complete rejection of the practice of waiting for spontaneous change in this sphere, are tangible results of our party's policy as formulated at its Sixth and Seventh congresses. In discussing my own particular sphere of activity, I would stress the following: in conformity with the policies of the latest party congresses, we have consistently emphasized the important link between the formation of socialist values in Polish literature and culture and party work among creative intellectuals, also the latter's ability to participate in social life, in programming the future of Poland and in moulding the socialist consciousness of her people. These general cultural-policy aims are being attained in three spheres.

First, in the general political sphere by fostering an appropriate political climate for the creative intelligentsia. Second, in the artistic sphere by suggesting to writers and artists ideas and themes of social significance and by encouraging dissemination of works reflecting reality, stimulating social development processes, and enriching socialist culture. At the same time, the party has in no uncertain terms disapproved tendencies that run counter to the ideology of socialism, and has actively opposed the dissemination of works that are no more than propaganda for anti-socialist, anti-Polish values. The third sphere concerns the general living conditions of the intelligentsia. In the past they did not receive adequate attention and provoked visible tension in our relations with intellectuals. After the Sixth PUWP Congress we worked out guidelines for remuneration for creative work, and much higher honorariums were set for writers, cinema workers, composers, musicians, actors and translators. A new system of payment has been introduced for the graphic arts, also a new pension law for creative workers and their families. The problem of improving medical service has also been solved. The network of facilities where writers can work in quiet has been extended. The system of financing creative projects and of stipends has been improved. The leading bodies of creative unions and societies now include cultural personalities who take a responsible approach to social questions and enjoy high prestige. All this has helped toward a favorable political climate for creative workers.

But this has not shut our eyes to existing political tensions and difficulties. Attempts to keep the tension alive come from a definite — and not too numerous — group of writers who have gone through a negative ideological evolution and have taken a stand of categorical opposition to socialism. They miss no opportunity to come out against the principles of our system and the main political forces of

the Polish People's Republic; they join with the reactionary and revisionist elements of other sections of society and cooperate with foreign subversive centers.

The struggle against these groups, which have strayed away from the problems of our art and culture, is a struggle for their effective political isolation based on the positive work of the party in the political, ideological and artistic areas.

The continued growth of the high prestige our cultural workers already enjoy, the degree of their participation in social life, will depend on closer bonds with representatives of other sections of society, above all the workers of the big industrial plants. Closer bonds and closer mutual inspiration are helped by the 'Alliance of Labor, Culture and Art' program. Essentially, this is a social experiment being tried out in major industrial plants throughout Poland. On the one hand, it gives us a closer understanding of the cultural development of the working class, its spiritual interests and aspirations, its role in asserting socialist culture. In other words, it enables us to define the quantitative and qualitative changes within the working class and how they influence the cultural interests of society as a whole. On the other hand, it offers a forum for serious debate on culture in the form of a constant dialogue between its 'producers' and 'consumers.' And such a serious discussion of socialist culture, allowing the writer and the artist more deeply to penetrate the thinking and interests of the new-type industrial worker, the comparison of views on life and art, the confrontation of various types of general and creative experience, are bound to enrich our reflections on, and judgment of, Polish reality, our way of life and its moral implications.

Our party wants to give creative workers ideological inspiration, and in relations with them it is guided by the principle of consultation and partnership in promoting a new type of civil consciousness. In this way we are working to utilize and develop the historically formed public role of the Polish cultural worker. Our creative unions do not confine themselves to purely professional problems. They have an active part in formulating and carrying out cultural development programs. These are civic functions and we make every effort to give them greater scope, simultaneously enriching the character and substance of contacts between art workers and the basic classes of our society.

Public control plays an ever bigger part in directing cultural processes. It is exercised by the voluntary unions and creative societies in the main centers, which represent the basic social strata of the working population. They help shape cultural requirements, stimulate popular cultural programs and submit suggestions and proposals to the central authorities. This nation-wide movement is indicative of

the growing social and organizational prerequisites for developed socialist society. This does not belittle the importance of other forms of public supervision of socialist culture, but should be seen as an additional factor that brings regional traditions and customs into the general picture.

The development of socialist culture, and of socialist society as a whole, requires constant improvement of political and ideological work. The main task here falls to scientific institutions and organs of creative thought, the editorial boards of social and cultural journals and the ideological units of the party. And of special importance is knowing and solving not only the general problems of cultural development, but also the new problems that stir the minds of creative workers.

Halina Krysanka. I would like to mention this fact. Approximately two years ago certain people holding opposition views attempted to influence the student youth with so-called explanatory lectures on socio-political subjects, giving their own interpretation of current problems.

With the help of active members of the Socialist Union of Polish Students we learned what questions young people were interested in most and what topics were most recurrent in these 'explanatory' lectures. We launched a major campaign, 'The Party Talks to the Youth,' which included talks by political workers, business executives and journalists. The students examined all the so-called sensitive issues worrying the youth, with the result that these 'explanatory lectures,' which at first attracted many students, started losing their popularity and interest waned. The academic world agreed that the scholarly level of these 'explanatory lectures' was 'surprisingly low.'

Pavlov. Party leadership in the cultural area is, of course, a complex and difficult process requiring clear formulation and consistent implementation of the main Marxist-Leninist aesthetic principles, but also an understanding of the uniqueness of artistic creation. By decision of the party Central Committee, we launched a major experiment 13 years ago: taking as our starting point the democratic traditions of Bulgarian culture, we entrusted the direction of culture on a combined state and public body. Under this state-cum-public arrangement, a cultural congress is held every five years, with more than 2,000 delegates from creative unions, and all the country's cultural institutions. It discusses the main problems, conditions and outlook for cultural work and, what is especially important and what testifies to the democratic nature of cultural leadership, it elects by secret ballot the chairman and deputy chairman of the Committee on Culture. That pattern is followed at all levels in all parts of the country. And still another element of the state-cum-public system: the commit-

tee appoints councils, composed of representatives of creative unions, public organizations, government departments, etc., to coordinate the main directions of the artistic process.

Begun as a social experiment, this principle is now firmly established and, in our conditions, has proved the most suitable method of organizing and guiding culture. Its main advantage is broad democracy in implementing the party's political line.

Members of the creative professions have their own organizations. There are 11 creative unions in Bulgaria — I am not going to enumerate them — similar organizations exist in other socialist countries. Most important is that they are independent and enjoy authority and prestige among the public. Regional party and government authorities have cooperation agreements with nearly all of these creative unions. The unions themselves coordinate their professional activities.

The party maintains close ties with the leadership of these creative unions, scientific and cultural institutions and with a wide circle of artists, scientists and cultural personalities. The party Central Committee includes 25 eminent Bulgarian writers and artists and there are more than 20 in our parliament; half of the members of the Writers' Union are communists.

Mention has already been made here of the question of moral and material encouragement of intellectuals. Outlining such a system is a serious task for it is important that remuneration of artistic workers should not go beyond the framework of the general system of wages in a socialist society while, at the same time, encouraging each and all in its evaluation of talent. We are working on such a system.

We make wide use of such incentives as the Dimitrov Prize and of honorary titles which are of moral and material importance. The creative unions have their own awards and recent legislation provides the Committee on Culture with what are called creative funds. In the creative unions these funds are very useful.

What I want to say is that we have an effective system of moral and material encouragement of creative work and we are constantly improving this system so it should help in implementing the party's policy in science and culture.

Question to Comrade Kornidesz. Bourgeois ideologists have tried to make out that in a socialist country the party and the intellectual, far from being closely associated, are actually in confrontation, and the party supervises the work of the intellectual. But the immense superiority of socialism lies in the fact that the intelligentsia, guided by the common strategic aims worked out by the party and the people, is working not only on concrete assignments, but sets itself creative and scientific goals, presents its proposals to the party and has its own channels of influence on society. How is this 'reciprocal

contact' achieved in practice? What is the mechanism that brings to the surface every valuable initiative that arises spontaneously, or at any rate is the product of independent creativity? For the intelligentsia is working not only to satisfy current requirements, but is often guided by its own, strictly scientific logic. How, then, does the party select from everything created by the intelligentsia what is most valuable, and what are its criteria?

Kornidesz. I have already referred to party and state assignments. But that does not imply that the intelligentsia has no independent initiative. It has, and this finds expression in different forms. One example. Our Central Committee discussed at a plenary meeting the development of agriculture. The question was also discussed by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at its plenary meeting last year, which drew attention to the need to study the water resources of the country and in particular the future of Lake Balaton, now being polluted by agricultural chemicals. Naturally, we took up this proposal and acted on it. Or another example. Not so long ago we examined fulfillment of Central Committee directives in the scientific field. The Academy of Sciences Presidium noted that many of these directives concern economic processes and research designed to solve economic problems, with less attention given to basic research. I want to say that in Hungary about 3.5 per cent of national income is spent on scientific research in which about 86,000 people are employed, an impressive army. It was therefore important for the Academy Presidium to adjust the ratio between applied and basic research.

And still another example. Several years ago a scientific research institute proposed investigating poverty. What is poverty? We were surprised. But after serious reflection we authorized the necessary funds. We — I refer to Academy personnel inasmuch as they were conducting the study — came to the conclusion that the problem merited attention though it concerned a negligible part of the population. And the study led to some very interesting conclusions, some of which concern our social problems and our educational policy. I might mention that the relevant organs examined the position of Hungarian gypsies (there are about 350,000 of them, or 3.5 per cent of the population). In most cases they belong to the poor-population category. The results of this particular research have been used, and will be used, in framing certain political decisions.

But there is also this aspect in relations between party and intelligentsia. It happens that one or another writer raises a problem that has long been the subject of political research, but still awaits solution. The impression is thus created that, in this case, the writer is acting as a sort of 'vanguard force,' whereas in reality he is simply

inadequately informed. In such cases it is essential candidly to explain how the situation developed and how the problem is being dealt with. And that is just what we are trying to do. On the suggestion of the Writers' Union we are putting out a series of books under the general title 'The Discovery of Hungary.' In it we disclose the character of the political, economic and sociological problems facing the country today. But the question I was asked is closely linked with the latter of the problems we selected for discussion, and I will have occasion to return to it.

Halina Krysanka. I would like to make this additional remark. True, the party and intelligentsia are sometimes presented as two completely isolated organisms. But reality is quite different. A sizable part of the party consists of intellectuals and a sizable part of the intelligentsia are party members. By the close of 1976, 31.7 per cent of all university instructors, 32 per cent of all engineers and 26.5 per cent of cultural and art workers were party members. The Marxist-Leninist party and the socialist intelligentsia are two closely interconnected organisms, and our intelligentsia accepts the need for party leadership of society.

3

Kornidesz. Socialist society is objectively interested in gaining maximum knowledge of objective reality, in disclosing and explaining natural phenomena, in knowing the laws of social development and of the world we live in, in disseminating true, modern knowledge. Naturally, we sincerely advocate freedom of scientific and artistic creation, support and encourage it, for objective scientific and also artistic truths, on the one hand, and freedom of creation, on the other, are mutually complementary and cannot exist without each other.

Our creative intelligentsia has responded to the confidence reposed in it. The vast majority of its representatives are applying their creative freedom with a keen feeling of responsibility, for they realize, know and proclaim the indivisibility of freedom and responsibility and their commitment to progress. Freedom and responsibility form an indestructible whole.

If we take the natural sciences, we can safely say that there is not a single scientific problem, in the analysis of which we are not interested. We have no banned subjects or prescribed conclusions. But the objective requirements of society, the confines of our material means impel us — and this has already been mentioned here — to choose the objects of research and determine how much we can afford to appropriate for on or another project. If we take the social sciences, public control here is expressed primarily in whether or not we should publish the results of certain studies, especially if they lead

to immature conclusions. Contradictory conclusions are first submitted to professional forums and the wider publication of research results is sometimes advisable only after a profound discussion that confirms the correctness of the conclusions to be drawn.

In our country, the stimulation of creative freedom, entails, first and foremost, support of socialist art, of the partisan, realistic aspirations, of wider contacts between art and reality, art and the people. Our party does not prescribe the subject, style or genre of one's work. We know that the socialist character of any work depends on the philosophy of its author, on his attitude to reality. We regard the encouragement of artistic self-expression and freedom in close association with the following passage in our party's policy statement: 'Literature and art facilitate the formation of socialist consciousness by giving a truthful presentation of the struggle for socialism, by truthfully depicting the constructive effort of men of labor.'

Socialist realistic art presupporse the depiction, reflection of contradictions, of human conflicts, these inevitable concomitants of social progress. The question is not whether the artist should take as his subject contradictory social phenomena, pressing problems and existing shortcomings, but *how* he treats them: does he present them from the socialist standpoint, with a sense of responsibility, realistically in all their historical and social interconnections; does he bring to the reader the real nature of relations between the individual and society; is he in a position — considering the specificity of the various genres — to reply in a socialist spirit to the contradictions and questions that crop up in social and individual relations; does he portray the existing tendencies and forces that guarantee the resolution of problems and contradictions, seen in all their long-term implications?

The overwhelming majority of our creative intellectuals accept party policy and regard the building of developed socialist society as a national program, a platform of action and an attractive 'artistic project.' But side by side with these conscious supporters of socialism there are those whose philosophy and creative work are not yet fully socialist and contain features and contradictions carried over from the past. There is room in our cultural life for all humane works, all genuinely artistic values. At the same time, however, our party policy toward our allies presupposes discussion with non-Marxist views in order to make our position perfectly clear to all and, on the other hand, strengthen the political alliance, narrow down differences in views with our political allies. And there is the proof of experience that consistent, principled discussion does not weaken, but rather strengthens our political alliances. And in this context, Marxist criticism holds a special place, for it combines support and popularization

of socialist values with trenchant criticism of all manifestations of formalism and decadence.

Naturally, there is no freedom in our country for the publication of works that propagate cruelty, hatred, anti-humanism and anti-socialist morality.

We make no secret of the fact that we are not out to maintain the ideological status quo, but to move ahead, add to the knowledge and popularity of Marxism-Leninism. And with the continuing bourgeois ideological offensive, it is particularly important to step up our own ideological struggle in the area of culture. We are convinced that we can win victory over non-Marxist views by employing the ideological weapon. That is the only way to bring home to all our intellectuals the understanding and acceptance of the perspective of socialist society, and to convince them, through their workaday activities and principled discussions, of the correctness of our policy and secure their sincere participation in carrying it out.

Stefanov. There is no need, I think, to speak at length on bourgeois political and ideological speculations on the problem of freedom of creativity. How do we see it? What meaning do we put into the concept of freedom?

That we proceed from a class approach, need hardly be said. When we speak of freedom of scientific or artistic creativity, the most important consideration, in our view, is this: can a scientist or writer implement the laws of the creative process, i.e., is he unhindered in his quest for the truth? That is at the heart of the matter.

We know from history that this is not an autonomous process totally separated from objective conditions. No, it is above all determined by socio-historical conditions and by class interests. And here, too, socialism demonstrates its superiority. For no other society and no other class are so deeply interested in cognition of the truth as are socialism and the working class. But that is beyond the ken of our critics.

It is from the same positions that we regard discussion, the battle of opinions, 'freedom' for the various schools, etc. Our critics maintain that genuine freedom of scientific and artistic creation includes free and unhampered popularization of the most diverse trends, schools of thought and orientations. We firmly hold that really progressive orientations can appear and take hold only through the battle of ideas, through active defense of progressive views. Nor is this a restriction of freedom; it is the crucial condition for its exercise.

Science cannot advance without discussion and the battle of opinions. In several of its documents our party notes inadequate promotion of such exchange of opinions. The party severely condemns manifestations of administrative methods in such discussions. It has

every faith in our scientists, but at the same time instills in them a sense of responsibility to society. These questions have found expression in the guidelines set by party congresses and plenums, for all party organizations at scientific institutions. They are discussed also at methodological seminars which exist in practically every major scientific center.

Question to Bulgarian comrades. The customary view of the intelligentsia is that it is always inclined to be critical. That view has its reasons if only because intellectuals engaged in one or another area of the economy or science see it in its perspective and often measure present-day realities against the ideal. This may be an insufficient explanation, but the fact remains that all of us have to deal with such an attitude. and hence the question: how can we prevent alienating some critical individuals and turn their criticism into constructive action?

Pavlov. I must say that critical attitudes are actively developing in culture and the arts. This has been glaringly demonstrated in the past few years in our cinema art. Cinema workers, especially in other countries, have noted the remarkable progress of Bulgarian cinema art. Some of our most interesting films are of a critical nature. The same applies to literature, the theatre, certain branches of the fine arts. What is important in all this? We have been told: the approach to, and, let me add, the aim of, this criticism. One can very sharply, even cruelly, criticize our shortcomings, but it all depends on what you want to achieve and if you are prepared actively to participate in setting things right. In its approach to criticism in science and culture, the party's primary aim is to establish what problems give rise to such criticism and how the intelligentsia can be recruited to analyze and solve them. And it is precisely in this joint effort to bring to bear the inexhaustible latent capabilities of socialist society that criticism acquires a positive significance.

We know that some of our Western opponents want to impose on us the critical approach as the only one possible in present-day socialist art. They are anxious to impose on our cultural workers their understanding of the political orientation of criticism. But let me emphasize: just as there is no sharper and more accurate criticism of some aspects of life in socialist countries than the criticism and self-criticism of the communist parties, there is no sharper and more profound artistic criticism of our weaker aspects than the criticism contained in our literature, theatre, cinema and fine art. But this criticism is from positions of our achievements and, more important, its purpose is to consolidate and develop these achievements. The negation of the bourgeois way of life, which is part of our criticism in literature and art of the past, is giving way to assertion of the ideals

and values of the new society. Simple negation is undoubtedly much easier, whereas the constructive approach requires deeper comprehension, interest, participation in our common cause. And I am inclined to think that precisely these feature determine the real intellectual of our society.

Question to Polish comrades. In common with other speakers you have outlined the principles of party work among intellectuals which in many ways are common to all socialist countries. But there is this question: what happens if these principles are violated? How does the party react to such facts, say, as gross interference in the creative process, the use of administrative methods; are there any guarantees against violations of party principles?

Gawronski. I would like to first dwell on some general background aspects.

The decisive majority of our writers and artists, as we have emphasized, fully accept the party's policy. This does not, however, mean that there are no contrasting views. We know of 'intellectuals' whose imagined superego raises them to a level supposedly independent of class determination but whose creations, nevertheless, raise important problems of social significance. This often helps to carry out party policy. We look seriously upon the question of this group moving closer to the party and on its constant ties with it. A part of our creative youth with a somewhat lower level of self-consciousness tends to shy away from public life and lean toward anarchist, irrational positions. There are also writers nurturing illusions of a so-called public mission of the intelligentsia and the vanguard public role of intellectuals and thus becoming easy prey for foreign centers hostile to us that strive to form an opposition force among them.

The influence of these groups differs depending on how effective and flexible our work is among the intelligentsia. We are endeavoring to intensify this work and give it a more offensive orientation, without, however, departing from established basic principles.

I think a guarantee against unwarranted interference in the creative process could be the constant analysis of the situation in the creative community, which allows for drawing the conclusions necessary for work not only with specific groups and collectives, but also with individuals. We are already conducting such studies and are planning to intensify them. Another guarantee is more active participation by members of the creative fraternity, particularly party members, in all aspects of creative work.

In reply to this question I should like to say that in the recent period we have not had a single case where publication of a book has been stopped. We try to resolve all controversial issues through the joint efforts of authors and publishers. Besides, such issues will be discus-

sed in the literary-publisher council we are forming in which writers will participate.

Halina Krysanka. I would like to add this fact. In January 1977, a group of sociologists, shortly before their congress, asked the Science and Edcuation Department of the Central Committee to establish whether the comrades responsible for the publication of sociological studies were not going too far in their demands on authors. We looked into the matter and supported the sociologists. It is probably impossible fully to preclude all manner of misunderstanding. Even the best mechanism cannot guaratnee this, and party organizations have to interfere. But in interfering it is important that they keep within a definite framework (as has already been pointed out).

Kornidesz. I would like to add to what has been said by our Polish comrades about publication procedures. We have no prior censorship, but from time to time we take a hard look at what some editorial boards and publishing houses are doing. A searching assessment of their work is a guarantee against mistakes and shortcomings. In our conditions, this has proved a good method and if it causes some problems, then it is because we do not always apply this method consistently.

Permit me one more remark on the young creative intellectuals. I would draw your attention to the following: For these young people the great epochal changes of the early revolutionary years are history. All that we have gone through is known to them only from textbooks, from the stories of their fathers, or from literature. Theirs is not direct, but indirect experience. It is therefore all the more necessary to help them assimilate our historical experience, but so far this has not been our strong point. We must raise the level of Marxist training in higher education establishments, in the universities, and help the students really understand the experience of their own party and of the international labor movement. And we should inculcate the influence of this experience in the new, growing generation of intellectuals. With this aim in view it is necessary to improve the theoretical foundations we give these young people, provide more interesting textbooks that give a deeper interpretation of our past and more fully reflect the historical process. Without truthful and convincing words we will make no headway here.

There was a general consensus on the validity today of Lenin's theory developed in his article 'Party Organization and Party Literature,' particularly as concerns the mutual relationship between the party and the intelligentsia, understanding the importance of this problem and the unacceptability of 'a standardized system. . .for its solution' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 10, p. 46). It was agreed that discussion of this

problem, important to the successful building of developed socialism, should be continued. Naturally, the framework of the present discussion allowed for only the most general questions to be dealt with. Undoubtedly, too, the problems of work among intellectuals, though in varying degree, are of keen interest to communists not only in socialist, but also in capitalist and developing countries. Participants expressed the wish that *WMR* would at some future date enable them to exchange views on its pages.

The agrarian question and the peasantry's role in developing countries

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL CONFERENCE

The peasantry as a socio-political force

The scale and outcome of the struggle for progressive agrarian change depends to an enormous extent on the peasantry, which forms the great mass of the population in the Asian and African countries. But in the social sense, the peasantry is by no means homogeneous and, as many of the speakers stressed, an undifferentiated approach to its various strata on the part of the forces exercising leadership, or fighting for leadership, in the national-democratic revolution, including organizations that have adopted working-class positions, could have very grave consequences.

The peasantry encapsules at least four different classes, or strata, of the population, which are related to three economic structures. The first stratum is the patriarchal peasantry, based on the subsistence patriarchal structure, which in most Asian countries features widespread feudal forms of exploitation, and in Tropical Africa, deep-rooted survivals of communal-tribal life. The second stratum is the petty bourgeoisie. This stratum is based on the small-commodity structure, formed in the process of disintegration of the commune, tribe, and so on. The third stratum (small rural entrepreneurs) and the fourth (agricultural workers) are linked with the small-capitalist structure.

The state of transition that characterizes all social life in the developing countries also affects the social structure in rural areas and

Final installment. For the beginning, see *WMR*, December 1978, p. 79.

gives rise to diverse intermediate strata, which are the living expression of the widespread and growing phenomenon of agrarian overpopulation. The most apparent and socially unhealthy embodiment of the latter is a special population group whose members have been increasing rapidly in recent years, and which consists of semi-declassé paupers and totally declassé lumpen. These semi-employed and semi-destitute people form the 'surplus' population of the countryside.

In his speech, Grienig stressed the importance of the fact that these diverse social strata, including the paupers, nevertheless have common interests from both the internal and external points of view. The peasantry cannot shake off the fetters of obsolete relations without fighting the whole system that produced them. So the peasant movement objectively presents a significant force not only for bringing about agrarian transformations, but also for social progress as a whole. On the other hand, the peasants' submission to the system of imperialist dependence and exploitation objectively endows them with a considerable anti-imperialist potential. The peasantry has become an important force not only against its 'own' exploiting strata, but also against imperialism, and for social and economic emancipation.

At the same time, Grienig continued, the peasantry's potential as a revolutionary force should not be overestimated. No one doubts that the peasantry's common interests have acquired a much deeper social content, thus widening the sphere of action of the peasant movement, which now embraces the whole of society. But it is also true that numerous factors stand in the way of its anti-imperialist and revolutionary potential. The scale of values, motivation and behavior of the peasant masses are dictated by their material conditions of life. The specific character of reproduction in the system of imperialist dependence and exploitation means that maintenance of the producer himself and his family remains the driving force of production in the broad spheres of agriculture. The needs factor is also shaped under the influence of these pre-capitalist relations. The conditions of production and consumption generate apathy, passivity and fatalism. What is more, the peasant masses retain their strong ties with the traditional social structures. The overwhelming majority of the peasantry live in a state of illiteracy and ignorance.

In these conditions the peasantry's fundamental interests, though objectively anti-imperialist and socially progressive, are refracted through the prism of traditional criteria, beliefs and behavior, and this not only hinders their understanding of their real position, but quite often leads to action on the part of individual groups that run counter to social progress. While still fettered by pre-capitalist beliefs and

criteria, the peasant masses remain highly susceptible to religiously embellished, reactionary and primitive utopian theories of socialism. Petty-bourgeois notions of equality are particularly widespread among the peasantry. The pauperizing and declassing of the broad peasant masses provides favorable soil for leftist, anarcho-Trotskyist and pseudo-revolutionary theories.

The various factors that tend to lower the modern peasantry's revolutionary potential were also mentioned by other speakers.

The influence of the feudals and of religion, Sudiman observed, ranks high among the reasons why in critical situations the peasantry is subject to vacillations, which are used by the exploiters in their class interests. However, the main feature characterizing the peasantry as a 'class' is its involvement in private ownership of the means of production (small though it is among the middle and poorer peasants). And this is the reason why the peasantry cannot act as consistently in the revolution as the working class.

Thiam drew attention to the extremely negative effect of the still persistent caste relations in backward rural society. In Senegal, for instance, the high dignitaries of the Moslem Murid fraternity, with their large estates, exploit the voluntary Talib agricultural workers. And they are voluntary because such a worker sincerely believes that the more and better he works for his 'spiritual master,' the more he will deserve the 'salvation' of his soul. This is a case where exploitation of labor is combined with a definite ideology designed to camouflage this wide-scale exploitation. Another negative factor is the absence of any strong militant traditions that would create a sense of common interest, particularly since what wealth there is has not set up any insuperable barrier between 'poor' and 'rich' peasants.

The peasantry's potential as a revolutionary force cannot be assessed without taking into consideration its waverings, its ideological and political contradictions, Jayasekera emphasized. In drawing up a national-democratic program, one must have a good knowledge of both the general socio-economic conditions in a given country and the regional distinctions there. The decisions formulated in the program cannot be founded on only a few basic characteristics that are more or less valid for all the developing countries. One must take into consideration the level of peasant consciousness at the present stage of the revolution in these countries, and the strategy and tactics of the bourgeoisie designed to exert an ideological influence on the peasantry by means of the capitalism-oriented development of agriculture. Here we have a hard battle to fight. And to win it, we must do everything to raise the level of the peasantry's political consciousness, keep up our work among them, and take part in their daily struggle against the exploiters.

The class struggle in the countryside is being complicated by the multi-sectoral structure of agriculture and the diversity of relations of production, said al-Helwai. In Iraq, it is the agricultural workers, and the middle and small peasants who stand for deepening the socialist orientation of agrarian transformations. At the present stage, the rich peasants can be regarded simultaneously as progressive, insofar as they oppose semi-feudal relations and bring modern methods to farming, and reactionary, notably because they resist anti-capitalist measures. It is highly important to define our stand with respect to this stratum. Our attitude is to reduce and do away with the reactionary activity of the rich peasants, while preventing their alignment with the enemies of the revolution.

It was stressed at the conference that the various factors tending to lower the peasantry's revolutionary potential — the pull of patriarchal traditions, the almost total illiteracy, the age-old humble social status, the deep-rooted influence of the feudal lords, which does not decline in proportion to the undermining of their economic positions, and much else — nevertheless do not negate the fact that in the Asian and African countries the peasants both before (in the struggle for political independence) and now provide the main social base of the national-liberation movement, even if a considerable part and, in some cases, the majority of peasants have remained outside the movement. At the same time, the peasantry as a social force has never politically been sufficiently independent.

There can, of course, be specific situations or periods when the peasant movement forms not only the basis of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, but also acquires some of the features of a driving force. However, in most cases the peasantry remains objectively in need of leadership by other classes. The national-liberation struggle has to a great extent been predetermined by the hardships the peasantry is forced to endure, and the degree of its participation in this struggle depends on the effectiveness of the political mobilization brought to the rural areas by other, urban classes. The class (or classes) that ensures itself the support of the peasant 'rear' also gains hegemony in the national-liberation movement.

This proposition is not refuted by the experience of the armed liberation struggle, for example, in China, Vietnam or Algeria. The national-liberation armies, mainly peasant in composition, have always been organized by representatives of the urban strata and have remained under their leadership throughout the struggle. In respect of Vietnam, as Van Tao noted in his speech, this proposition has been concisely and clearly expressed by Le Duan, General Secretary, CC, Communist Party of Vietnam: 'Only by following the working class can the peasantry become a mighty force.'

It is another matter that the basically petty-bourgeois psychology and consciousness of the peasant masses may have a serious reciprocal effect on the leadership provided by other classes, and may even swamp its primary class-political characteristics, as happened in China. The Maoist concept of the peasantry as the basis and guiding force of the revolution is to some extent the result of such swamping. Projected on to world development, this concept led to a corresponding unscientific interpretation of the national-liberation movement.

It is not in doubt that in the course of social development the political activity of the toiling masses of the peasantry tends to increase. But this process moves very slowly by its own momentum. Hence the need to introduce urban 'catalysts' that can rouse, politically enlighten, and enlist the various strata of the peasantry in organized class struggle.

A characteristic feature of the latter in any society, and particularly in developing countries, with their far from mature social structures, is that the confrontation is not only between two antagonistic classes (and the corresponding political organizations). In practice the contest is always between various coalitions of classes and social strata, which tend to broaden as they acquire a wider range of goals satisfying. though perhaps in different degrees, the interests of all participants. These coalitions or alliances are flexible. This is seen, first, in the way their composition fluctuates as the primary targets are or are not achieved, and secondly, in the overt or covert struggle for leadership of the coalition (there have been instances of such shifts in Sri Lanka, India and other countries).

In most of the young states, the class-political divide now lies between imperialism, foreign and local big capital (where it exists), feudalism or its survivals, on the one hand, and the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the progressive intellectuals, the so-called middle strata, and part of the national bourgeoisie, on the other. Probably the best way to advance the national-liberation revolution and deepen its socio-economic and political content at the present stage is for the working class to play the leading role. However, in the majority of cases, it has yet to achieve this, and so the leading position among the progressive forces is held by revolutionary democracy.

In social-class terms, revolutionary democracy is a 'close relative' of the rural petty bourgeoisie. This is one of the main reasons for its powerful influence over the peasantry. As regards the specific activity of revolutionary democracy in the urban areas, its content naturally depends on whether it is in power or operating as an opposition force.

If the revolutionary democrats are in power, this activity is mainly confined to moderate progressive agrarian reforms, including restric-

tion on the private ownership of large estates, the creation of a state sector and the development of cooperation among the peasantry (partly and sometimes mainly in the production sphere); the setting up of broad peasant alliances to promote agrarian policy (this generally progressive measure is also used, however, as was noted at the conference, for obscuring the class distinctions among the peasantry, which usually results in the agricultural workers' losing their right to set up their own trade unions); and the more or less intensive technical and economic modernization of agriculture. If they are not in power, the activity of the revolutionary democrats among the peasantry is far less definite, but on the whole it is designed to bring the peasantry into various forms of struggle for its own interests against the despotism of the feudal lords, and against the policy of the right-wing conservative circles in power.

Alliance of the working class and the peasantry

The position of the working class or, rather, of the communist parties, which express its interests, in relation to the peasantry is determined by one of the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and the class struggle. This principle stipulates the need to establish and consolidate by every possible means the alliance with the peasantry, 'the need, in backward countries,' as Lenin stressed, 'to give special support to the peasant movement against the landowners, against landed proprietorship, and against all manifestations or survivals of feudalism, and to strive to lend the peasant movement the most revolutionary character' (Vol. 31, p. 149).

The question of the worker-peasant alliance figured prominently at the conference, and particularly in speeches by *Yu. Gavrilov* (USSR), *Jose Lava*, (Philippines), *S. Damdinsuren* (Mongolia), *D. Tishev* (Bulgaria), I. Sinha, J. Kanela and P. Jayasekara.

The ideologists of imperialism and the Maoists, who have a direct link with them, Gavrilov said, systematically distort the Marxist-Leninist attitude to the peasantry and to the peoples' struggle for national liberation. They try to 'prove' that Marxism-Leninism is alien and cannot be applied to Afro-Asian realities. But the idea of alliance between the working class and the peasantry is basic to Leninism. The need for such an alliance springs from the coincidence of their fundamental interests in the struggle against the common enemy — capitalism. The logical continuation of the idea of alliance between the working class and the peasantry in one country was the realization of the need for alliance between the international working-class movement and the working people of the colonial and dependent countries.

For the communists it is not a tactical device to establish relations

of alliance, in one form or another with the peasantry and the non-proletarian working people. It is a fundamental principle of the struggle for the crucial interests of the working class and all working people, of the struggle for the peasantry, for enabling it to advance to a new technology of production, to a better life.

The positions of the Maoists stand in complete contradiction to the Marxist-Leninist treatment of the problem. Their activity aims not at solving the basic problems of social and economic development, but at conserving backwardness and, hence, dependence on imperialism. In the ideological and political sphere they are working not for the political enlightenment and growth of the social consciousness of the peasant masses, but for the reduction of theory, in pursuance of their own selfish aims, to the level of the backward, illiterate strata of the Asian and African peasantry which are still in the grip of religious and other superstitions.

The conference noted that the relative weakness of the working class in the Asian and African countries increases the need for an alliance with the peasantry. It is also obvious that in order to create a coalition of progressive social forces and raise its effectiveness there must be cooperation between the working class (given all-round consolidation of its class-political independence) and revolutionary democracy.

In this connection, *Badamyn Lhamsuren* (Mongolia) expressed the opinion that revolutionary democrats must not be described only as representatives of the petty bourgeoisie. Thanks to the breadth of their social base they express, in the main, the interests of the toiling masses of town and country. At the same time, it is the heterogeneity of this base that gives rise to the revolutionary democrats' inherent wavering and inconsistency. The example of socialism-oriented countries like the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Angola, Mozambique, Congo and Ethiopia, shows that the establishment of a vanguard party guided by the ideas and principles of scientific socialism is a law-governed process arising from the polarization of the political forces and development of revolutionary democracy as the national-liberation revolutions gain in depth. Lhamsuren compared the evolution of present-day revolutionary democracy and the establishment and strengthening of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, and noted their specific features arising from the concrete historical and national conditions in the various countries. But there are some common features between the ideological and political development of the MPRP and the evolution of revolutionary democrats under the influence of scientific socialism.

A number of comrades touched upon specific questions of building and consolidating alliances between the working class and the peasan-

try. It was pointed out, specifically, that in countries where there are communist parties, the political ties between the young working class and the peasantry become far stronger than where there are none. This depends both on the direct activities of the communists in the given area and on their influence on the general social character of the national-liberation movement. It stands to reason that the stronger the communist party, the more its influence is felt. In any case, experience has shown that the communists' positions and slogans on the agrarian question and their concrete political work among the peasant masses have a definite effect on the guidelines adopted not only by the revolutionary democrats, but also by the bourgeois groups in the national movement.

While taking into consideration the specific nature of national conditions, the communist parties of the developing countries stick to the tactic of establishing peasant unity and place their reliance on the agricultural workers and poor peasants, while trying to win over the middle and, where possible, the rich peasants in order to liberate the peasantry as a whole from exploitation by feudalism, big local capital and imperialism. The Communist Party of India, said Sinha, tries to organize the agricultural workers into an independent class force and forge as broad a unity as possible among the peasants, whose hard core should be the poor peasants, and to strengthen the alliance of the working class and the peasantry by organizing their general struggle against the monopolists controlling the basic 'agricultural' branches of industry (cotton, jute, sugar, rubber, tobacco, etc.). The demand for nationalization of these branches and their whole system of procuring raw materials is gaining increasing support among the broad peasant masses. But achievement of unity of the forces interested in radical agrarian reforms is hindered by the concepts and activities of the Maoist and other 'ultra-left' groupings. The Communist Party of India, while conducting an ideological and political struggle against erroneous theories and concepts, seeks to develop joint practical action with all left-wing and democratic forces aimed at solving the problems that confront the peasantry.

Vasizwe Seme (South Africa) stressed that in considering the worker-peasant alliance one must pay special attention to the role of the middle peasantry in view of the great importance of its direct support and participation in the struggle against the exploiting sections in the countryside.

Characterizing the situation in the Sudan, Dishoni said that the weakness of the economic basis of rural capitalism rules out the claim that the country already has a rural proletariat forming part of the working class. Rather one should speak of a semi-proletariat, since the greater part of the wage-labor force consists of seasonal workers,

i.e., poor peasants, whose world view and interests are linked with their native village and their own scrap of land. But at the same time they objectively are, or can become, an important link of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, an alliance that is historically necessary in the struggle for the non-capitalist alternative of development, for progressive changes in the socio-economic and political spheres, including agrarian reform.

Kervan pointed out the many difficulties in forging a worker-peasant alliance that confront the Communist Party of Turkey. Nevertheless, in recent years the CPT has substantially improved its work among the peasantry. The link with the rural areas operates through the agricultural wage-laborers, the semi-proletarian who come to work in the towns after the farming season is over, and through the progressive-minded village teachers. The CPT concentrates its efforts on mobilizing the landless and poor peasants, and the agricultural workers, and attaches great importance to training party leaders from their ranks.

The slogan for work among the peasant masses is democratic land reform. The party program advocates supporting the small and middle peasants, defending the small producer from the landowner, the capitalist, the middleman, the money-lender, and also from the local and foreign monopolies. The party also supports the democratic cooperative movement.

Working on the assumption of the need for political action in the countryside, said Sudiman, our party created a mass revolutionary organization, the Peasant Front of Indonesia — Barisan Tani Indonesia (BTI). The front fought for the interests of the working peasants, explained to rural workers the policy of the working-class party in the agrarian sphere, frequently joined with progressive trade unions in various kinds of action against the rural exploiters, demanded reduction of the prices on article of prime necessity, and opposed foreign capital.

The White terror of 1965-66 deprived the party and the BTI of a large number of its peasant cadres. To all intents and purposes, work in the countryside had to be started from the beginning. The conditions of struggle continue to be very difficult today, because the present regime is still brutally suppressing the progressive and democratic forces. The Communist Party's positions in the countryside have not yet been rebuilt, but we are determined to rebuild them.

The Algerian communists, Malki stressed, are convinced that the rural proletariat should play an independent role within the framework of the peasant movement. This does not mean opposing peasants to agricultural workers. The communists want to prevent any such opposition and always set specific targets that have a unifying

and mobilizing effect and are aimed against rural reaction and the imperialist danger. They act on these lines with a view to building structures that would give the masses a fighting capacity in line with their social composition (agricultural workers, small peasants, middle peasants, etc.), occupation (crop-growers, cattle-breeders, traders, tobacco-growers), and the region where they live.

Diallo spoke about the Guinean experience of establishing worker-peasant alliances. In Guinea, the low development level of the productive forces, particularly in the sphere of industrialization, on the one hand, and on the other, the numerical superiority of the peasantry and the decisive role it played in the national-liberation revolution, and also the almost similar level of revolutionary consciousness of all working strata, have reduced the social and, particularly, the ideological difference between the working class and the peasantry to such a degree that their revolutionary potential has been able to develop within the single politico-ideological framework of the mass party. Acknowledging the theoretical and historical truth of the Marxist-Leninist principle of alliance between the working class and the peasantry under the guidance of the working class and its vanguard party, the Democratic Party of Guinea affirms that in Guinea's political and economic conditions the revolutionary potential of the working class and the peasantry is concentrated in a single and united political force — the class-people.

As the only center for elaborating, systematizing and carrying out the line based on scientific and revolutionary ideology, the DPG performs the function of a vanguard party capable of planning, preparing and guiding the process of revolutionary social change. The radicalizing of the people's revolution in the 70s, Diallo said, led to the rise of a party-state. This fusion was made possible by the existence of a mass party, which set up a state corresponding to the needs of the people's movement.

The problem of consolidating the alliance between the working class and the peasantry is extremely important not only within the framework of one country, but also on the transnational level, that is, on the plane of interaction and alliance between the main currents of the global revolutionary process — the world socialist system, the international working-class and the communist movement and the national-liberation movement. This aspect of the problem was emphasized by Lava, Damdinsuren, Seme, Diallo, and other comrades.

Lava noted, specifically, the practical significance of such forms of contact between the world communist and working-class movement, on the one hand, and the peasant movement in Asia and Africa, on the other, as exchange of information and experience, agreements on cooperation, conferences to discuss problems of mutual interest, and

coordination of international activities. The publications put out by Peace and Socialism Publishers, the World Federation of Trade Unions and other progressive international organizations can be instrumental in securing closer ideological contacts and a better understanding of the strategy and tactics of the three main currents of the world revolutionary process in the common anti-imperialist struggle.

Trying to isolate the national-liberation movement from the international working class, from its mighty bastion — the world socialist system — the ideologists of anti-communism stake on opportunism and nationalism, Damdinsuren said. This is no accident because the tendency to distort the Marxist-Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism, to counterpose the national objectives of the revolutionary forces to their international obligations, to use national frontiers and national interests as a means of shutting oneself off from the common struggle against imperialism, are characteristic of all opportunist deviations. A striking example of this is provided by the chauvinistic, splitting policy pursued by the Maoists, which consists essentially in working against the unity of world socialism and its alliance with the national-liberation movement. This policy, epitomized in the slogan of 'struggle against social-imperialism' and the 'superpowers' and 'three worlds' theses, has been affirmed in decisions passed by the 10th and 11th Congresses of the CPC, and in other documents. The Chinese leadership is doing everything it can to undermine the cooperation between the developing countries and the socialist countries and urges them to engage in a dialogue with the imperialist states, that is, with the former metropolises, thus promoting the neo-colonialist policy of imperialism as a whole. The exposure of the reactionary essence of the Maoists' theory and practice, along with resistance to the ideological subversion mounted by imperialism and reaction is one of the crucial conditions for further strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasantry on the international scale and ensuring unity of action among all revolutionary forces.

In closing the conference, Frolov said that it had been successful not only in providing an insight into the actual situation as regards the struggle for a progressive solution to the agrarian question in the most diverse countries of the national-liberation zone and the specific tasks confronting the communists, revolutionary democrats and other progressive forces. It has also provided some theoretical generalization and new ideas on how to approach this problem, undoubtedly one of the crucial issues of modern times. In this sphere there could be no cut-and-dried formulas. So the exchange of information and opinions and the pooling of experience of agrarian reform in various

countries, of political work among the peasants, and of efforts to organize and recruit them for the struggle for socio-economic and political progress, the exchange of ideas regarding the most effective methods and forms of building an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, had all been extremely useful and necessary for every country and for the communist and revolutionary-democratic parties. The present conference had been an important step forward in this respect.

Frolov thanked all speakers and participants in the discussion, and especially the Mongolian comrades, the MPRP Central Committee, who had done everything to promote the success of the conference.

RECENT SOVIET PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS IN ENGLISH

Philosophy in the USSR: Problems of Dialectical Materialism.
By a team of prominent Soviet scholars including Fedoseyev, Oizerman, Bogomolov, Sheptulin, Kelle et al.
Cloth $7.25 270pp

Philosophy and Sociology G.P. Frantsov
A critical analysis of the historical evolution and contemporary state of bourgeois philosophical and sociological thought.
Cloth $5.95 420pp

Dialectical Logic. E.V. Ilyenkov
Essays on history and theory.
Cloth $4.95 370pp

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M5V 2P6

viewpoints

Afghanistan: the beginning of a new era

Comments on the April 1978 Revolution by Saleh Mohammad Zeray, CC Political Bureau Member of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is an ancient country with nearly 3,000 years of recorded history.[1] The feudal system, which succeeded the slave system after the fall of the Great Kushan State (one of the biggest slave states of the ancient world), is about 1,500 years old. Throughout these centuries the people were unfree because they had no parties, no ideology, no organization that could help them improve their lot.

In 1838, British imperialism invaded our country for the first time. The invasion was resisted very bravely and the British were defeated. But as Afghanistan's strategic position was important to Britain, which wanted to keep its Indian colony, it was invaded for a second time (1878-80). The invaders were defeated again and realized that they could not bring our courageous people under their direct rule.

The monarchs and feudals, however, acted differently. In 1879, British imperialism induced Emir Yakub Khan to sign a treacherous treaty with Britain and 'rewarded' him with an annual subsidy of 600,000 rupees.[2] From then on — for over 40 years — Afghanistan was dependent on Britain although ruled by Afghan kings.

When the Russian proletariat broke the then weakest link in the chain of world imperialism and accomplished a victorious socialist revolution the event had a powerful impact on all Asian countries, including Afghanistan. Our people began to struggle against British imperialism for a third time and won national independence (1919).

Afghanistan could now set out to build its economic independence and consolidate its national sovereignty. But the British imperialists knew that this would make it harder for them to hold on to India. They brought down King Amanullah Khan and put Nadir Khan, their faithful servitor, in his stead. King Nadir ruthlessly killed fighters against British domination and committed other brutalities. In the end, he was assassinated by a patriot. Afterwards the rulers used

various disguises according to circumstances, posing as partisans of democracy (and leaving some room for the exercise of political freedoms) but calling for 'national discipline' and condemning demonstrations and strikes because they were 'not good' for the national economy. What they really meant by 'national discipline' was complete despotism.

However, despotic rule could not isolate Afghanistan from changes in the world, from ideas and influences gaining ground everywhere with the appearance of a strong socialist camp, the collapse of the colonial system and the emergence of dozens of independent sovereign states. Still, fearing that the revolutionary and opposition movement might intensify under the impact of these developments, the monarchic feudal forces resisted the spread of even the bourgeois ideology and the rise of the bourgeoisie itself, to say nothing of bourgeois parties. As a result, there was no bourgeois movement in Afghanistan, nor did bourgeois ideas take root. Revolutionaries and advanced progressive intellectuals, watching the changes taking place in the world, turned increasingly to the ideology of the working class. The feudal ideology dominant in Afghanistan could not resist the ideology of the proletariat, which was winning more and more adherents.

Equipped with scientific ideas, the revolutionaries discerned the primary causes of the situation in which the country found itself after winning independence. Of course, we had our national holidays, we had a flag, we had international recognition. Still, the country was not free. Even our political independence proved limited. Our people suffered from indirect colonialism — they were being strangled, not with a chain, but with a silk scarf. The consequences were appalling: per capita income was one of the lowest in the world (about 60 dollars a year) and the imperialists pumped out much of what was produced by the people.

The somber realities of backwardness and oppression aroused protest among the patriots proud of their people and their country, which the colonialists had never been able to bring under their direct rule. Gradually the revolutionaries came to the conclusion that they must launch bold patriotic action in the name of their country's future. But this could not be done without an organization.

We founded our party in January 1965. Preparations for this event lasted nearly 18 months. Our leader, Cde. Noor Mohammad Taraki, had made a deep analysis of the situation and come to the conclusion that a party of the new type — a party guiding itself by the scientific ideology of the working class — could be formed in Afghanistan. The constituent congress, held at his home, announced the birth of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). In founding the

party, we took advantage of an article of the Constitution in force during the reign of King Zahir Shah; it allowed the formation of parties but, of course, the authorities did their utmost to prevent that.

The party got down to work. Our basic means of struggle were demonstrations and political strikes as well as efforts to publicize the working-class ideology. We celebrated all the national and international holidays, such as May Day, which helped mobilize the masses and foster progressive thinking.

Conditions for party work were very difficult. True, Zahir Shah made himself out to be a democrat, which enabled us to hold demonstrations openly, but our comrades were persecuted, dismissed from their jobs, sent to jail or even killed although these facts were little known either at home or abroad. The people hardly knew that there was a party, the PDPA, working in such conditions.

But our activity became better known to the masses as time passed. Ultimately, the revolutionary patriotic forces' struggle under the party's leadership created conditions for overthrowing the outdated regime.

Realizing that it could neither go on in the old way, nor cope with the growing popular movement, a section of the ruling group led by Mohammed Daud[3] and his family staged a coup and declared the overthrow of the monarchy. Subsequent events, showed, however, that the coup was actually directed against the progressive forces, against our party.

A despotic and egotistic man, Daud began by using 'revolutionary' language and announced a relatively progressive program which was supported by the progressive forces, such as the proposal to set up a united front — we openly declared our readiness to join it. But behind his fine talk and 'revolutionary' language were reactionary ambitions, anti-democratic and anti-national aims. In the five years Daud was in power, hardly anything was done to promote social and economic progress. The machinery of despotism inherited from the monarchy was still there. As in the past, the regime exercised political power in the interests of the oppressors and exploiters. Understandably enough, the authorities were not very long in switching from talk about 'revolution' and 'freedom' to steps aimed at suppressing both.

The Daud regime suspended political freedoms and banned all demonstrations and strikes. It outlawed all parties except the party which went by the name of 'National Revolution Party' but was throroughly anti-revolutionary and anti-national. The situation prompted us to take precautions. After three and a half years of semi-legal existence, the PDPA decided to desist from public activity. Once again we had to spell out our current policy chiefly by means of handbills and typewritten leaflets.

After the Daud coup we intensified our work in the armed forces. Our party leadership had always given them much attention. The party had always schooled comrades wearing the uniform, had educated them politically and ideologically. This task was made easier by the fact that numerous officers came from peasant or working-class families and, with few exceptions, were not linked with the ruling class by their social origin. Members of this class were not ready to accept military discipline with its restrictions. The son of a feudal lord did not aspire to a general's career but rather to a government or diplomatic post. He preferred to become a cabinet minister or an ambassador and to live 'the high life' in Western Europe or America. Not so officers coming from ordinary families. They appreciated the aspirations of the masses and readily joined the party, accepting its ideology and, as members of an organized party of society, the party discipline. Anger and protest grew fast both in the army and in society as the Daud regime closely associated with home and foreign reaction.

The masses prepared to rise. Their living standards were declining fast. People left their families in search of work; over one million Afghans migrated to Iran alone. This meant that we were losing a huge labor force to the detriment of the national economy. The authorities were badly discredited in the eyes of the population and isolated from it, with the result that their orders and instructions were ignored. In the social, economic and political situation, that was shaping, it was a most important fact that throughout those 13 or 14 years we had been working actively among the masses, leading the popular movement. Our party's 50,000 members and close sympathizers were an impressive force on the eve of the revolution and this, of course, frightened the regime. Terror and repression against our comrades were stepped up shortly before the regime fell. The people's finest sons were jailed, and some of them were put to death.

We felt that the same was in store for the PDPA leadership, for the party leader, Noor Mohammad Taraki, and so forewarned our comrades and colleagues in the armed forces, telling them that they should regard his arrest as the signal for action against the Daud clique. When members of the CC PDPA and Cde. Taraki himself were jailed or put under house arrest the mortal danger threatening the party and the country became only too obvious. The arrest was a clear sign. In conformity with the plan and the instruction received from Cde. Taraki, Cde. Hafizullah Amin, one of the party leaders, ordered the beginning of the revolutionary uprising led by the PDPA. The operation was so well organized that it ended in victory in broad daylight. It took a very short time — a mere ten hours — and involved very few casualties. Contrary to the allegations of the imperialist

press, it was by no means a military coup but a revolution backed by the population and the patriotic majority of the Army.

Hearing the news of the revolution over the radio, hundreds of thousands of people all over Afghanistan took to the streets to demonstrate their support for the new, popular power. The people received with great enthusiasm the declaration of the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on the basic lines of its activity intended to consolidate the gains of the national-democratic revolution and accomplish its strategic tasks.[4]

Our revolution is of a new type. It has proved that if a people accepts a progressive ideology and an organization corresponding to it; if a party of the finest sons of the peasantry and the working class has been formed and is fighting right and 'left'-wing opportunism in its ranks; if it is working in the armed forces, promoting a progressive ideology among the military; and if the military are of peasant or working-class origin, a revolution carried out by the finest sons of the people can achieve victory. In Afghanistan the revolution was accomplished by one party, the vanguard party of the working class. The Central Committee of the PDPA authorized the Revolutionary Council to manage national affairs. As for the Council itself and the government formed by the Council, they work under the guidance of the party CC. Speaking generally, the best party cadres are taking part in government. Take, for instance, provincial governors. They, too, are members of the PDPA and its Central Committee. Nor are they operating by themselves but with the support of the respective provincial party committee, which submits proposals to government agencies, with the governor's consent, regarding appointments to government posts. The party pursues its policy through government bodies. The CC presents various problems to the government, which discusses them and makes appropriate decisions.

The tasks facing the country are enormous. They are determined by the character of our revolution, by the fact that it has taken place in a society dominated socially and economically by a feudal system. This being so, our aim is to eliminate feudalism as speedily and completely as possible and to effect democratic changes. The chief problem at this stage is that of land, for land reform is the main content of our revolution.

Our heritage in the sphere of agrarian relations and farming is distressing. The country has 14 million hectares of arable land but in the past it only cultivated 3.3 million hectares. Nearly half of the land belongs to feudal lords (five per cent of the population), who also own the water resources, seed and implements. The landless account for 36 per cent of the rural population, and the small holders (owning less

than four hectares each) make up 45 per cent. Add to this the two or three million nomads living a very hard life.

It is perfectly clear that in these circumstances the land reform is of strategic importance. And it is equally important to take preparatory tactical steps paving the way for the reform. This includes the problem of organizing the peasants, of encouraging their independent activity and initiative. We have many problems of this kind. To solve them is all the more essential since ours will be a genuinely democratic agrarian reform in the interests of the peasants and with their direct participation.

The revolutionary state took the first step toward effecting agrarian changes by issuing Decree 6, which remitted the debts (plus interest on them) owed by landless peasants and small holders to feudal lords and usurers. The working people of the countryside have regained the land mortgaged by them. Over 11.5 million landless and land-hungry peasants have been relieved of the burden of usury.

The people welcomed the decree as further proof that ours is their party and their state working for their good. At the same time, the measure led to intensified class struggle in rural Afghanistan and helped make headway toward organizing the peasants.

We have adopted two charters setting up peasants' mutual aid funds and rural cooperatives. From now on, peasants can obtain aid from the fund and those who belong to a cooperative, from the agricultural bank.

The revolution is doing much to settle the national question. We have proclaimed the equality of the peoples inhabiting our country — the Pashtuns, Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hazaras and smaller ethnic groups. Our party's policy in this respect was also known before. We have always been against all national oppression, for the exercise of the right to use one's native tongue and to native culture, against religious discrimination. And now the people can see for themselves that we are actually implementing this program. Formerly the Uzbeks had no newspaper in their language but now they have one. The Pashtuns, Hazaras, Tajiks, Uzbeks and members of other nationalities are working shoulder to shoulder on the PDPA Central Committee and in the government. They hold high government positions. The culture of Afghanistan's peoples is publicized through the mass media.

We have said that we respect the principles of Islam and do not prevent anybody from performing religious rites. We do not intend to interfere in religious affairs. We are backed by believers, by truly religious people. Like their leaders, they say, for instance, that Decree 6 (remitting peasants' debts) is a 'truly religious act,' and they have voiced their support for it in their prayers in mosques. Not so Moslem leaders linked with imperialism and reaction. Our policy goes

plainly against the grain with them. But they can do nothing, for the masses are not on their side and the government has the full support of the people and the armed forces, among whom our party's influence is absolute.

Lastly, a word about social and economic development since the revolution. Our five-year plan will become effective at the end of the first quarter of 1979 and work is under way on industrialization plans. Since people's rule was established, considerable efforts have been made to solve economic problems. Among other things, coal production has gone up sharply and there is a substantial increase in oil und gas production. We have built 110 new schools and published and distributed about one million textbooks. Appropriations for public education amount to three million afghanis. We have cut the prices of food and other necessities, granted some low-paid categories higher pay, reduced working hours and created more jobs.

Our principal concern is the working man, for it is in his name and for his good that the revolution has been carried out. For nearly 15 years we declared that we were the party of the working class, its vanguard. Today we are proving this by deeds.

1. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan borders on the Soviet Union, China India, Pakistan and Iran. It has an area of 655,000 sq. km. and a population of over 18 million. Its capital is Kabul (740,000 inhabitants). The country's natural riches include coal, iron and chromium ore, copper, gold and silver. — *Ed.*

2. The Treaty of Gandamak (1879) deprived Afghanistan of foreign political independence and granted the British the right to control Afghan home policy. — *Ed.*

3. Close relative of the King, Prime Minister from 1953 to 1963. After the 1973 coup, he assumed the leadership of the country but left the order based on feudal exploitation intact. — *Ed.*

4. In the home policy sphere the government announced the following social and economic program: carrying out a democratic land reform; strengthening the state sector of the economy: democratizing the state apparatus; settling the national question on democratic principles; ending neo-colonialist and imperialist influence; ridding the state apparatus of counter-revolutionary and anti-democratic elements and of persons opposed to the interests of the people and country; strengthening the army: meeting the economic and professional demands of the Afghan people — workers, peasants, officers and men, artisans, small traders, intellectuals, patriotic clergymen, nomads, the lower and middle class and strata; guaranteeing equal rights for women: establishing control over private investment in industry; stabilizing prices at the requisite level and controlling them in the people's interest; introducing universal, compulsory free elementary education: providing free medical care; taking effective steps to end unemployment. — *Ed.*

Struggle for revolutionary and democratic renewal

Hamid Safari
CC Secretary,
People's Party of Iran

The situation resulting from the mass movement in Iran has been assessed by our party in an article in *World Marxist Review*.[1] Since the middle of September, i.e., when Comrade Eskandari was interviewed by the journal, important new elements have appeared. The prolonged operation of several factors resulting from the socio-economic strategy and domestic and foreign policy of the rabidly reactionary and despotic regime has given the democratic movement a dimension unprecedented in the last 25 years.

Despite the Shah's widely trumpeted economic measures of the last 10-15 years (what the bourgeois press calls the 'white revolution'), the only people to profit in our society was a small minority, while living conditions deteriorated for the overwhelming majortiy, eloquent evidence of this is the agrarian reform, the pivot of the 'white revolution.' Its purpose was to create favorable conditions for capitalism in the semi-feudal rural areas and somewhat modify the regime's socio-economic base. The reform did not and could not abolish large estates or give land to the rural poor. To this day the majority of the peasants have either no land at all or no more than tiny plots. But the Shah and his family, the army and police élite, the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie own huge estates. The capitalist agrarian reform has had tragic socio-econmic consequences — poverty and mass migration to the cities (500,000 annually) and a bruising crisis in agriculture. Sixty-five thousand villages have been reduced to the verge of ruin, farm production is either making no headway or is dropping, and a country that once had a thriving food exporting industry is now forced to import wheat, rice, meat and other food.

Iran's chief wealth, oil, was used for anything but ending the country's economic backwardness or its dependence on the imperialist powers, or raising the people's living standards. The capitalist world's largest oil exporter after Saudi Arabia, Iran has been raking in 20 and more billion dollars annually. But the lion's share of these revenues has gone, first, into the excessively large military expen-

ditures[2] to turn Iran into the leading military power in the Middle East, into boosting the Shah's role as a 'privileged' ally of imperialism, notably U.S. imperialism, and as regional policeman guarding the oil cartels neo-colonialist interest; second, into technological 'modernization,' more for prestige than anything else and far removed from the country's socio-economic realities and needs (for instance, the construction of 20 atomic power plants by 1993); and last, the revenues dissolved in the impassable jungles of corruption thriving in all the economic and political pores of the regime.

Iran's domestic policy is a good example of the government's thoroughly reactionary core. The police methods and mass terror of SAVAK, the assassinations and torture, the flagrant violations of human rights, and the total surveillance practised by SAVAK subdivisions at factories, offices and universities are among the more glaring expamples of this openly repressive system. Ever since the overthrow of the Mossadegh government in 1953 and to this day there has been no legally functioning progressive organization in Iran. Scores of our party activists have been shot, tortured or imprisoned.

It was this policy of the anti-people's pro-imperialist regime that finally led to the eruption of mass discontent that had been simmering among the people. Although at this writing it is still difficult to make a comprehensive analysis of this turbulent stage of the movement, the following aspects are clear.

— The movement has disclosed the moral and political isolation of this decaying monarchy. There is no effective social force in the country today defending the monarchy. The nationwide disaffection with the existing order that had been built up over the 40 years of the Shah's autocratic rule has forced him even to dissolve the official Rastakhiz Party and now the regime can rely only on its own instruments of repression — the army and police.

— Notwithstanding the religious overtones generated by objective and subjective factors, the movement is mainly social and political. Most active in it are industrial and office workers and the urban youth, with students and intellectuals setting the pace. With their high level of political awareness these social groups have put forward not only economic demands, many of which the situation forced the regime to concede, but also radical political demands such as repeal of martial law, release of all political prisoners, freedom of speech, the press, assembly and of parties; disbandment of SAVAK; annulment of treaties and agreements with the imperialist powers and the expulsion of their military and civilian advisors.

— The industrial workers, particularly their most tightly organized contingent, the oil workers, and also office employees, teachers, and other categories demonstrated their strong militancy. The powerful

wave of strikes in October-November 1978 made it clear that the working people had rejected the trade union leaders foisted upon them by the regime and were standing for their class and national interests. This significant fact will undoubtedly influence the further development of our liberation and class struggle.

— Moreover, the events disclosed essential weaknesses in the people's democratic movement such as the relative political inertness of the peasants compared with the intensity of the urban struggle. It became apparent that the masses lacked a determined and efficient leadership. These shortcomings are unquestionably the result of the many years of tyrannical rule by Iran's hard-line reactionaries. This does not, however, make the tasks of the democratic forces any easier.

In early November the Shah installed a military government headed by General Azhari, thereby admitting that the monarchy was maintained solely by force of arms. Significantly, its first step was to ban the leading newspapers, thus sharply curtailing the influx of information. Martial laws was enforced more strictly and the authorities arrested the well-known writer Beh Azin, many progressive journalists, and leaders of the opposition National Front,[3] K. Sanjabi and D. Foruhar.

The formation of a military cabinet did not mean the regime was no longer attempting to influence events in its favor, ease political tensions and resolve the crisis on the Shah's conditions. Our party feels it would be a mistake to underestimate the political strength of the reactionaries, for their strength depends on the support the Shah gets from U.S. imperialism and from his allies in our part of the world — Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Israel, and other countries. Over the past five years the United States has sold Iran ten billion dollars' worth of military hardware and this flow is to increase in the immediate future — U.S. commitments are estimated at 12 billion dollars. There are 80,000 U.S. advisors in Iran with at least half that number employed on military contracts. Small wonder that President Carter recently declared the United States would be 'disturbed' if the present regime in Iran should fall, while one Presidential assistant admitted that Washington 'had plans covering all possible contingencies.'

Apparently, these are imperialist plans of military intervention in Iran's internal affairs. This would be a flagrant violation of international law and could have serious consequences. Our party is grateful to the Soviet Union for its stand, which was stated by Leonid Brezhnev, who said that the Soviet Union was 'against any foreign interference in the internal affairs of Iran by anyone, in any form and under any pretext.'[4] At this crucial period the Soviet Union has thus

reiterated its principled position by denouncing the interventionist intentions of the imperialists.

This tense confrontation between the people and the reactionary forces is the internal affair of Iran alone. It is clear to the whole world that the people of Iran are pressing for radical political and socio-economic reforms, and regardless of changes in the situation, this basic factor will determine developments in our country.

November 21, 1978

1 See Iradj Eskandari. 'The Iranian regime in crisis.' *WMR*, November 1978, British edition.

2 By 1980 the Shah plans to have his more than 400,000-strong armed forces equipped with 3,000 tanks, 700 planes and 60 naval vessels.

3 An association of several political parties with nationalistic and democratic platforms. — *Ed.*

4 *Pravda*, November 19, 1978.

The question of confidence

Professor *Gerhard Kade* (FRG)

REFLECTIONS ON THE PROSPECTS FOR DETENTE

The question of confidence in bourgeois parliamentary practice is usually an act designed to establish whether the government or one of its members enjoy the confidence of the majority. Now and again, government crises and an atmosphere of no-confidence result as soon as the question of confidence is brought up.

But the question of confidence which I intend to consider should produce results that are the opposite of crises and mistrust and should unite instead of dividing.

What I want to consider is the ways and means to be used in developing cooperation between countries with different social systems, and the premises for it.

Helsinki principles

The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe formulated the basic international-law norms for political relations and ethical rules whose observance by all the par-

The author is a prominent public figure. a member of the Steering Bureau of the Committee for Peace, Disarmament and Cooperation of the FRG, and Vice-President of the Vienna International Institute of Peace.

ticipating states (including my own country, the FRG) is a necessary premise for further progress. I have in mind the ten basic principles formulated in Basket One (Security) guiding relations between participating states, 'irrespective of their political, economic or social systems as well as of their size, geographical location or level of economic development. . . .'

The importance of the Final Act was reaffirmed in the communiqué issued by the 1978 Belgrade meeting. At the same time, the events at Belgrade and after showed that attempts are still being made to rewrite and reverse the policy of détente. One such attempt was the recent decision by the U.S. President on the production of the main components of the neutron bomb.

Unfortunately, some '*real* politicians' in the NATO countries think that such acts and blackmail, launched by them or with their tacit consent, are 'no more than a diplomatic game of chess,' a kind of bargaining round.

The facts show how dangerous such games are. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how one can square with the spirit of Helsinki the fact that a new bomb is planted at the door of one of the states taking part in the talks on cooperation and security. This is quite obviously a terroristic act of blackmail, which the same NATO politicians tend to condemn in other cases. Terrorism in politics is incompatible either with the spirit or the letter of Helsinki. Apart from the danger which such atomic-weapons rattling presents to mankind (and the neutron bomb, despite all the efforts to whitewash it in the style of the best advertising by U.S. detergent makers, is just such a weapon, and it is even more dangerous than 'conventional' atomic bombs), one should ask: how does this agree with the U.S. President's so highly extolled morality and ethics?

I think that Western politicians, those at any rate who are capable of taking a sober view of events, should by now have understood that these attempts to blackmail the Soviet Union or other socialist countries, like all the efforts to interfere in their domestic affairs, are doomed to fail. The Helsinki countries undertook 'to refrain from any intervention, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating state, regardless of their mutual relations.' That is why acts which contradict the spirit and letter of the Final Act, could only push the détente into a dead-end or freeze it.

Accordingly, I think, abandonment of any attempts at blackmail and unconditional recognition of the ten Helsinki principles, wholly and severally, must be the primary basis of any further advance. Let us recall these principles: I. Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; II. Refraining from the threat or use of force;

III. Inviolability of frontiers; IV. Territorial integrity of states; V. Peaceful settlement of disputes; VI. Non-intervention in internal affairs; VII. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; VIII. Equal rights and self-determination of peoples; IX, Cooperation among states; and X. Fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law.

We find that these ten commandments by which the peoples could live in peace and accord have already been formulated. What then needs to be done to establish them in day-to-day relations among states? Here we come up to a point which induces us to clarify yet another matter relating to the basic conditions for further advances in détente. What I have in mind is the problem of backing up the political détente with a military détente.

Chief measures to strengthen trust

Diverse politicians, especially the right-wingers, in the Federal Republic are prepared to consider anything as 'strengthening confidence' in the inter-state East-West relations, except disarmament, the question which is of paramount importance for Europe and the rest of the world.

It is true that in the recent period the CDU and CSU have modified their tactics and are now trying not to act as too rabid opponents of Helsinki, as they did earlier on. Still, considering their attitude to the U.S. neutron bomb, the observer will easily draw the conclusion that their activity, which is hostile to the Helsinki understandings, has not been reduced. CSU Chairman Franz Josef Strauss says that even Carter is not taking a tough enough line, and that he has not got the qualities of a leader. The anti-communist hysteria, among certain circles closely linked with the arms business in spirit, and the urge for profit are boundless.

No one will deny that the seeds of European cooperation sown at Helsinki could simultaneously sprout in many places. Cooperation is as multi-faceted as life itself. But these shoots can develop and flower only if the soil is thoroughly cleared of poisonous substances in advance. Mistrust is one such poison produced by the armaments policy and refusal to have disarmament. There is no doubt that it has blocked and slowed down many opportunities for advancing mutually advantageous cooperation among states with different social systems along a broad front in various spheres, be it the economy, transport, protection of the environment, science or culture.

Of course, mistrust which has, in addition, been accumulating for a long time, cannot be removed by fiat or persuasion. The situation is much more complicated. The peace movement is faced with a powerful military-industrial complex, which has self-seeking aims and

whose power directly or indirectly determines the acts of the governments of many capitalist countries. Besides, there are many politicians in Western Europe and other regions who pay lip service to political détente or even act in favor of it, but who, for the most diverse reasons, want to maintain military strength and frequently even to increase it, on the assumption that this is required for economic or ideological reasons, or for reasons of prestige or anti-communism.

On the other hand, the fact that for more than a quarter-century the United States has not been alone in possession of unprecedentedly devastating weapons has forced the NATO leadership to give serious thought to the possibility of self-destruction in the event of a nuclear-missile war.

Consequently, there are some objective possibilities and even some necessity for limiting the danger and reducing mistrust. This is expressed, in particular, in the fact that over the past several years nearly 20 arms limitation agreements have been signed. And although the arms race has not been resolutely stemmed, there is no doubt that these agreements have had a favorable effect on the overall political climate. Conversely, in accordance with the inner logic of things, further progress in disarmament now provides the key for opening wider the doors to cooperation and trust among states with different social systems.

Recent experience shows that without further détente in the military field and without effective steps toward disarmament, there will be a lack of the necessary measure of trust, which is a must for political détente and cooperation on a world scale: armament breeds mistrust, disarmament breeds trust. Even some of the Helsinki countries have yet to realize that that is something they had also signed. Although disarmament questions were not on the agenda of the Helsinki Conference, the Final Act says the following: 'The participating states recognize the interest of all of them in efforts aimed at lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament which are designed to complement political détente in Europe and to strengthen their security.'

The answer to the question of what should be done first of all to build up confidence is to secure decisive progress in 'efforts aimed at lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament.' The peace movement can and must make a contribution to this effort. The adversaries of détente must be vigorously rebuffed. The idea that mankind does not need new weapons systems but a full-scale system for ensuring peace cannot be realized without intense effort. Only as a result of action by means of which the tight knot of armaments can be loosened and then untied is it possible to create opportunities for

meeting the requirements of men and women in worldwide progressive contacts and joint endeavor in improving life and making rational use of the riches of the world for the benefit of all the nations.

Obstacles must be removed

Who has been blocking the way to disarmament and greater confidence? NATO's political language itself shows how little importance it attaches to disarmament. Let us note that in NATO the talk is frequently about control of armaments and not control of disarmament. Some circles would want not only to maintain the 'balance of terror' for all time, but also to change it in their own favor.[1] This applies not only to the military-industrial complex of the United States but also, regrettably, to influential circles in the FRG, which seek to have new rounds in the arms race so as to practise aggressive blackmail against the Soviet Union.

Kai Uwe von Hassel, Bundestag deputy and President of the Consultative Assembly of the Western European Union, made in Kiel one of his notorious statements about the neutron bomb: 'So this is a weapon for maintaining peace. Its inclusion in the arsenal of defensive weapons on European territory is inevitable.' He painted a terrifying picture of 40,000 Soviet tanks, which he intends to stop along the most 'forward' lines, and attacked the idea of disarmament as a concession to the 'spirit of the times, whose spread is being promoted by the massive propaganda effort of the Soviet Union and its friends.' Add to this the statement by Werner Marx, von Hassel's party colleague, at a forum discussing policy issues in West Berlin (September 22-24, 1977), and it will be clear what that trend is. Dr. Werner Marx declared that 'the legal substantiation of boundaries cannot be derived either from the inner German basic treaty (meaning the Treaty on the Principles of Relations between the FRG and the sovereign GDR — *G.K.*), nor from the Eastern treaties. It is necessary . . . to say that the German question remains open and that the common German state membership is not a subject we care to discuss.'

Such statements mirror the true political motives of the opponents of disarmament in the FRG, the reasons for their demagogic moves, the lies about the 'threat from the East,' which NATO has been most assiduously spreading whenever it needs to justify new outlays on arms and to adopt new weapons systems. In this context, even the timely and reasonable warning sounded over the neutron bomb by the head of the Soviet state, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev, is regarded by such politicians as a 'dark threat.'[2]

Characteristically, the above statements contained a clear 'linkage' between allegedly 'inevitable' armament, including the neutron

bomb, and non-recognition of borders, above all the borders with the GDR, which have been guaranteed by international-law treaties and the Helsinki Final Act.[3]

It is hard to imagine the danger that would arise for world security if certain aggressive circles in the FRG could gradually edge their way, via NATO's back door, to the right to dispose of mass destruction weapons. Let us recall that Strauss once characterized — and this was not only his personal opinion — the possession of nuclear weapons as the 'criterion' of the FRG's genuine independence, and this will show the even greater hazards that stem from the inducements behind business deals, like the sale of nuclear reactors to Brazil, or the construction of a rocket testing ground in Zaire.

The magazine *Die Neue Gesellschaft* carried an article entitled '1978 Issues' by Herbert Wehner, Chairman of the SDPG group in the Bundestag, who pointed to the dangers which, he feels, confront the FRG: 'The danger lies in an imperceptible takeover of power by those who want to return the German people to the cold-war atmosphere of the 50s, thereby undermining the Federal Republic's possibility, which is based on East-West treaties, of taking an active part in ensuring peace.'

This makes it all the more incomprehensible why leading SDPG politicians make a point of covering up those who seek to violate these treaties, just when there is the need for a clear-cut stand meeting the interests of the people. This applies to the intention to keep the German issue 'open' (SDPG Minister Franke), and the attitude to the neutron bomb, on which there was first a series of shifts between 'yes' and 'no,' subsequently followed, after some tactical delays, by publicly voiced support for President Carter on behalf of the FRG coalition government with respect to the U.S. bomb plan. That is why there was no display of immediate interest in Bonn in an agreement between the United States and the USSR on a mutual renunciation of the neutron bomb, as Leonid Brezhnev has long since proposed, but instead loud support, together with the rightist forces of every stripe, for the futile attempt to blackmail the Soviet Union by including the subject in the current arms limitation talks.

Shortly before his visit to Bonn, Leonid Brezhnev proposed the discussion of some measures aimed to create the conditions for subsequent arms and troop cuts by repudiating any increase in them: an end to the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons, a ban on and an end to the manufacture of all other types of mass destruction weapons, an end to the development of new types of conventional weapons with great destructive force, renunciation by the permanent members of the Security Council and their allies of any increases in armies or conventional armaments.

This stand of the USSR, reaffirmed at the 10th Special UN General Assembly, its declaration of readiness not to start making neutron weapons so long as the United States refrained from doing likewise, its accession to the international treaty of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in Latin America, and its assurance that for a long time it has not enlarged its armed forces and has no intention of increasing them in the future, all of this (and not for the first time either) has demonstrated the Soviet Union's will to ensure universal peace and is, simultaneously, a considerable unilateral concession on its part.

It is time the politicians in the NATO countries stopped tagging as 'propaganda' and shelving the numerous proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries for concrete steps toward disarmament, which, incidentally, largely coincide with the desire of many non-aligned and developing countries and are supported by all the peace and democratic forces of the world. It is time these politicians put these proposals to the test. Of course, this should be done on the long-accepted principle of parity and equal security of the parties. After all it is not reasonable to expect the socialist countries to abandon their defense might, for which they have sacrificed so much, without similar acts by the other side. The principle of undiminished security of all states involved in disarmament measures meets the interests of the peace and democratic forces. That is the only possible basis for progress, for it is only on the basis of equal security that new agreements on disarmament can help to overcome the obstacles being thrown up by its opponents.

Need to change approach

It should be realized that there is no reasonable alternative to the joint building of a peaceful world. In order to be effective, peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and their peaceful competition need more than the mere absence of war, so long as, say, subversions and diverse discriminations remain. If the mad arms race is to be stopped, there must be a complete break with the old categories of thinking. It is clear, after all, that cooperation between the two systems cannot be very broad if its participants keep coming up against mines and have constantly to be on the alert for atomic traps.

Of course, one could depict as a realistic utopia diverse and extensive opportunities for cooperation among states with different social systems, its long-term prospects, and the consequent possible benefits for men and states, for trade and travel, and for the flourishing of culture. But I deliberately dwell in greater detail on the potentialities of cooperation and the obstacles in the way as seen by a citizen of the Federal Republic.

Since August 1970 (the signing of the Moscow Treaty), the policy of détente has brought benefits to both sides. From 1970 to 1977, foreign trade increased 5.5-fold. Roughly 1,500 firms in the Federal Republic are involved in commercial and cooperation ties with the Soviet Union. The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation has never had any reason to complain that the Soviet Union or other East European countries have not been prompt in repaying their credits. The Soviet Union has supplied not only raw materials but also manufactures, ranging from hydrofoil ships and electronic equipment to medical devices. Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the Federal Republic has also given a considerable impetus in this field.

In the past few years, trade with the socialist countries has noticeably helped to ensure employment. That is undoubtable. But there remain vast untapped potentialities in the economic field, and these could go to benefit our country.

When I read Leonid Brezhnev's speech at a young people's forum[4] in which he said that just now one million square kilometres (or roughly the territory of Spain, Britain and Italy taken together) is being economically developed and settled only in the Ob River area of Siberia, I could not help thinking about the jobless young people in the Federal Republic who have to start out in life without occupational training.

Economic cooperation helps to deepen the détente and to enhance the guarantees of peace. It has been and is increasingly the key element of peaceful coexistence between the two systems. It is not surprising, there, that the enemies of détente have given this field of relations almost as much attention as the problems of disarmament.

Nor have they shunned the basest means and ignored the facts and elementary logic. Thus, they claim that the volume of trade between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union is too small to be of any importance for the FRG, and in the next breath express the fear that the FRG is becoming economically dependent on the Soviet Union. They voice doubts about the USSR's credit-worthiness and simultaneously complain of the Soviet sales of gold on Western money markets. And again and again they float the famous myth about the allegedly 'ill-intentioned and naive' Social-Democratic-Liberal ruling coalition in Bonn salvaging the Soviet Union from economic chaos.

Here, as on disarmament problems, these notions are rooted, in particular, in the diehard anti-communism and in the survivals of the old stereotypes of thinking. Although historical experience shows that the socialist countries have existed and have been capable of developing even in an almost total economic blockade by the capitalist world, the notorious hawks in our economic circles still imagine that they can use trade as a means of political pressure.

Of course, one can claim that the U.S. 'way of life' is the only right one, but it is improper to seek forcibly to impose it on others. After all, the states of existing socialism refuse artificially to export their revolution, their system, to impose their system on other countries against their will, and they have repeatedly reaffirmed this.

In the United States, 'fair play' falls just short of being an ideology. Politicians love to talk about 'fair play.' But in that case, this idea should include the notion of fair play for the other side in peaceful economic competition and cooperation between the two systems. How can this 'fair play' be squared with the crafty plan of imposing on the USSR by means of a fresh round in the arms race economic burdens to slow down the rise in the living standards of a people which, as everyone knows, suffered the greatest losses in the fight to liberate mankind from Hitler's fascism.

Via disarmament to trust and cooperation

The fact that the scientific and technical revolution in the second half of this century has produced within the framework of both social systems a number of similar interests helping to limit the danger of war does not, of course, mean that the problem of war and peace will be solved of itself. But this has given the forces of peace, democracy and social progress additional opportunities for advancing the political and military détente and disarmament. A fresh impetus in this direction has been given by the Special UN General Assembly.

Much importance now attaches to the preparations for the World Conference on Disarmament, which could adopt binding decisions, and that is why it should be attended by all the countries, including the United States and China, which have up to now strongly resisted its convocation. Military-budget cuts also appear to be a very urgent measure on disarmament, as this would help to release large-scale material and financial resources to stimulate socio-economic development and solve global problems, like protection of the environment, provision of energy and and the drive against disease. Some of the money could also be used to help developing countries. Disarmament could ease mankind's economic and social problems and help to solve them to the extent to which the social system makes it possible to do so.

The special importance of the Helsinki Conference lies in the fact that it covers the politically most important region of the globe, where the chief political and military forces of the two different social systems face each other. One could assume that the good example in backing up the political détente with a military détente in this region would have a moral and practical influence on the rest of the world.

Here is the alternative: destroy mankind or destroy armaments.

The answer lies in ensuring peace — not through terror but through disarmament and advance to greater confidence and better cooperation between all the nations, regardless of their social systems.

1. This will be seen, in particular, from the results of the NATO Council meeting in Washington last May, which adopted a plan to build up and modernize weapons virtually up to the end of the century. — *Ed.*

2. See, *Die Welt,* January 23, 1978.

3. Under Article Three of the Treaty between the USSR and the FRG, concluded in August 1970, both parties, for instance, recognize that peace in Europe can be maintained only provided that no on will encroach on the existing borders. 'They undertake scrupulously to observe the territorial integrity of all the states in Europe within their present borders.'

'They declare that they have no territorial claims whatsoever on anyone, and will not make such claims in the future.

'They regard as inviolable, now and in the future, the borders of all the states in Europe as running on the day of the signing of the present Treaty, including the Oder-Neisse line, which is the Western border of the Polish People's Republic, and the border between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.'

4. His speech at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Young Communist League on April 25, 1978. — *Ed.*

Threat to peace in the South Atlantic

Dialogue between *Julio Laborde*, CC member, Communist Party of Argentina, and *Essop Pahad*, South African journalist.

Imperialism's dangerous actions, which are escalating tension in various regions, the neo-colonialist offensive mounted in Africa[1] by U.S.-led NATO circles, and the attempts to form new military blocs are causing anxiety in the world. A case in point is the militarist project for a new military group in the South Atlantic, which is to be called the South Atlantic Treaty Organization (SATO) by analogy with NATO.

A bit of history

Pahad: I would suggest, for a start that, we take a quick look at the history of the issue.

Laborde: It would indeed be useful to recall that the first steps to set up an aggressive military-political bloc and thereby place the armed forces of Latin American states under U.S. control were taken more than 30 years ago. I have in mind the 1947 Inter-American Mutual Assistance Treaty (also known as the Rio de Janeiro Treaty).

Under the terms of that treaty its signatories pledged to assist any American state in the continent's 'security zone' demarcated by them to 'repulse aggression.' I should like to underscore two distinctive features of the Rio de Janeiro Treaty. The first is that geographically it is not confined to the American continent (North and South). In Article 9 the definition of aggression covers not only armed attack on the territory and population of any signatory state and on its armed forces but also 'invasion of a region under the effective jurisdiction of another state.' Since the USA is the only American state with territory and bases in foreign countries, the signatory states may be drawn into an armed conflict in any part of the world where U.S. imperialist interests are threatened.

Pahad: Would it be correct to say that in some sense the Rio de Janeiro Treaty is the prototype of the aggressive blocs subsequently fashioned by the USA in other parts of the world?

Laborde: Yes, indeed. Besides, the treaty's second distinctive feature directly bearing on our subject is that the eastern boundary of the 'security zone' runs from Greenland across the Atlantic, and includes the South Atlantic.

The U.S. imperialists give that zone their unremitting attention. The question of forming a military bloc there was considered by the Inter-American Defense Council in 1957, while since 1960 the navies of the leading Latin American South Atlantic states have been conducting regular exercises jointly with the U.S. Navy under the command of U.S. admirals. This was approximately when the propaganda campaign for SATO was stepped up. At a conference of four admirals — George Ellis (who was then in command of U.S. naval forces in the South Atlantic), James Sagerholm (who succeeded Ellis), Brazil's Minister of the Navy Geraldo de Azevedo Henning, and Emilio Massera, then Commander-in-Chief of the Argentine Navy — at the Belgrano naval base in 1976 it was declared that 'only three countries, whose culture and traditions make them part of the Western world, are so sited geographically as to enable them to play a significant role in controlling and defending this zone (the South Atlantic. — *Ed.*). They are Argentina, Brazil and South Africa.'[2]

Pahad: In South Africa, too, they are campaigning for a South Atlantic bloc. The efforts in that direction have been stepped up appreciably of late. I should like to accentuate the fact noted by you, Comrade Laborde, that Western imperialist circles, chiefly of the USA, have been and remain the main architects of the contemplated bloc.

Imperialism's interest in the South Atlantic

Pahad: Imperialism has long been endeavoring to dominate the Atlantic, but lately the imperialists of the USA and other industrialized

capitalist powers have become apprehensive of the events that have taken place in Southern Africa. Today this whole region is in ferment. The oppressed Black masses, driven to desperation by their deteriorating political and economic condition, are drawing inspiration from the freedom won by their brothers in the North. Ever larger numbers of oppressed people are having recourse to an armed struggle against the racist regimes.

South Africa, regarded by the West as its most dependable bastion in Africa, is becoming a weak link in the system of imperialist rule. Precisely for that reason, despite the UN resolution calling for a boycott of the racist South African regime, the NATO members continue to help it reinforce its military potential on a massive scale. Take France. In 1967-75 it was South Africa's largest supplier of armaments, annually selling it military equipment worth one billion francs.[3] In 1976 South Africa purchased a further large consignment of military equipment, of which 20 per cent came from the FRG.[4] For many years Israel has been supplying South Africa with patrol boats and small arms.

Laborde: At this point, I think, we should note that while extending military assistance to the racist regimes and furthering their political and military interests, the imperialist powers have their eye chiefly on capitalism's holy of holies. I mean profit.

Pahad: Unquestionably. In South Africa, for instance, the USA and the Common Market states have colossal investments. At the close of 1976 U.S. investments in that country amounted to $1,665 million, or almost 40 per cent of the total American investments in Africa.[5] British investments add up to roughly $5,000 million. France, the FRG, and Israel have likewise invested heavily in South Africa. Moreover, these nations are the largest importers of South African primary materials. The USA, for example, covers more than 90 per cent of its cobalt and chrominium requirements with imports from South Africa, while the FRG is entirely dependent on South Africa for its uranium, antimony, chrominium, gold, cobalt, copper and other minerals.

Laborde: For that very reason the victory of the peoples of Angola and Mozambique and the mounting national-liberation struggle in Rhodesia and South Africa have compelled U.S. imperialism and the NATO circles to look for ways of bolstering their shaken influence in the South Atlantic, which is of major strategic significance. I feel that the projects for the South Atlantic Treaty Organization should be considered in a broader context. Analogous attempts are to be observed in some other regions, for instance, the Middle East and the Red Sea.

A point that must be made is that of itself the existence of military

bases cannot halt the revolutionary process. The USA had and still has bases in the Caribbean, but that did not prevent the victory of the Cuban revolution, the building of socialism in that country, or the upswing of the revolutionary liberation movement in Latin America. The U.S. military bases in the north-eastern extremity of Brazil, the Azores and continental Portugal could do nothing to prevent the victory of the Portuguese revolution and the liberation of the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and other countries. All this is what compels U.S. imperialism in its efforts to stem the anti-imperialist and national-liberation movement, to extend the sphere of its activities and, in addition to maintaining the military bases scattered throughout the world, reinforce existing military blocs and form new ones in regions regarded as most vulnerable from the angle of the interests of the imperialist powers.

Pahad: In my opinion, imperialism and the NATO circles regard Africa as one of these regions. At the NATO Council session in Washington Carter pressed for Africa's inclusion in that bloc's sphere of operation. This issue was brought up also at the NATO symposium on naval problems in Annapolis, USA. NATO Secretary-General Joseph Luns, Admiral Kidd, Supreme Allied Commander (Atlantic) and others urged extending the boundaris of NATO's southern flank beyond the Tropic of Cancer.

The NATO leaders are acting on their words. U.S., British, and French naval units have spread their operations to the south of the Tropic of Cancer. With the developments in Zaire as their pretext, the NATO leaders embarked upon direct intervention in Shaba Province, counting, apart from everything else, on intimidating the patriotic forces of South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia, and ensuring NATO's permanent presence by involving Southern Africa in the 'Atlantic' plans.

The USA has made it plain that support for South Africa's defense system was consonant with its interests. In South Africa the USA maintains a missile-tracking system, while NASA has a space-tracking station. They have now drawn up a project, code-named Advocate, under which South Africa is to have a tracking system to collect intelligence in a huge territory covering the entire African continent, the South Atlantic and the Indian Ocean for transmission to the British Admiralty and U.S. Naval Headquarters. The codes used for gathering information are classified and known only to the NATO strategists. This and the fact that the Silvermine complex in South Africa keeps NATO and the Pentagon informed of the movement of all ships in that region are evidence that classified information is exchanged regularly between NATO and South Africa.

A noteworthy point is that the imperialists are trying to camouflage

the aggressive nature of their 'Atlantic' plans for South Africa and the south of Latin America with the assertion that these regions are menaced by the 'Marxist revolutions in Angola and Mozambique,' by the 'communist threat.' Again and again they drag out the 'Soviet menace' myth, to which they have added the somewhat fresher 'Cuban threat' myth.

The actual aims of this myth-fabrication

Laborde: This is indeed symptomatic. By demanding an 'extension of the NATO zone of responsibility,' the American General Haig, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, sought to unnerve public opinion with the bogey of a 'real and growing' Soviet and Cuban 'threat.' The generals and politicians are making a show of anxiety over an alleged threat to sea communications. Here, for instance, is what the Argentinian bourgeois newspaper *La Nacion* wrote in an article headed 'Marine Strategy in the South Atlantic.' I quote: 'People versed in marine strategy believe that the influence of the pro-Soviet bloc in Angola, together with its influence in Guinea, give the Soviet Union two splendid strong points that imperil the oil route round the Cape of Good Hope, which is vital to Western interests. Furthermore, this situation is fraught with a latent but nonetheless real threat to the similarly vital sea route along the eastern coast of South America, which connects the two parts of the American continent via the Strait of Magellan and Cape Horn... Moreover, marine strategists indicate that the Soviet Navy's great radius of operation and power are, in the event of any conflict in the future, a serious threat even to the Panama Canal.'[6]

Pahad: The purpose of this anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban campaign is quite obvious. The alleged threat from the Soviet naval presence in this region and of Cuban troops in Angola is used in an effort to undermine the trust of the Africans and Latin Americans for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, distort the actual purport of the internationalist aid extended by them to Angola, Ethiopia, and some other African nations, and bring the reactionary regimes in the southern cone of Latin American into an alliance with racist South Africa.

Laborde: The U.S. imperialists are making no secret of this. The U.S. General, Gordon Summer, Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Council, made this clear when he lauded the initiative of the Uruguayan Navy, whose spokesman, Rear Admiral Hugo Marquez, urged setting up SATO by merging the navies of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, and the countries situated on the western seaboard of Southern Africa.

As always when it is a matter of combating the national-liberation

movement, which imperils their economic and political supremacy, it is by no means accidental that the imperialists are having recourse to the ideology of anti-communism. The arguments presented by the Argentinian General Alberto Marini sum up the stance of the proponents, of the reactionary 'holy' alliance of the Latin American dictatorships with South Africa. In the same breath that he called for the defense of the 'heritage of Western Christian civilization' against communism, he pathetically exclaimed (I quote): 'Unless the West helps South Africa . . . it will mean the end of that region. If we let it fall, if we deny it assistance, we shall inevitably lose control of the Indian Ocean, and Europe will become communist in less than a decade. The turn of our America will come next, and only then will we begin to lament our past errors which it will no longer be possible to rectify.'[7]

Pahad: The mass media in our countries eagerly use statements of this kind. But they steadfastly turn a blind eye to the fact that the USSR and other socialist-community countries have no aggressive ambitions, that the internationalist ideals of socialism are consonant with lasting peace, freedom and the equality of nations.

Laborde: Everybody knows that there is not a single Soviet military base in Latin America, for instance. The tales about a 'Soviet threat' are in fact nothing but a smokescreen concealing the tangible imperialist threat to the Cuban revolution and the anti-imperialist movements in the continent.

Pahad: To this I would add that whereas the USA and the other NATO countries want secure communications around Africa, the Soviet Union wants such communications to the same extent. To it they are an important ice-free sea route linking its western and eastern coast. However, the Soviet Union sees the way to security not by continuing the build-up of naval forces, by enlarging existing and building new military bases, but by dismantling such bases, scaling down navies and dimilitarizing whole bodies of water, for instance, the Indian Ocean, where the world's major sea and trade routes cross.

As regards the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and Ethiopia, they are there at the request of victorious peoples to help repulse imperialist conspiracies and aggression.

I strongly feel that the formation of a NATO-type bloc in the South Atlantic under the aegis of the USA would seriously threaten the independent nations of Africa and the liberation movements in the south of the two continents.

Further, the new bloc would strengthen the South African armed forces, whose weak spot is their navy. According to the journal *Jeune Afrique*, in 1976 the South African Navy personnel numbered 4,000. On the other hand, the Brazilian Navy has 49,500 and the Argentin-

ian has 33,000.[8] The integration of the navies of these three nations would create a large naval force in the South Atlantic that could 'respond speedily' to changes uncongenial to the imperialist countries.

A tangible threat to peace

Laborde: I subscribe to the view that what we have here is a move against the revolutionary liberation movement in the 'southern cones' of Latin America and Africa. Imperialism is intent on preventing the example of Cuba and now the examples of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau from spreading. To some extent this is also an attempt to revive the idea of inter-American forces commanded by Pentagon generals and legalize the so-called inter-African forces operating under NATO control. The idea of inter-American forces was embodied partially in 1965, when U.S., Brazilian, Honduran, Nicaraguan and Costa Rican military units took part in crushing the people's patriotic movement in the Dominican Republic. And now, 13 years later, a similar mechanism has been used in Zaire.

It is not easy to deceive our people with the argument that the planned bloc will be purely defensive. A bloc of this kind already exists in Latin America: it is the Central American Defense Council set up in 1964. Its record of suppressing the people's movement in Guatemala, Nicaraguan and other Central American states is well known.

Also alarming is the circumstance that U.S. imperialism accords the principal role in the 'defense' of the South Atlantic to the Brazilian dictatorship, which, to quote Luis Carlos Prestes, 'as the policeman of imperialism has the mission of safeguarding capitalism in the continent by preventing neighboring nations from advancing to socialism.'[9] When the left forces in Uruguay were close to assuming power, the Brazilian dictatorship conceived the 'Thirty Hours' and 'Green Poncho' operations with the purpose of invading that neighboring state. Moreover, Brazil helped to bolster the Pinochet regime in Chile, giving it military and economic assistance at the most crucial moment.

The imperialist claims of the USA, South Africa and some Latin American dictatorships to supremacy in the South Atlantic are a serious threat to world peace, for no country or bloc of countries has any title to jurisdiction on the high seas. Freedom of the high seas means that they are used by all countries jointly. No country has the title to maintain police forces on the high seas.

Pahad: Grave apprehensions are aroused also by the fact that among the countries that have not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons there are so-called nearly-nuclear

states, whose level of research and industrial development places them in a position to manufacture nuclear weapons. Above all, this concerns South Africa. With the help of the FRG, France, and some other Western states South Africa has advanced significantly in the development of uranium-enrichment technology. More, in 1975-76 it purchased enriched uranium from the USA. The South African racists now have all the facilities for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

It will be recalled that in August 1977 the USSR apprised the USA that South Africa was secretly preparing to explode a nuclear device in the Kalahari Desert. On August 9, 1977 TASS carried an official statement to this effect. The USA had to acknowledge that the USSR's apprehensions were justified. Although South Africa, as Carter declared at a press conference, had pledged that 'no nuclear explosive test will be taken . . . now or in the future,'[10] declarations of this kind do not dovetail with the facts. The secret installations in the Kalahari Desert, situated in Pretoria-occupied Namibia, have been left untouched and in readiness for a nuclear explosion.

It should be borne in mind that the South African racists are motivated by fear, that the 'last frontier' psychology may induce them to actions leading to a thermo-nuclear war.

Laborde: Argentina and Brazil have likewise declared they would not sign the non-proliferation treaty. Both have progressed quite far in their nuclear programs and regard the manufacture of a nuclear bomb more of a political than a technical question. This is particularly true of Brazil. Under an agreement with West Germany on nuclear energy cooperation, it is to receive from the FRG uranium-enrichment mills and factories processing nuclear fuel into plutonium.

True, the Brazilian authorities are taking pains to underscore the peaceable orientation of their nuclear program, but business, journalistic, political, and other circles believe that the military élite wants to have the bomb or at least the possibility of blackmailing world opinion with the threat of manufacturing it. Military circles in Brazil laud the agreement with the FRG as a step toward turning Brazil into a 'great power' and declare that by 1990 'Brazil's nuclear strength will no longer tolerate barriers.'[11]

In view of all these facts, it must be stated unequivocally that the attempts to create a pro-imperialist military bloc under the pretext of defending the South Atlantic are, I repeat, a serious threat.

Transient tension or fundamental disagreements?

Laborde: We should now examine the attitude to SATO of some countries earmarked for membership of that bloc.

Pahad: Could you put it clearer?

Laborde: What I mean is that although U.S. imperialism regards the racist regimes in Southern Africa and the dictatorships in Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay as the mainstay of SATO, it is well aware that there can be no question of a bloc in the South Atlantic without the participation of large states such as Brazil and Argentina. That is why the Pentagon has intimated to Brazil that it would like to form a military group under its aegis to control the North and South Atlantic. Essentially speaking, this spells out a striving to fuse two treaties: the Rio de Janeiro Treaty and the contemplated South Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The idea of a South Atlantic pact has won the hearts of those Brazilian circles who want to see Brazil become a major world power. In these circles a position of prominence is held by General Golbery do Couto e Silva, a leader of the Brazilian geographical school. In a book entitled *The Geopolitics of Brazil* he claims that Brazil's geographical location, might, and significance give it the right and possibility, given privileged relations with the coastal states of the South Atlantic, to maintain its presence in that zone, which is vital to the interests of the Western world generally and to Brazil itself in particular.[12]

In the meantime the USA has begun to court Argentina. The above-mentioned General Summer declared that 'Argentina is unquestionably of major significance to everybody studying the strategy of the free world,' that 'it is the southern anchor of the inter-American system,[13] and so on and so forth. However, many observers note that there are some divergences between Argentina and Brazil, on the one hand, and the USA, on the other.

Pahad: U.S. imperialism is likewise interested in consolidating its military alliance and cooperation with South Africa. This is the actual situation, so where do disagreements come in?

Laborde: I am referring to the press ballyhoo over the alleged deterioration of the USA's relations with some Latin American states — Brazil, Uruguay and Chile, to name a few — as a result of Carter's human rights campaign, whose aim is to pressure and blackmail these countries. As a matter of fact, some tension was generated when Brazil, Uruguay, and some other states unilaterally scrapped their military aid agreements with the USA in 1977 following the charges that their governments were violating human rights.[14] However, this is a momentary, transient tension.

For instance, take Brazil, whose authorities were bitterly 'offended' by the U.S. Administration's pronouncements. Many pro-government Brazilian newspapers charged that Carter was playing a dangerous game in Latin America and called Brazil's decision to renounce aid a 'Brazilian challenge to the USA.' But what has

changed? Brazil continues to extend various privileges to U.S. finance and industrial capital. It continues to receive a large proportion of the U.S. loans and credits. For its part, the Pentagon continues to regard Brazil as a strike force in the continent, while Carter, who had demagogically reproached the Brazilian government for violating human rights, called it a great power during his visit to that country in March 1977.

A very similar picture is to be observed in the USA's relations with Chile, Uruguay, and Paraguay.

However, apart from transient devergences, there are disagreements over fundamental issues between the countries in Latin America's 'southern cone' and the USA. Underlying these disagreements are the collision of the national interests of these countries with U.S. imperialism's plans relative to Africa, particularly in trade, the aspiration of these countries to play a more independent role on the international scene, and especially the opposition of their peoples to the plans for setting up the bloc we are talking about.

Pahad: Something of the kind is to be observed also in the USA's relations with South Africa. There, too, friction does not concern the main issue on which U.S. imperialism and racist South Africa see eye to eye — I refer to their efforts to retain South Africa within the orbit of the capitalist world system. The imperialists are worried over the mounting influence and prestige of the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party and no longer feel that South Africa can independently carry out police functions in that region. They are therefore endeavoring, on the one hand, to set up a military organization in the South Atlantic and, on the other, suggest a neocolonialist solution that would relax tension in southern Africa and, at the same time, enable them to continue making fabulous profits. I shall take the liberty of quoting *The African Communist*. The journal writes: 'It is precisely because the revolutionary process in Southern Africa is being speeded up, not halted, by white racist repression and ruthlessness that the Western imperialists are now attempting to intervene in the hope of saving something from the wreckage.'[15]

This explains why the USA is pressing the government of South Africa to put some political and economic reforms into effect. Needless to say, the country's political system itself is to remain unchanged.

However, the South African authorities are in no hurry to modify the racist system in any way. This, in my view, lies at the root of some of the contradictions between U.S. imperialism and South Africa.

At the same time, whatever the South African racists say about them not countenancing interference in their internal affairs, they are

well aware that they cannot dispense with the support of the capitalist world. Hence their certain tractability to pressure relative to the problem of Namibia, where the USA wants to see a government of 'moderate' Africans with a minimum role accorded to SWAPO, the nation's leading national-liberation movement.

Laborde: It seems to me that at this point we can draw some conclusions.

Some conclusions

Pahad: First, it may be asserted that with the USA at their head the NATO circles have not only planned a South Atlantic treaty but have begun backstage talks on carrying out that plan. This is no simple matter, for the approach of the nations concerned to this issue is not quite identical. There are some divergences between them: those we have noted and others. Although, as we have pointed out, cooperation between Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa continues to develop, the formation of a military alliance between them would be a crucial decision, a qualitatively new stage in the relations between them. South African racism is much too odious and the political burden it entails is much too heavy even for the reactionary regimes in Latin America. As I see it, this is one of the major stumbling blocks to the SATO project.

Laborde: In Argentina and Brazil only the most extreme right elements want a military alliance with South Africa. The authorities are trying to dissociate themselves from these plans. The Brazilian Foreign Minister and his Argentinian counterpart have publicly rejected the idea of a military bloc in the South Atlantic. Of course, as everybody has justifiably observed, they are embarrassed by the idea of a pact with the undisguisedly racist regime of South Africa. This is particularly the case with Brazil, which is bidding for the leadership not only of Portuguese-speaking nations, but of Africa generally.

Another factor hindering the formation of SATO is the state of the relations between Argentina and Brazil. There are disagreements over the building of hydropower stations on the Parana River and its tributaries,[16] frontier problems, disputes over tariffs, and, lately, the dispute between Chile and Argentina over the Beagle Channel.[17]

It would therefore be a grave mistake to underrate the danger threatening the peoples of Africa and Latin America and fail to make the maximum effort to wreck the plans of the imperialists. The last word in the question of new military blocs must be said not by the South African racist regime and the reactionary dictatorships in the 'southern cone' of Latin America but by the peoples of these countries who want peace, social justice, and confidence in the future. The days when practically nothing stood in the way of imperialist plans

have gone. Today, imperialist plans of aggression have to contend with the socialist world community headed by the Soviet Union, with the working class in the capitalist countries, and with the national-liberation movement. These forces have time and again compelled imperialism to retreat. They are quite capable of doing this today as well.

1. 'NATO, Hands Off Africa,' *WMR*, November 1978.
2. *Cuadernos para el Dialogo*, October 1976.
3. *Le Nouvel Observateur*, August 29, 1977.
4. *Stern*, June 28, 1977.
5. *The African Communist*, No. 72, 1978.
6. *Cuestionario*, May 1976, p. 17.
7. *Le Monde diplomatique*, September 1977.
8. *Jeune Afrique*, July 9, 1976.
9. *America Latina*, No. 4, 1976, p. 79.
10. *International Herald Tribune*, August 25, 1977.
11. *Der Spiegel*, January 31, 1977, p. 28.
12. *El Economista*, October 25, 1974; R. Ghioldi, *Hegemonia brasilena en el Atlantico Sur?*
13. *La Prensa*, October 11, 1977.
14. Under these agreements the USA pledged to give, lend or sell military equipment to some Latin American states, train Latin American military cadres at its educational institutions, and so forth. — *Ed.*
15. *The African Communist*, No. 72, 1978, p. 9.
16. Brazil and Paraguay are building the Itaipu hydropower station, while Argentina and Paraguay are building the Corpus project. — *Ed.*
17. *World Marxist Review*, Nov. 1978.

Have you changed your address?

Please do not forget to notify us of the change. To be sure you do not miss an issue we must receive your change of address immediately.



A fundamental work

The Great October Revolution and the Cuban Revolution (Veliki Oktyabr i kubinskaya revolutsia), Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1977, 300 pp.

The most important events of our day show the vitality and meaningfulness of the epoch-making experience of the October Revolution, by means of which the working class of Russia has carried mankind on its mighty shoulders into a new epoch, the epoch of proletarian revolutions and the building of the communist formation.

One of these striking and convincing events is the Cuban revolution, the first socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere. It was carried out in special conditions, under a new balance of forces in the international arena. This revolution appears, at first sight, to be absolutely unlike any earlier ones. But while having its unique aspects, it has also embodied all the intrinsic and fundamental features of the socialist revolution. There is exceptional interest in it throughout the world, so that it is quite natural that over the past period many Marxist works — popular works for the mass readership and in-depth scientific studies — have been written about the Cuban revolution and the Isle of Liberty.

There is now good ground to say, I think, that the research has entered a new phase, the phase of in-depth theoretical comprehension of the experience of the first victorious socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere. The first important step in this direction has been made with the publication of the monograph under review.

It covers chronologically the important and interesting period of struggle against the pro-imperialist dictatorship, the growth of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, and the building of socialism in Cuba. The authors show the characteristic features of the development of the revolutionary process in the country and consider a complex of key methodological problems of socialist revolution.

Among these problems are the objective and subjective premises for revolution, the Cuban people's struggle against the reactionary

Batista dictatorship, the character, motive forces and stages of the revolution, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, the basic socio-economic transformations at the democratic stage and its growth into the socialist stage, problems of the transition period, socialist transformations, and the building up of the material and technical basis of socialism, the formation of the new society's political system, the cultural revolution, the revolution's social policy, the role of proletarian internationalism in the development of the Cuban revolution and its international importance for the peoples fighting for national liberation and social emancipation.

With the publication of this fundamental scientific work, Marxist-Leninist historiography has been enriched with an important scientific study shedding light on the key problems of the Cuban revolution and making it possible to bring out both the general regularities which the October Revolution inaugurated and which have been expressed in the revolutionary process in Cuba, the peculiar conditions of the Cuban revolution, and the Cuban communists' original and creative contribution to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

This book will undoubtedly have a part to play in the ideological struggle against revisionism, in exposing the bourgeois anti-scientific speculations about the Cuban revolution and the construction of the new socialist society in our country.

Oscar Dúyos

Nazi wave on the West German book market

Erich Mayer
Board Member, German CP

The biggest anti-fascist demonstration since 1945 was held in Cologne last spring. Organized by 84 unions of Resistance fighters and victims of fascism, it brought together 30,000 marchers from all parts of Europe. They demanded the disbandment of the SS fraternities and protested against the rehabilitation of nazism and the spread of nazi propaganda.

Initiative and action groups to prepare the demonstration and rally were set up in many towns. In Dusseldorf, Kassel, Nuremberg, Munich, Hildesheim, Marburg, Giessen, Hamburg, and other areas there were impressive anti-fascist demonstrations in which trade unionists, communists and other democrats took part, and where nazi sorties were effectively foiled.

Resolutions protesting against neo-nazi activities were adopted at state and district trade union conferences in Hesse and Bavaria, and also at local trade union meetings. The Congress of the United German Trade Unions, held in Hamburg in May, adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution expressing 'concern over the growing activities of neo-fascist groups in the Federal Republic. The trade unions consider it their duty to combat all forms of neo-fascist activity.' The Congress demanded a 'ban on the circulation of neo-fascist propaganda (printed matter, phonograph records, films).'

The appeal of the Committee of Socialist and Democratic Publishers and Book Dealers calling for 'an end to the circulation of neo-fascist literature' was backed by 10,000 signatures from every part of the Federal Republic.

From toys to the Bundeswehr

The trade unions and other organizations have very good reason to protest against neo-nazi activities and propaganda. In the past three years the Federal Republic has been swept by a new 'Hitler wave.' You can feel it in the cinema, in books, magazines, phonograph records, even in children's toys. The purpose is to whitewash Hitlerism by falsifying its record and making it more attractive to the

young generation in order to stage a comeback at some future date. And the propaganda is becoming more brazen and arrogant, with the publication of nazi 'documents,' demonstrations of documentary films and displays of nazi decorations. One of these 'documents' is a five-volume collection of articles from the *Signal* magazine of the Hitler days and now put out by the Jahr publishers of Hamburg. Then there are the phonograph records with such titles as 'One People — One Reich — One Führer,' and 'To Arms?'

And more and more of this nazi-saturated propaganda is being put on the market. It comes from neo-nazi publishing houses such as Schütz, Podzun Pallas and Druffel, and such staid bourgeois firms as Seewald, Ullstein, Stalling and several more. Their lesser brethren, too, have joined the neo-nazi publishing spree.

The following jacket blurbs provide a fair enough idea of what is between the covers:

Bolko von Richthofen: 'Who is to blame for the 1939-41 war. A historian proves that the other side bears most of the responsibility.'

Reinhard Pozorny: 'The annexation of the Sudetten. Hundreds of photographs, some of them startling, recreate the events in the Sudetten area on the eve of the Munich agreement and the area's inclusion in the German Reich.'

Udo Walendy: 'Truth for Germany. A documentary survey containing incontrovertible evidence that refutes all the biased political arguments about Germany being responsible for unleashing World War II.'

'Before We Are Blown to Smithereens.' These words from a fascist song have been chosen as the title of a book eulogizing nazi conquests, by one Otto Ernst Schüddekopf, a former SS officer.

The list could be continued and it would include the memoirs of Albert Speer, Hitler's Minister of Armaments, the diaries of Bormann and Goebbels, put out in a first edition of 75,000 copies in anticipation of bigger editions and bigger profits.

The causes

The main cause of the new Hitler wave and a certain rivival of nazism should be sought in West Germany's development since 1945. Contrary to the decisions of the Potsdam Conference, fascism and militarism were not extirpated, nor the power of monopoly capital destroyed. The 'denazification,' such as it was, affected only the small fry while the big financiers and industrialists who supported and nurtured Hitler went off scot free, and it did not take them long to re-establish their positions in the economy and in the state.

There was no real campaign against the fascist racist and chauvinist ideology. Its spread was helped by hostility toward the Soviet Union

and by anti-communism, soon to be made the official doctrine. High-ranking government officials took every precaution to conceal the link between the monopolies and Hitler fascism and reduce the whole thing to the crimes of individuals — in fact, Hitler was proclaimed the sole culprit.

As things stand today, there is no unambiguous condemnation of the fascist crimes against peace and humanity, or any official campaign against glorification of the nazi past. This applies to all government institutions, schools, the mass media, textbooks and the judiciary. Investigation of fascist crimes drags out, sometimes for as much as 20 years. And if former SS men are sentenced, they are soon released on 'grounds of health.' Many old and new nazis are entrenched in the economy, the civil service and the cultural sphere.

The Mutual Aid Society of Former SS Servicemen (HIAG) is but a screen, and a pretty transparent one, for unions of former SS men. They meet quite frequently for 'regimental get-togethers,' but also with Bundeswehr officers to preserve and pass on the 'spirit and traditions' of Hitler's war against the peoples of Europe and to boast of their 'exploits' in that criminal war. No wonder there have been anti-Semitic and other nazi outrages in Bundeswehr units. Provocation and terror by neo-nazi groups are no longer a rarity.

The neo-fascists are working to increase their ranks. There have been appeals to the public. Also new organizations. One of them, the 'National Socialist Action Front' in Hamburg, has 22 year-old Michael Kühnen, a former Bundeswehr lieutenant, as its Gauleiter.

The neo-nazis operate not only through the 'traditional' fascist organizations, but also through parties which are neither fascist nor pro-fascist, but support HIAG, the Union of Expelees and similar outfits, and have taken a tolerant, if not favorable, attitude toward the fascist and racist regimes in Chile, South Africa, etc.

Another reason for the heightened neo-nazi activity is the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, increasingly intertwined with periodical cyclical crises. Stagnation or recession hits hard at the working class, and by using social and nationalist demagogy the reactionaries exploit this. The program of the German Communist Party says: 'Imperialism still has ... considerable opportunities for influencing the masses, manipulating public opinion and engaging in psychological warfare. It is still a dangerous foe. In its search for a way out of the crisis, it restricts social gains and democratic rights. This is fraught with a constant danger of authoritarian or outright dictatorial rule, right down to fascism.'

It is against this social background that one should see the calls for a 'strong personality.' There is, for instance, the statement by Joachim Fest, journalist, historian, and author of a detailed, and now

filmed, Hitler biography. Says Fest: 'The stability of the Federal Republic is inconceivable without the Hitler phenomenon.' During his rule and as a result of the 'people's community' he created, Fest claims, class antagonisms were largely eliminated, and by sheer force Germany broke her way into the modern world. In other words, Hitler is held up as the 'German manifestation of the 20th century revolution.' *Frankfurter Algemeine* wrote: 'The renewed interest in European fascism of the 30s . . . has made Hitler a new superstar for the mass media. He has become the hero of the conservative 70s.'

Lastly, as noted above, one of the principal causes of the present neo-nazi wave is the exploitation of anti-communism. Witness this from the right-extremist publishing-business magazine *Nation Europa* (in praising a Wehrmacht propaganda journal): 'Hitler's Germany stands before us in all its cultural and spiritual richness as the last bastion in the fight against the mortal menace of Belshevism.' And also this from the reactionary *Deutsche Nazional-Zeitung:* 'Today's fight against communism will not carry weight unless we recognize and appreciate yesterday's armed fight against communism.'

The inroads neo-fascism is making into publishing, the mass media and the cinema are measurable in the following figures issued by the Department for Protection of the Constitution. Toward the close of 1976, the 142 registered right-extremist organizations had an aggregate membership of 18,300 and published 109 newspapers, magazines and bulletins with a total circulation of 178,300. And no one should be surprised to find 588 neo-fascists (the figure is from the above-mentioned report) employed in education, the judiciary and the police. Of them, 392 are in the civil service and the armed forces, 47 hold high, 113 responsible and 150 medium posts (the figures are patently minimized — *E.M.*).

However, neo-nazism is not an exclusive West German phenomenon. It is international: in the USA alone there are now about 2,000 registered fascist and fascist-type terrorist organizations. The neo-fascists are becoming more active in Italy, France, Latin America and South Africa. Besides, ultra-left groups in several West European countries are, by their conduct and propaganda, stimulating the organization of avowedly neo-nazi and fascist terrorist groups and the loud demands for 'strong-personality' government. That atmosphere favors fascist, anti-Soviet and anti-GDR propaganda.

Who reacts and how?

Of course, not all political leaders, journalists, TV and radio commentators minimize the danger of neo-fascism. The fact is that ever wider forces in West Germany are standing up to fascism and neo-fascism. Television, radio, books and periodicals have in many cases done

much to bring home the danger of neo-nazism and mobilize opinion against it.

Political leaders like Herbert Wehner and Willi Brandt, the social democrat groups in state parliaments, and also some state parliaments as such, have come out against the circulation of fascist 'documentation' in the form of phonograph records and books or through other means. This suggests that the fight against neo-nazism can be given bigger scope and breadth, but the book mart is still flooded with fascist literature.

The popularization of Hitler and fascism is palmed off as historical research, but the real purpose is to play down the horrors of fascism, provide a semblance of justification for its crimes.

One should bear in mind that many of these neo-nazi books are published only for profit: bourgeois publishers hope for quick returns. And so we find respectable firms and prominent personalities helping neo-nazism, giving it financial and other support, and not secretly but quite openly and publicly. This means that publication of memoirs, biographies, war stories, etc., associated with the Hitler cult and put out as 'objective' research, all contribute to the propaganda and glorification of fascism.

Young Socialists in Essen, the big Ruhr industrial center, have drawn up a list of more than 4,000 books of a fascist character. West German publishers and bookshops are kept regularly informed of books about Hitler. Thus, the bibliographical *Buchreport* of September 2, 1977, contained this item: 'Books about Hitler are still in great demand. Apparently there is no decline in interest in Hitler of the Third Reich period. Last year the name "Adolf Hitler" figured in the titles of 57 books on display in the Lingenbrink sales rooms. This year (West) German publishers will be putting out more than 20 books dedicated to Hitler and the Third Reich.' Then follows a list of 'Hitler books, 1977' which, together with the above-mentioned Schütz, Seewald and Ullstein firms, includes such reputable publishers as Athenäum, Deutsch Verlagsanstalt and Econ.

The usual reaction from the bourgeois parties is to play down the danger of neo-fascism, thus facilitating its propaganda and providing a measure of justification. Things have reached a point when the communists — of all people — are being blamed for the new outbreak of neo-fascism. Ex-Interior Minister of Lower Saxony and Chairman of its Free-Democrat Party, Gross, is quoted for the statement that the anti-fascists and communists are responsible for making neo-nazism 'respectable' again. This shows how far anti-communist slander has gone.

Attempts to justify or discount the menace of fascism through seemingly innocuous 'investigations' are a danger to the development

of democratic consciousness. For these so-called studies present a deliberately distorted picture of fascism and militarism, thus providing an impetus to neo-fascism. They also encourage arguments of the type that neo-fascism is 'best left alone,' for publicity can only bring it additional support. But with neo-nazi propaganda having assumed such dimensions and with neo-nazi organizations emerging into the open, there can be no more talk of the danger being exaggerated. It must be fought day after day, and experience has shown that the most effective way is to administer an energetic rebuff to its actions and give an unambiguous answer to its propaganda. It is along these lines that anti-fascists demand a ban on neo-nazi activity and propaganda. The democratic forces in the Federal Republic can rely on the laws of the Allied Control Council, the verdicts of the Nuremberg Tribunal and also on the Federal Constitution. Its article 139 says: 'All legal acts promulgated for the purpose of liberating the German people from national socialism and militarism shall not be affected by the provisions of the Constitution.' This applies especially to article 7 of Law No. 8 of the Allied Control Council, which expressly forbids: 'Written, oral or any other propaganda and agitation designed to preserve, revive or encourage the militarist or National-Socialist spirit or organizations, or to glorify war.'

In line with this law, the government ought to ban HIAG and neo-nazi youth organizations and take decisive measures against propaganda in praise of war and fascism.

The Association of Victims of Nazism and Union of Anti-Fascists has an important part in the battle against neo-nazi ideas. This organization unites a large number of anti-fascists — communists, social democrats, Christians — and publishes magazines, books, and pamphlets exposing the real purpose of the nazi wave on the book market.

Such newspapers and magazines as *Unsere Zeit* and *Die Tat* and such book series as the *Resistance Library* put out by Röderberg, plus the numerous publications of Marxistische Blätter and Pahl-Rugenstein expose fascism and help mobilize the progressive forces against it. The present state of the neo-nazi movement shows that we must combat every form of anti-communism, every attempt to push government policy to the right. In this context, there should be a strenuous campaign against the notorious Berufsverbot, smearing of opponents of the regime, and especially champions of peace, democracy and social progress. For the situation today has a dangerous resemblance to what the nazis were doing in the late 20s and early 30s.

Things have reached a stage where emergency-law provisions are being used against communists. There was this outrageous case a while ago: Herbert Mies, Chairman of the German Communist Party,

and Presidium members Jupp Angenfort and Martha Buschmann were put on the Federal Border Police and other lists of wanted persons. Photographs and data on leading members of the German Communist Party were shown on television in the 'Fight Terrorism' program along with dangerous criminals, terrorists and leaders of extremist organizations. Somewhat later photographs of all Presidium members were published in *Quick* magazine.

These scandalous cases show that the ultra-rights want to create a situation in which they could make short work of everyone opposed to the present shift to the right, every champion of democracy and peace. What we have is a fresh attack on the German Communist Party because its growing influence is seen as a danger by the ruling circles.

What is being done today to Herbert Mies, Jupp Angenfort and Martha Buschmann can be done tomorrow to social democrats and trade unionists. Our party has received numerous letters protesting against these undemocratic procedures and pledging support and solidarity. This indicates that the neo-nazi danger is beginning to penetrate all the democratic forces. Many social democrats and communists who had gone through the concentration camps know how all this could end. We must demand decisive and consistent measures to put an end to all the soft talk and minimizing of the fascist danger.

Joint actions of anti-fascist, democratic forces, notably the communists, socialists and trade unionists, at every level, have more and more frequently repelled neo-fascist sallies.

The communists and the socialists bear a great responsibility in this struggle. For upon them largely depends the scope of the mass fight-back against neo-fascism. We must bring home to the people that by combating this new brown wave of filth and terror we will prevent something much worse. But that can be done only by decisive struggle by all the anti-fascist forces.

Where the party began

Lenin in München, Dokumentation und Bericht von Friedrich Hitzer. Münich, 1977. 521 pp.

The Munich period is one of the most important in Lenin's revolutionary career. In Munich he continued his work on fundamental theoretical and political writings that substantiated the need for a revolutionary party to prepare and carry out the socialist revolution and build a society free of exploitation. Publication of the newspaper *Iskra* and the magazine *Zaryz,* and of his fundamental and revolutionizing 'What Is To Be Done,' the fight against the Mensheviks in preparation for the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Brussels and London, 1903) — such are the highlights of Lenin's revolutionary work in the Bavarian capital. No wonder there is such a lively interest among party historians in this period in the life of the leader of the October Socialist Revolution.

Hitzer's book contains much that is new. The documentary and other material on Lenin's political contacts during his stay in Munich from 1900 till March 1902 are presented against the historical background of those years and the crucial events of the first quarter of the century. The reader will be attracted by its lucid style, handsome design, and wealth of hitherto unknown or unpublished records and facts about the diplomatic, legal and police apparatus of the time, enabling the reader to distinguish between historical truth and bourgeois-propaganda legend and falsification.

Published for the first time are the photostats of Lenin's first texts, in German, on the Third RSDLP Congress, notes on Bavarian agriculture, radiograms to Lenin from the Bavarian Soviet government, the form Lenin filled out for a residence permit, police files on Russian students and emigrees. Of special interest are the quarterly reports — likewise made public for the first time — of the Munich police on the activities of the Social Democrat Party and trade unions, motivated, not unsurprisingly, by the need to 'keep terrorists under close surveillance.' One of the more bizarre items is a confidential report from the Berlin Foreign Ministry to the Bavarian Royal Court on the October Revolution.

Letters written by Lenin and Krupskaya will doubtlessly be read with interest. Other material discovered by Hitzer describes Lenin's

contacts with leading German Soccial Democrats and the assistance they gave him, at times risking their own safety. The book is a reminder of the German Social-Democrats' long tradition of international proletarian solidarity. But many of the facts it contains are evidence of their right-wing leaders' betrayal of the revolutionary principles of the Socialist International and the surrender of the powerful German labor movement to jingoism.

Hitzer's book is more than a collection of historical documents. It is evidence against those who today, as decades ago, are deliberately distorting the facts of history and the lessons of the revolutionary German and international workers' movement, or shy away from them as sterile dogmas.

The publication of these documents and background material relating to Lenin's revolutionary activity has very topical implications in the light of the controversy over the role of the working class and the communist parties, and mankind's advance to socialism.

It is to be hoped that the book, put out in 2,000 copies, will soon appear in an edition accessible to a much wider circle of readers.

Hans Schneider

The Final Reckoning: Nuremberg Diaries

Boris Polevoi

A book you can't put down. Written with a journalist's eye for detail and human interest, in a terse but lively style, this is a personal account of probably the most famous and most significant trial of the century. The book is enriched by commentary on behind the scenes activity among the international press and accounts of assignments throughout war-torn Eastern Europe.

Cloth $4.95 (can.)

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England

Progress Subscription Service
71 Bathurst St., 3rd floor,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6 Canada

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St.,
Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism,
5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi 55, India.

New Horizon Publications
14 Tamaklos Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

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

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P O B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St.,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Bagdad, Iraq.

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay
Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee
St., Calcutta 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: 'Russki' 6,
'Hemus', Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2,
Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

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

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

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandels-
betrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig,
Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITIONS:

Stephanos N. Papayannis,
Menandrou 66, Athens, Greece
People's Agency,
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus.

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of
Peace and Socialism, P.O.B.
9525, Haifa, Israel.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI,
Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

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

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via
della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

MALAYALAM EDITION:
5 Rani Jhansi Road,
New Delhi 55, India.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol
Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I.
Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715,
Oslo 1, Norway.

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

POLISH EDITION: RSW 'Prasa-
ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul.
Wronia 23, Poland.

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

PUNJABI EDITION: Punjab Book Centre,
1038 Sector 22-B, opp. General Bus
Stand, Chandigarh, India.

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66, P0B 2001,
Bucaresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya
Kniga, Smolenskaya-Sennaya 32/34,
Moscow 121200, USSR.

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

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt.
Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

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

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino
Torrico N 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro,
Parroquia San Juan, Caracas, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758,
San José, Costa Rica.

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

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

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

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

TAMIL EDITION: Marxia Oli,
32 Broadway, Madras-1, India.

TURKISH EDITION: Agence de
diffusion, 16616 Praha 6,
Thakurova 3, CSSR

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