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

Sept. 1974, Vol. 17, No. 9 50¢

Dialectics of détente / 126

Economic integration / 39

Guatemala—25 trying years / 25

Bulgaria—30 years of socialism / 3

Economic chaos in Chile / 113

Belgium / 73

Workers of all countries, unite!

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

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

Sept. 1974, Vol. 17, No. 9

**Features**

3 From the summit of 30 years
*T. Zhivkov*

8 International significance of socialism's economic achievements
*L. Strougal*

15 The foundation of peace and international security
*S. Olszowski*

**The Party**

25 Twenty-five trying years
*M. Rodriguez*

33 Party News

**Theory**

39 Economic integration and the world revolutionary process
*International theoretical conference*

63 Approach to the study of developed socialism
*R. Kosolapov*

**Political panorama**

73 Communal and power crisis in Belgium
*L. Van Geyt*

82 Friends look at Bulgaria. Destinies of a country advancing along socialist road

113 Economic chaos in Chile. One year of junta misrule
*C. Millas*

123 The people of Cyprus shall win
*D. Constantinu*

126 The dialectics of détente
*Jan Prazsky*

132 Diary

**Books**

133 The impact of the scientific and technological revolution. A survey of literature
*R. Richta*

143 Books in brief

Second class mail registration number 2352. Printed in Canada.

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: $5.00 a year, $9.00 for two years. Single copies 50 cents. Overseas: $8.50 a year.

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

Subscriptions to these may be obtained through PROGRESS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto.
M5V 1T4

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

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is published by PROGRESS BOOKS, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
M5V 1T4

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

feature

# From the summit of 30 years

*Todor Zhivkov*
First Secretary, CC Bulgarian CP,
Chairman of the State Council,
People's Republic of Bulgaria

Representatives of Communist and Workers' parties, members of the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review,* the international communist journal, visited Bulgaria shortly before the 30th anniversary of her socialist revolution. They gained first-hand knowledge of our achievements in economic, scientific and cultural fields, the problems of socialist democracy, and of the Communist Party's leading role in building a mature socialist society.

Bulgaria's Communists, her working class and all working people are always aware of their responsibility to other contingents of the international communist and workers' movement and are always prepared to give account to the world proletariat of their work of socialist construction. For genuine internationalism, the very foundation of our movement's unity, is inconceivable without a keen feeling of revolutionary solidarity and responsibility to the Communists of the world for the activity of each Communist party.

This is a jubilee year: the 30th anniversary of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria and of the liberation from fascism of several European countries, the 25th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic and of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. This year Bulgaria joins other European socialist countries in celebrating 30 years of freedom, freedom won as a result of the Soviet Union's momentous victory in the Second World War and of the heroic struggle of the masses, led by the working class and its communist vanguard.

Our victory holds a place of its own in the revolutionary annals of the 20th century. After the Great October Socialist Revolution mankind made another historic step, climbed another rung in its ascent to its socialist future. Following the Soviet people, many other peoples entered the stage of socialist transformations and took up the work of

A report on the recent visit to Bulgaria of a delegation of fraternal Parties will be found elsewhere in this issue.

socialist construction. Marching shoulder to shoulder with them in the great socialist offensive is our country, the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Those who have visited Bulgaria know what wide vistas open up from our mountain summits. The 30th anniversary of our socialist revolution can be likened to mountain summit in the development of our people and their state – a summit from which open radiant vistas of our future. But from which, too, we can look back on the hard path we have travelled – we can see where that path could have been shortened, where time and energy could have been saved. We gave our guests the opportunity to survey this panorama of three eventful decades and look into the future of Bulgaria. I trust that they will frankly share their impressions. But I would like to draw attention to some of the central factors that have made our advance possible.

First, the revolutionary steeling of the Bulgarian Communist Party, enabling it to prepare for the capture and consolidation of power. It is no exaggeration to say that Bulgaria's Communists have been tested in every form of revolutionary struggle. For many years our Party was legal and for more than 20 years driven into clandestinity. It organized popular risings, directed hard-fought class battles, conducted election and mass campaigns, fought in parliament for the class interests of the Bulgarian people, elaborated strategic revolutionary programs, formulated democratic platforms, withstood all the blows of its enemies, built up its strength and mustered its forces. It learned to operate in conditions of bourgeois democracy and in conditions of fascism. It formulated policy in revolutionary situations and in low-tide periods of the movement. Only a Marxist-Leninist Party composed of the most class-conscious, active and devoted representatives of the working class, united in a militant, monolithic and disciplined organization – only such a Party could effectively use diverse forms and methods of struggle.

It traversed a long, difficult but glorious path to reach the day of victory, September 9, 1944, when the working class and the people, led by their Communist Party, took over power and ours became the ruling Party. It was the experience accumulated in the years before the socialist revolution, and the fact that ours was a genuinely Leninist Party, a Party of the new type, that enabled it confidently to direct the building of the new society. In the socialist years the Bulgarian Communists steadily expanded and strengthened their contacts with the masses, enhanced the leading role of the Party, consistently promoted inner-Party democracy and strengthened Party discipline, resolutely rebuffing all deviations from the Leninist standards of Party life and the Leninist principles of Party leadership. In this respect the April 1956 Plenum of our Central Committee was espe-

cially important. It opened a new chapter in the life of the Party and the country and accelerated its development. The 10th Party Congress and the Program it adopted for building developed socialism are indicative of our Party's maturity and its indispensable leading role. True to its militant traditions, the Bulgarian Communist Party will continue selflessly to work for the cause of the working class, for the peoples' advance along the path of social progress, and will always be an internationalist, Leninist Party.

Second, the Bulgarian Communist Party is unshakeable in its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. In all the vicissitudes of the struggle against capitalism and in the building of the new society, the Party has always been guided by Marxism-Leninism, has always abided by the laws of social development, while carefully taking into account our national features and historical specifics. We know from the experience of the world revolutionary movement that replacing Marxism-Leninism by any variety of opportunism, deviation from the general laws, whether to the right or the 'left,' creates grave difficulties in socialist construction and jeopardizes the gains of the revolution.

Creative development of scientific communism is achieved in the crucible of revolutionary struggle. Today the Marxist-Leninist doctrine is being enriched by the practice of socialism and by the multiform struggle of the world communist movement, the most active and influential political force of our age. To be a Marxist-Leninist today implies ability to combine theory with solution of pressing practical problems, and to use theory to answer questions posed by the revolutionary struggle and by socialist construction.

Thus, when we began to build socialism we were guided by Lenin's theoretical proposition that the transition to socialism could assume many different forms. At the same time we drew on the experience of the CPSU and of other fraternal parties in the socialist countries. This enabled us to make a profound analysis of People's Democracy as a new form of proletarian dictatorship which does not, in essence, differ from Soviet power. But our Party also employed a number of specific methods in leading all the patriotic forces united in the Fatherland Front and working in cooperation with an agrarian party, the Bulgarian People's Agrarian Union, in building socialism.

Today, too, in solving the problems involved in building mature socialist society, we rely on Marxism-Leninism, on our own experience, on that of the CPSU and its contribution to the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, on the experience of parties in the fraternal socialist countries and on the collectively formulated documents of the international communist movement.

Third, an atmosphere of peace and security is of exceptional importance to our progress. The defeat of fascism and the emergence of the

socialist world system gave mankind unparalleled opportunities for peace. We know that only in a world at peace could we have accomplished what we have accomplished in the past 30 years. And we take legitimate pride in the fact that Bulgaria and her people, who have made so many sacrifices in the cause of freedom, independence and social progress, are today actively working for the independence and freedom of other peoples and countries, for peace and socialism throughout the world. That is why we unreservedly support the Peace Program of the 24th CPSU Congress; that is why we resolutely condemn and reject the subversive activity of the Maoists directed against the peace efforts of the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries. The Bulgarian Communists will always consider it their national and international duty actively to support the positive changes in the world and the Soviet Union's energetic struggle for its Peace Program and for success of the peaceful coexistence policy, for continued international détente.

Georgi Dimitrov once compared the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution to a searchlight piercing the darkness of war in the Balkans. Today the People's Republic of Bulgaria, a socialist country, is exerting every effort to promote peace, good-neighbor relations and cooperation on the Balkan peninsula.

These are some of the factors that have gone into our achievements. But there can be no profound understanding of our life and development without account of a factor that has so powerfully shaped Bulgaria's historical, national and social development. I refer to the ties of friendship and fraternal devotion of the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples.

Bulgarian-Soviet friendship has had a beneficial influence on every aspect of our socialist life. If we take the Party, it became a truly Leninist Party only by mastering Leninism and creatively applying the experiences of the CPSU. If we take the victory of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria, we have to say that without the Soviet Union and its all-round support and assistance, our working class and our working people would never have been able to retain power and our young socialist state would never have been able to retain its freedom, independence and sovereignty. If we take the successful application of Marxist-Leninist theory in Bulgarian conditions, we have to say that time and again throughout these 30 years we drew on the treasure-store of Soviet experience, with its epochal implications. We are proud of the fact that Bulgaria has from a backward become a developed country, from an agrarian, an industrial-agrarian country now building a developed socialist society. And every Bulgarian links our achievements with the constant and disinterested assistance of the Soviet Union. We often recall the apt words of Leonid Ilyich Brezh-

nev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, words that so accurately reflect the nature of relations between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union: 'This is socialist internationalism in action.'

Our Party Program faithfully expresses the thoughts and feelings of Bulgarian Communists: 'For the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Bulgarian people, Bulgarian-Soviet friendship is what sun and air are for every living being; it is a friendship rooted in the centuries; it is one of the motive forces of our development, the condition and guarantee of the continued progress and future of our socialist homeland.'

But, of course, the Bulgarian Communists realize that the momentous gains of our people were won in close cooperation and with the mutual assistance of other fraternal socialist countries, that they are the result of Bulgaria's active participation in the international socialist division of labor, the result of closer socialist economic integration and of support by the international communist movement and all the progressive forces of the world.

For 30 years now Bulgaria has been advancing on the path of socialism. It is a difficult, at times tortuous path, but the only path of true social progress. It is the path that is leading our people to the radiant summits of communism. We make no secret of the fact that today, too, things are not always easy and that there are considerable difficulties still to be overcome. But what we have accomplished over these 30 years in social, economic and cultural development, in building a mature socialist society, is equivalent in scope to a whole era. And this justifies our pride in our successes. Now as always, we are unswerving in our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, in our unqualified affiliation to the socialist community, in our readiness to support peoples fighting for peace and social justice, in our efforts to strengthen the cohesion and unity of the anti-imperialist forces and of the world communist and workers' movement.

There is a popular Bulgarian saying: 'The eyes see, but the heart feels.' I do not doubt that our guests from fraternal Parties did not only hear and see, but also felt what we, Bulgarian Communists, their comrades in ideas and struggle, have achieved in the 30 years.

# International significance of socialism's economic achievements

*Lubomir Strougal*
Presidium Member,
CC CP Czechoslovakia,
Chairman of the
Czechoslovak government

For a third of the world's population the building of socialism and communism has become an everyday reality. The experience of the world's first socialist state has clearly demonstrated that socialism creates new conditions for the working people, ensures a rapid rise of material production and of living, educational and cultural standards and guarantees respect of human dignity. These fundamental changes, their significance enhanced by the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the victory over fascism, are a heartening example for the working people of other countries. In a number of them, the working class, led by its Communist Party, has overthrown capitalist rule and has launched out on the building of socialism. A new, revolutionary factor, the socialist world system, has been brought into the making of world history.

In a relatively short span, the last quarter century, the socialist community increased its economic potential several times over and markedly raised its political and economic influence on world affairs. The growth of its economic, scientific and technological potential, the higher level of education, and of the moral and political consciousness of its people, provide a reliable basis for its defense capacity, for curbing the forces of world imperialism. And it is only thanks to this that mankind has been spared another world conflict. As the 1969 International Meeting pointed out, the socialist world system has become a decisive factor in the effort to maintain and consolidate peace, in the anti-imperialist struggle and in the struggle of the working class and other working people for freedom, democracy and the new social system. Expressed in this is the new quality of socialism's impact, a quality fully brought to bear only at a definite stage of socialist development. Socialism's convincing achievements are respected even by many of those who, while not subscribing to re-

volutionary Marxism, take a realistic view of things.

'A spectre is haunting Europe – the spectre of communism,' Marx and Engels wrote in the Communist Manifesto. After the Great October Socialist Revolution, what was a 'spectre' became the ideal and only realistic way out for the exploited and oppressed.

The economy is the decisive area in the competition and struggle of the two world systems. The economic successes of the socialist community and each of its member states have a tremendous impact on the masses and on social development throughout the world. Lenin, it will be recalled, emphasized the importance of building the material and technical basis of the new society superior to the productive forces of capitalism: 'Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 32, p. 437).

The facts show that the socialist world system and primarily its backbone, the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, have made incontestable progress toward that goal. In a historically short space of time, 25 years, the CMEA countries, in the past mainly agrarian or agrarian-industrial, now represent a predominantly industrial complex with a high level of labor productivity. Their industrial output has increased 740 per cent since 1950 and their industrial growth rate is three times that of developed capitalist countries. CMEA has become an important industrial region of the world and its strength and influence are increasing from year to year.

The CMEA countries account for more than a third of the world's research facilities. Their engineering industry employs about 18 million, or more than the whole of Western Europe and twice the U.S. figure. The chemical industry is rapidly expanding, now employing about 3 million people and producing 15 times more than in 1950. The CMEA countries are an important factor in scientific and technological progress, increasingly influencing the direction of decisive aspects of the technological revolution and also development of the social sciences.

There have also been fundamental changes in agriculture. Systematic development of large-scale farming, and consistent use of all the achievements of science have made for a steady increase in output and productivity. For example, cereal output is up 70 per cent on 1960 and 90 per cent of the increase is due to higher per hectare yields. Meat output is up more than 50 per cent. Agriculture is successfully coping with its main task of maximizing food production.

Rapid growth of industrial and agricultural output and progress in other branches of the economy have produced a firm material basis for continued development – not only quantitative, but primarily qualitative – and for a steady growth of productivity and systematic

improvement of the economic structure.

The Soviet Union plays a decisive part in the development of the socialist world system. The biggest country of the community, it accounts for more than half of its economic potential and for nearly three-quarters of CMEA's. The USSR also has the community's largest and best research facilities. It has accumulated rich experience of socialist construction. It consistently applies the principles of socialist internationalism, notably in economic cooperation with socialist countries: it has placed its natural resources at the disposal of other members of the community. The USSR is the stabilizing factor of the socialist system, the bulwark of its cooperation, a partner upon whom the socialist countries can rely even in the most complicated situations.

The economies of CMEA members differ sharply from those of capitalist countries. Apart from their socio-economic structure, there is purposeful long-range planning that guarantees stable and rapid social and economic growth. This is of tremendous importance for the competition of the two socio-economic systems, as will be seen from the following figures of average annual industrial growth rates for 1966-72: CMEA countries – 8.4 per cent, developed capitalist countries – 4.7 per cent, and the most developed, the U.S., only 2.8 per cent. The socialist countries are ahead also in agricultural growth rates.

Socialist integration is the highest form of their cooperation. It makes for closer economic ties, accelerates the process of equalizing economic levels, makes for more homogeneity and for qualitatively new conditions in the competition of the two systems. It is through integration that we are bringing to reality the tendency noted by Lenin, 'toward the creation of a single world economy regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integral whole according to a common plan' (Vol. 31, p. 147).

Socialist economic integration calls for a bigger role of plan coordination and for a start on joint planning for the entire community. Accordingly, the 28th CMEA Session earlier this year decided more closely to coordinate plans for the coming five-year period. There will be a joint five-year plan providing for multilateral integration measures and joint research on long-range planning for key industries. Joint planning and prognostication will make for fuller satisfaction of long-range requirements in fuel, energy and raw materials, and will help improve economic structures and promote international research and production complexes.

Purposeful planning and management stand out in sharp contrast to the increasingly frequent and destructive fluctuations and upheavals in the capitalist economy, against which capitalism is powerless.

Characteristic of socialist economic cooperation are mutual advantage, comradely assistance and genuine equality. Characteristic of the capitalist system are relentless rivalry, 'aid' (with numerous political strings) to developing countries, inequality, unequal exchange and exploitation.

Socialist cooperation makes the experience of the more developed countries available to all and gives the community a guarantee of stable economic and social development. Its advantages stand out in bold relief against the background of the energy, raw materials and monetary crises in the capitalist world.

Why do socialism's economic achievements so powerfully influence the hearts and minds of millions? First, because all these achievements, in economic and public life, directly benefit the people. Indeed, where else in the world can one see such a rapid rise of living standards, such a system of public health, social maintenance, education and training, such confidence in the future? In the socialist countries the aim is not profit for a few, but a prosperous and happy life for the working man, all-round development of his personality and full scope for his creative abilities and interests. That is why there is such a conscientious attitude to one's work and such active participation in managing the affairs of society.

The epochal importance of socialism's economic achievements, their international significance and infiuence, can be properly assessed only in the broader context of the situation in the world of today and the competition and confrontation of socialism and capitalism. The present world situation is but part of a continuous process that is gradually and inexorably changing the world balance of forces, adding to socialism's strength and influence.

In the initial stages, the appeal of existing socialism was through its humanistic ideas. Now it is through its concrete achievements, for socialism has a powerful material and technical basis enabling it to carry out qualitative changes of unparalleled scope in every branch of the economy. This new aspect of socialism's impact could fully manifest itself only at a definite stage of its development.

The anti-imperialist revolutionary movements of our time, whether socialist, democratic or national-liberation, to one or another degree draw their inspiration, strength and hope from the Great October Revolution and the victorious battles of the working class and its revolutionary parties in the other countries that have overthrown capitalist rule. Besides, the socialist world system and its strongest member, the Soviet Union, with its vast economic potential provide a material basis for the world revolutionary movement.

The socialist community plays a crucial part also in the fight for peace. The positive changes in international relations over the past

few years are the result of persevering and coordinated efforts by the USSR and other fraternal countries. Their foreign policy is ample proof that peace and socialism are indivisible. However, only the new conditions, created primarily by the growing influence of the socialist community, have made it possible to apply the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence as the fundamental and permanent principle of international relations. That is evidenced by implementation of the Peace Program of the 24th CPSU Congress which has become a program of hope for hundreds of millions the world over. Its aim is to eliminate international tension and promote mutual understanding.

That policy, which has the support of everyone concerned for social progress, is bound to have serious repercussions: it will further inhibit the most aggressive forces of imperialism and will accelerate progressive development in all fields. The aim is to banish the menace of war for all time, pave the way to international cooperation that will benefit everyone, irrespective of race or nationality, and will create new, favorable conditions for joint efforts by all the states and peoples to solve mankind's pressing social, economic and other problems.

One area in which opportunities for such cooperation are especially rich, is the economy. And here the socialist community is showing the way ahead. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, emphasized in his message on the 25th anniversary of CMEA that its 'example of international socialist economic ties will have an increasing influence on world economic relations, will help to eliminate the discrimination, inequality and unequal exchange born of imperialist and neo-colonialist policy.'

That influence is already making itself felt. It is spelled out not only in the statistics of economic relations between socialist and non-socialist countries, but also in the interest shown in developed capitalist countries in expanding economic relations with the USSR and other members of the socialist community. The July 1973 Crimea meeting of the leaders of Communist and Workers' Parties emphasized that economic cooperation of socialist and capitalist countries can play a big part in furthering better international relations.

We have no illusions about the class attitude toward socialism of the men who speak for international capital, nor have we changed our own view of the nature of capitalism and its future. We know that imperialism accepts peaceful relations with the socialist countries only when all other methods have failed, or only if such relations promise good profits. But that does not alter the fact that cooperation creates favorable conditions for promoting and consolidating peace.

Economic development in the non-socialist world has been such that the capitalists find themselves obliged to develop normal economic intercourse with the socialist countries, which offer solid

guarantees of stability in long-range business arrangements.

The socialist countries have always stressed their desire for mutually advantageous relations. That is their position today too. And in addition to trade, they want broader cooperation in scientific and technological progress, exchange of licences, patents, etc.

Economic cooperation could become the material basis of peaceful coexistence, but, naturally, only if the forms and methods employed fully accord with its principles.

Socialist economic achievements have a positive influence on all aspects of public life. Their greatest influence is on the working class of the capitalist countries, the most important, organized and growing revolutionary factor of social development in the capitalist world.

The existence of a dynamically developing socialist community is of very real help to the international working class in its fight against state-monopoly capitalism. For the revolutionary ideas and experience of the socialist countries, and also their social gains, are reflected in the battles of the working people in the capitalist countries, with their sharper accent on political and democratic demands. The capitalists have to reckon with this. Hence, over the past half century existing socialism has played a definite part in the victories of the working class.

The aggressive imperialist forces are doing their utmost to halt or at least slow down social progress. Their attacks are directed also against the national-liberation movement, the immense scope of which led to the collapse of imperialism's colonial system. The revolutionary process brought independence to dozens of Third World countries. They see in the socialist lands their natural protectors and supporters. Indeed, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries not only supported their just struggle for national liberation, but continue to give them all-round and constantly increasing assistance. The socialist countries consider it their internationalist duty to render such assistance and to cooperate with them in the political and economic fields. And, of course, socialist assistance carries no conditions that restrict their sovereignty or exploit their economic difficulties.

Because of their dynamic economic growth the socialist countries are in a position to extend this assistance. Besides, their vast experience is of immense value to newly-liberated states that choose the non-capitalist path.

Whereas the socialist community is successfully evening out national economic levels, in the capitalist world the gap is widening between the most developed and the majority of other, especially developing, countries, particularly in terms of economic levels and growth rates. In this respect, too, the advantages of the socialist mode of production are becoming more and more obvious.

Every passing year adds to the attractive power of socialism as an example to the workers of the world. And the most graphic and convincing example is that of the Soviet Union, the world's first and most powerful socialist state. One has only to recall how backward tsarist Russia was, and the fact that the Soviet people were more than once forced to take up arms in defense of their revolution and their country, and subsequently, in incredibly difficult conditions, rebuild the country – one has only to recall this to appreciate the grandeur of what they have accomplished under the leadership of their Communist Party. Embodied in their record of achievement is the emancipation of labor, which radically changed the status of the working class and other working people, the will and the determination of a people in power, of a people that is shaping its own future.

In contrast to the capitalist world with its increasing social instability, with the benefits of civilization accessible only to a minority which denies the majority even the right to a place in the sun; in contrast to this world of irreconcilable contradictions, the socialist community presents to mankind an inspiring perspective: confidence in the future, opportunities for full development of the personality, a new morality that eliminates alienation and individualism and creates social relations in which man feels that he is not alone, but a useful member of a collective of equals.

The inspiration of socialism finds expression also in the fact that social development is convincingly proving the correctness of its humanistic ideas, and that the contours of the future are already visible from the edifice of socialism.

The attractive power and influence of socialism, its superiority over capitalism, is growing in every sphere. That is not accidental. It is an objective tendency that stems from the main laws governing the development of society. At a time when the capitalist mode of production has long ceased to be a progressive factor, socialism gives expression to the objective requirements of society. We have every reason to be optimistic and look with confidence to the future, for the present unmistakably confirms the prophetic words that communism is the youth of the world.

---

# The foundation of peace and international security

*Stefan Olszowski*
Member of PB,
CC Polish United Workers' Party
and Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Polish People's Republic

Characteristic of the international situation in the past few years is closer cooperation and intensified foreign-policy activity of the countries of the socialist community. On the whole, our community has become stronger and more closely united. Multilateral relations between its members have been further developed and their interaction raised to a new stage, as evidenced by the summit meetings in the Crimea, the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee session in Warsaw, the 28th Session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in Sofia and numerous contacts and bilateral visits. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose Leninist policy is the decisive factor in the growing influence the socialist community exerts on international affairs and on the promotion of peace and security, plays a particularly active part in this truly creative process.

The need and possibility of close coordination of their foreign policy stem from common ideology, identical social and economic development goals and the need for united action in the confrontation with imperialism and in the struggle for peace and security. In their bilateral treaties of friendship and cooperation and in the Warsaw Treaty itself, the socialist countries have assumed international obligations providing for consultations and coordination of their foreign policy.

*Foreign policy coordination is an expression of the socialist community's unity and a major factor in changing the world alignment of forces in favor of socialism.*

In common with other fraternal socialist countries, Poland believes that the effectiveness of its international activity depends to a decisive degree on membership in the socialist community, on the latter's unity around the Soviet Union, the main force of socialism and

progress. It is out of these fundamental considerations that we attach so much importance to coordinating our foreign policy actions with the USSR and other members of the socialist community.

*Alliance, friendship and cooperation with the USSR* and with all fraternal countries are the main factors in Poland's national security and socialist development. And it is because of the growing world role of the Soviet Union and the socialist community that we can maintain our accelerated pace in building socialism and also pursue an active foreign policy.

The international activity of our Party and government center on developing and deepening our fraternal alliance and close cooperation with the CPSU and the USSR. We are firmly convinced that support of Soviet foreign policy accords with the interests of the entire socialist community. The Polish People's Republic wholeheartedly supports the developing process of peaceful cooperation between the USSR and the USA, which is having a salutary effect on the international situation.

Lat year's visit to Poland of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the talks held during the visit of Comrade Edward Gierek to Moscow in December 1973, and during the multilateral meetings in the Crimea and in Warsaw, Comrade Brezhnev's participation in the celebrations of the 30th anniversary of People's Poland contributed to closer ties between our Parties and countries. The talks reaffirmed complete identity of views on all major political and ideological questions, and a desire for cooperation based on still closer links.

There are regular foreign-policy consultations with the Soviet leaders, as instanced by our frequent meetings with Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko.

The USSR, which accounts for more than 70 per cent of total CMEA industrial output, is Poland's biggest trading partner. Our relations are fully in keeping with our aim of increasing the role of foreign trade and production specialization as economic development accelerators. We are broadening our contacts with the Soviet Union also in other fields. For instance, expanding cooperation between the PUWP and the CPSU in the ideological field. We are availing ourselves of the opportunity to train cadres in the USSR.

Poland is forming closer relations also with other fraternal countries.

We note with satisfaction numerous contacts with the GDR at various levels and in various fields. Steps have also been taken by both sides to develop their bilateral relations. One example of industrial cooperation is joint construction of a spinning mill at Zawiercie. We welcome the arrangements for travel to each other's countries without passports or visas.

Last year's friendship visit to the GDR of a Party and Government delegation led by Comrades Gierek and Jaroszewicz did much to promote cooperation between the two countries. Another significant event was the recent friendship visit to Poland of a GDR Party and Government delegation led by Comrade Erich Honecker, First Secretary, CC Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Cooperation with our southern neighbor, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, is being intensively developed. The visit this March of a Czechoslovak Party and Government delegation led by Comrade Gustav Husak, General Secretary, CC Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, served to further the traditional friendship of our Parties and peoples and made for closer economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties.

Friendly relations are being extended also with the People's Republic of Bulgaria. During the visit to Poland of Comrade Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary, CC Bulgarian Communist Party, decisions were drawn up on continued development of cooperation in all fields.

We have traditional and strong ties with the Hungarian People's Republic. Steps designed to further strengthen these ties were decided upon during meetings between Polish leaders and Comrade Janos Kadar, First Secretary, CC, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party.

Relations are also being extended with the Socialist Republic of Rumania. They cover a wide range of economic, scientific, technical and cultural cooperation.

We can speak of important achievements and rich experience in developing relations with fraternal socialist countries. But we are fully aware that there are still many untapped reserves and that new opportunities will emerge for still closer cooperation. The earnest of that is the steadily growing potential of the community countries and their achievements in building developed socialism.

Growing cooperation in all fields of political, economic and cultural life with the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia has been facilitated by reciprocal visits and meetings of the leaders of the two countries and joint action on the world scene.

We stand for normalizing relations with the Albanian People's Republic, and a statement to that effect was made in the Sejm on May 29.

Poland is pursuing a more active policy beyond Europe, too. In recent years we have formed closer ties with Cuba, which is now a member of CMEA and is extending cooperation with all countries of the socialist community. We welcome the achievements of the Cuban people and the growing prestige of the Island of Freedom in Latin America and among non-aligned nations of other continents.

Our friendship and cooperation with the Mongolian People's Re-

public is successfully developing. Mongolia's principled policy is highly appreciated in Poland.

Poland supported the struggle of the fraternal Vietnamese people against imperialist aggression. We are extending our friendship, solidarity and cooperation with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Its people's effort to preserve peace and rebuild their country enjoy wide respect. We support the Vietnamese in insisting on stringent observance of the Paris Agreement and on the right to shape their future.

Relations of friendship and cooperation with the Korean People's Democratic Republic are developing satisfactorily. Poland supports its policy of maintaining and consolidating peace on the Korean peninsula and its desire for peaceful unification of Korea on democratic principles and without outside interference.

United action sealed by proletarian internationalism and based on harmonizing the interests of the entire socialist system with those of each of its member countries is in our opinion, the chief condition for effective struggle against imperialism, for peace and international security. We are working on this premise: the closer the policy of the socialist community is coordinated, the closer the unity of its countries, the greater will be their strength and the more active their role in consolidating the positive changes in international affairs.

We fully agree with what L. I. Brezhnev said at the jubilee session of our Sejm on July 21: 'Today we have tried and tested principles and forms of multilateral cooperation. We have accumulated experience, strengthened our collective organizations. The Warsaw Treaty has become a reliable and effective instrument of peace and socialism.'

It is now clear to all that to the socialist community has fallen the historic mission of initiating and consistently carrying out efforts to resolve the complex international problems of Europe and other parts of the world. Our countries fully appreciate that they can best achieve that by acting unitedly. Their increasingly close unity is the reliable guarantee that the guns which have been silent in Europe for 30 years shall never again disturb the peaceful labors of its peoples. Unity of the socialist community is also the key precondition for creating a genuinely democratic system of international relations. The growth of that unity, especially in foreign policy, is a tremendous contribution to the progressive trends of our time and, more especially, to the world communist movement.

Edward Gierek, First Secretary, CC PUWP, declared in a speech on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of People's Poland: 'We are proud of the fact that the social and political system of People's Poland and its foreign policy have placed our people in the van of the forces of world peace and progress.'

Each country of the socialist community draws fresh strength from

its unity in resolving common and national foreign-policy problems. The main aim is to preserve and consolidate peace for every nation and for the whole of mankind.

In strengthening their unity in the fight against imperialism and the policy of aggression, the members of our community are in solidarity with all peoples and social forces committed to freedom, independence and social progress. And experience has convincingly shown that close interaction of the socialist countries in world affairs, their concerted efforts to achieve the common aims that follow from the ideology of socialism and communism, represent a substantial contribution to the preservation and consolidation of peace, help foil the aggressive designs of the neo-colonialist and militarist forces and promote the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

The uninterrupted growth of the strength of the socialist world system is the decisive factor in the anti-imperialist and anti-war struggle and in promoting universal peace.

The present alignment of world forces in favor of socialism and progress is the result both of the socialist community's political and economic and social influence and of the enhanced activity of the masses, their continuous efforts in behalf of peace.

The socialist countries' peace offensive and their struggle for social progress are based on a desire to spare mankind a devastating world war and discharge the great liberating mission of the communist and workers' movement. That peace policy has tremendous attractive power, winning over to socialism broad sections of the people throughout the world. The policy of peaceful coexistence helps the revolutionary struggle of the working class in capitalist countries and creates an effective barrier to imperialism unleashing a nuclear war.

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems, elaborated on by the 24th CPSU Congress in its Peace Program, presupposes renunciation of aggressive war as a policy instrument, respect for sovereignty, equality, independence and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. It also presupposes mutually advantageous cooperation of states with different social systems.

However, peaceful coexistence is not class peace. It does not eliminate the antagonistic contradictions between socialism and capitalism. In fact, it is a form of struggle between the two opposite systems in the economic, political and ideological spheres, but excludes armed conflict.

In this setting the ideological struggle becomes highly significant, for its results exercise the utmost influence on the character and rate of the development of society.

The achievements of the scientific-technical revolution coupled with the socialist principles of organizing society are a powerful catalyst of growth, providing a solid foundation for the aims of our community and thereby assuring the ultimate victory of socialism in the long-term and historical contest against capitalism. This optimistic forecast is the cement of our politico-ideological unity.

It is possible to *deepen the process of international détente*, with political realism prevailing in the capitalist countries and an edifice of lasting peace rising in Europe and in other continents, provided the unity of the socialist countries becomes still stronger. And this premise is at the center of our foreign policy.

The vital task facing the countries of the socialist community, including Poland, is to build a collective security system and assure a continuous improvement of the situation in Europe. With the passage of time the socialist community's position on this score has won the appreciation of many capitalist countries.

In December 1964, following up earlier Soviet initiatives, Poland proposed in the UN that an all-European conference should be convened to discuss security and cooperation. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries issued a relevant declaration during its Bucharest meeting in July 1966, another statement at its Budapest meeting in March 1969, and then its Prague declaration in January 1972. Our countries participated actively in the preliminary consultations at Helsinki. Throughout, the countries of the socialist community applied efforts to get practical measures off the ground jointly with all the European states, aiming at an enduring system of collective security.

The Budapest statement of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee was especially significant. With the object of ruling out armed conflicts in Europe, its signatories recommended broad cooperation among the European countries on the basis of the peaceful coexistence principles, irrespective of the social system. The unresolved European problems, they hold, should be settled by peaceful means, by negotiation. They repeated their proposal of convening an all-European conference to discuss security. All-European peaceful cooperation, they pointed out, was the sole realistic alternative to the dangerous military confrontation.

A number of questions had to be settled before multilateral preparations for the Conference could begin. Among these was recognition of the inviolability of the European frontiers by the Federal Republic of Germany, including the frontier along the Oder, Nysa Luzycka and the Baltic; renunciation by Bonn of the claim to represent 'all Germany;' formalization of the status of the German Democratic Republic in international law; renunciation of the validity of the Munich

agreement by the FRG, and also formal renunciation by that country of nuclear armaments. This was regarded by the countries of the socialist community, including Poland, as an essential premise for normalizing European relations and for erecting a security system.

The conclusion of the 1970 Soviet and Polish treaties with the FRG, the four-power agreement concerning West Berlin, the agreements between the GDR and FRG and between the GDR and the West Berlin Senate, and finally the agreement between Czechoslovakia and the FRG, paved the way for the Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

The purpose of the Conference, attended by 33 European states, the USA and Canada, is to create conditions for lasting peace and cooperation among countries with different social systems, and to organize a European collective security system based on formal political commitments.

Like the entire socialist community, we want the All-European Conference to result in a formal consolidation of détente and in agreed principles for peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation. The future model of European cooperation will function effectively, provided all discrimination, including attempts to gain unilateral advantages over other states, is eliminated from the economic and cultural relations between the countries of our continent.

In view of the historic significance of the Conference and the part it is to play in Europe's future, its third phase, the signing of documents, should be held at summit level. We hold that its aims, once translated into reality, will be a major victory for peace and political wisdom.

For us the Conference is not the end, but the beginning of the building of new relations between the European countries. The constitution of a permanent body of the states party to the Conference would formalize its results in international law and help shape a dependable infrastructure for European détente.

The peoples are looking forward to an early conclusion of the Conference. And to live up to their hopes is the duty of all its participants. The Warsaw Treaty countries pledged this April in the communique of the Warsaw Political Consultative Committee meeting to do everything in their power 'to facilitate a successful conclusion of the Conference in the shortest possible time in order that its results should conform to the aspirations of the peace-loving peoples.'

*Political détente* must be complemented by military détente. This is why the countries of the socialist community are taking part in the Vienna negotiations to reduce armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, and making constructive proposals for similar reductions in agreed regions. In the opinion of the Warsaw Treaty countries such a reduction would, without altering the now existing alignment of forces

in Central Europe, step down the military confrontation and give a start to the process of military détente. The Western delegations propose that the Warsaw Treaty countries should make a considerably larger reduction than the NATO states. If we were to accept their proposals, the existing relation of forces in Europe would change. We cannot go along with that. Our standpoint is much more realistic and based on principle. And we expect that the Western givernments and public will be understanding. Success in the negotiations to reduce armed forces and armaments in Central Europe would contribute palpably to the process of détente and create favorable conditions for similar measures in other regions.

In the United Nations the countries of the socialist community have contributed very greatly to the elaboration of treaties on the peaceful use of outer space, the demilitarization of sea and ocean beds, outlawing the manufacture and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons, and others.

Like the other socialist countries, Poland participates in moves to consolidate peace not only in Europe, but on other continents where explosive situations still persist. Hungarian and Polish representatives are on the international commission of control and supervision over fulfilment of the agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam. There are Polish representatives on the Laos Commission, and also on the commission of neutral states in Korea. Polish army units are serving in the Mid-East UN peace-keeping force, and on the UN force observing the separation of Syrian and Israeli troops.

Acting on the principles of peaceful coexistence, Poland is extending its cooperation with the capitalist powers, especially France, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, Belgium, Austria and Japan. Despite some persisting difficulties, the normalization of our relations with the FRG is also making headway. Our contacts with the United States, especially economic contacts, have increased considerably.

Poland is expanding relations with the developing countries. Versatile cooperation with India is building up rapidly. This shows that there are still many areas in which we could have mutually beneficial cooperation with many other Asian, African and Latin American countries. Among other things, we are planning to triple our commercial turnover with countries of these three continents by 1980.

Following a policy of cooperation, peace and détente *in common with the other countries* of the socialist community, we note regretfully that the chauvinist, anti-communist and anti-Soviet policy of the leadership of the People's Republic of China exercises a distinctly negative influence on the international situation.

The Maoist leadership's renunciation of proletarian internationalism, its rejection of class principles in foreign policy, are all

too clearly manifested in its approach to the crucial problems of our time. The international activity of the People's Republic of China, especially in the UN, amounts in effect to attacks of the Soviet Union. The PRC goes out of its way to try and frustrate the constructive peace and détente initiatives of the community of socialist countries. It opposes all measures promoting détente, it is against preparations for a world disarmament conference, and for many years vainly tried to prevent the European Conference for Security and Cooperation. Now it is trying to obstruct its progress, and is also fiercely attacking the constructive idea of a collective security system for Asia. It is trying at every price to discredit the vanguard role played by the socialist countries in consolidating world détente.

In their dialogue with imperialists, the Chinese leaders are mainly looking for points of contact in fanning hostility against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Nor do they bother to conceal their contacts with, and their sympathy for, the most reactionary, anti-communist cold war forces. The build-up of ties between the People's Republic of China and Chile's fascist junta is a typical example.

In their utterances and actions, the Chinese leaders range themselves with opponents of socialism. In fact, Maoism has created a second ideological and political front against the socialist community. We hold, therefore, that struggle against Maoist theory and practice is a very important objective in the policy of our parties and governments. It has the effect of tightening the unity of our community, and multiplies the results of the joint and coordinated policy of the socialist states. It is not right to take a neutral stance in this struggle and to regard the Chinese policy as a mere falling out with the Soviet Union. By striking at the peace policy of the Soviet Union and at the unity of the socialist community, by opposing the processes of détente, China's Maoist leaders are also striking at the vital interests of Poland and all other countries of the socialist community.

Speaking of the basic problems dealt with by Polish foreign policy in close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries, we should first of all stress our efforts toward the further development, in content and form, of the cooperation among the socialist states. For this we have to keep the new tasks predicated by changes in the international situation and the further development of the socialist societies, well within our range of vision.

Accordingly, we envisage a number of meetings at top Party and government level, and also new agreements designed to extend cooperation in various fields. Poland attaches great importance to extending the defensive potential of the Warsaw Treaty, which guarantees the independence and security of all the countries of the socialist

community. The system created by the Warsaw Treaty, whose 20th anniversary will come in 1975, is of the utmost importance. This anniversary will enable us to further invigorate the role of our defensive organization as a substantive factor of the security of the socialist community and its active influence on the processes of international détente.

Our cooperation with other socialist countries in carrying forward the socialist integration program in the CMEA framework, is expanding. In the past 25 years fraternal economic cooperation among CMEA member-states has contributed considerably to the success of the fraternal Communist and Workers Parties' policy of promoting the further convergence of our peoples and still closer cooperation in building socialism and communism. This was noted at the 28th CMEA session held in Sofia this June. The cooperation of CMEA countries is becoming a progressively more important factor of their economic development, their rising living standards, and the balancing of their economic levels. Socialist economic integration occupies an increasingly more important place in the social-economic strategy of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Polish state. We attach great importance to the dynamic development of integrative processes in the CMEA framework. 'The economic future of our country,' the PUWP Central Committee's theses on the 30th anniversary of socialist Poland stress, 'is tied in with the further development of specialization and cooperation among the CMEA countries and the progress of socialist economic integration.'

Poland will continue its efforts to promote international détente. 'Security and peace are the aim of our foreign policy,' said the First Secretary of the CC PUWP, Comrade Eduard Gierek, at the first national PUWP Conference. 'This is the unalterable wish of our nation, which has suffered so much in its modern history. The struggle for the peaceful perspective is predicated by our communist ideology and ranks among its fundamental principles.'

Deeply pleased with the results of the détente, Poland will consistently work with the other countries of the socialist community to make them irreversible.

---




# Twenty-five trying years

*Miguel Rodriguez*
General Secretary, CC
Guatemalan Party of Labor

The Guatemalan Party of Labor, the party of Communists, was founded 25 years ago. Those were years of great battles. We made untold sacrifices and gained considerable experience. Our Party has always upheld the interests of the working class of town and country, striving to apply Marxism-Leninism in a creative spirit, with due regard to our national realities. Its history is inseparable from the revolutionary movement and mass action for democracy, national independence and the people's well-being.[1]

## *The 1944 revolution*

On October 20, 1944, the reactionary government under Ubico, which held up the nation's economic progress, was overthrown. Its policy injured the interests of almost every section of society. A number of internal and external factors led to a broad alignment of anti-dictatorial forces. A military and civilian movement against Ubico and his clique was launched to win democratic freedoms.

The decisive international factor for the progress of the 1944 revolution, known as the October revolution, was the worldwide battle against fascism, a battle in whose forefront was the Soviet Union and which greatly stimulated the peoples' struggle for democracy.

The decisive internal factor in the revolution was the contradiction between the landed proprietors and the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the national bourgeoisie as a whole, the middle strata, the workers and peasants, on the other. The revolution benefited the working people most of all. And though it developed under the leadership of a revolutionary-minded petty bourgeoisie and some segments of the national bourgeoisie, the working class influenced numerous revolutionary measures and in some cases played a vanguard role, as under the Presidency of Jacobo Arbenz (1951-1954).

Developments in Guatamala were a confirmation of what Lenin

said about revolution. 'The outcome of the revolution,' he wrote, 'depends on whether the working class will play the part of a subsidiary to the bourgeoisie, a subsidiary that is powerful in the force of its onslaught against the autocracy, but impotent politically, or whether it will play the part of leader of the people's revolution' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 9, p. 19).

After 1944 Guatemala's workers began to form trade unions. The main purpose of Marxist study groups of workers and students was to establish links with the rising trade union movement. In September 1947, they merged into an association called the Democratic Vanguard of Guatemala. This was an important step toward founding a Communist party.

On September 28, 1949 the Communist Party of Guatemala was founded at its First Congress. At its Second Congress (December 1952), its name was changed to Guatemalan Party of Labor.

At the height of the revolutionary movement (1951-1954) the Communists had a legal organization. They worked hard to arouse and organize the masses, unite the workers and peasants in trade union centers and promote the movement of youth, students, women and cultural workers. A most important task at the time was to establish a national patriotic front that could become the mainstay of a genuinely democratic, popular and anti-imperialist government.

The Second Congress called on the Party to carry forward the agrarian, anti-imperialist, democratic and popular revolution.[2] The main tasks were formulated by the Congress as follows: bringing about an agrarian reform law transferring most of the land to poor peasants, industrializing the country, aiding the handicraftsmen and small manufacturers, establishing a public sector to end dependence on U.S. monopolies and protect the natural resources, in particular oil, which should be exploited by the state.

The chief enemy of the Guatemalan revolution – U.S. imperialism allied with the domestic reactionary bourgeoisie and landowners – plotted continuously against it. The State Department, upholding the interests of the United Fruit Company, grossly interfered in Guatemala's affairs with CIA support. In 1954 it engineered an intervention from Honduras and Nicaragua. Reaction resorted to force to stop the revolutionary process.

The revolutionary experience gained by the Guatemalan and other contingents of the communist movement shows that imperialist intervention can only be defeated if there is a solid united front and close unity of the masses and all patriots and if the people are given arms to defend national sovereignty in alliance with the patriotic section of the army.[3]

These conditions were not met in our country and this accounts in large measure for our setback.

In 1954, in an atmosphere of brutal repression, the Party set out to reorganize its ranks. This was an arduous task because we had no experience of underground activity and had to learn from our own experience. In spite of mistakes and shortcomings, we succeeded in preserving the Party and continued our revolutionary work.

In 1954-1960 the Party's activity was aimed at unifying the revolutionary democratic opposition, fostering the student movement and unfolding work in the trade unions controlled by the reactionary government. It was a hard economic, political and ideological contest in which the Party tried to revive the revolutionary democratic movement.

In 1960 the mass struggle for pressing demands showed an upward trend. Dissatisfaction with the government and opposition to it manifested themselves even in the army. On November 13, 1960 a group of army officers holding diverse political views revolted against the Fuentes regime. The revolt failed, but it plainly revealed the crisis of reactionary rule.

The crisis was aggravated by insurgent operations in March and April 1962, when the regime tottered under popular pressure, with large sections of the people demanding the resignation of President Fuentes. The government took massive repressive measures, with over a hundred killed and thousands more jailed. The people spontaneously reacted to violence with violence. The Party tried to give popular action the right direction but the revolutionary forces were not strong enough to topple the reactionary regime. The 1962 events showed again that the ruling classes do not merely raise obstacles to the revolutionary movement but try hard to put it down.

The Party warned the people that the oligarchy and imperialism would resort to a military coup. Its forecast came true: on March 30, 1963, on the eve of presidential elections, a military dictatorship was established.[4] The ruling classes feared that political developments would go beyond the election campaign.

After the 1963 coup the authorities declared a state of emergency, abolished all democratic liberties and even outlawed bourgeois democratic parties. They took repressive measures against the trade unions and peasant and student organizations.

Against the background of reactionary violence, the issue of revolutionary violence became more pressing than ever. Documents of the Fourth Party Congress (December 1969) listed a number of reasons for the violence which the people had to use in resisting counter-revolutionary terror. They were the backwardness and poverty of the vast majority of Guatemalans, who lived in conditions unfit for human beings while the minority – foreign and domestic exploiters

– showed off their surfeit and luxury; the social injustice reigning throughout the country; the fact that freedom and the people's rights were trampled underfoot; systematic persecution, which had become a standard of activity of the reactionary government and precluded all dialogue with even a moderate opposition; the presence of imperialism, which furthered its own interests and dominated national life; and last, the fact that the revolutionary process had been forcibly broken off in 1954.

Hence, the only choice left to the people was to form armed units of insurgents. These units included members of the November 13 Revolutionary Movement, April 12 Movement, and Guatemalan Party of Labor – workers, peasants, students and patriotic soldiers and officers. Their goal was to bring about a democratic, patriotic, revolutionary government through revolutionary violence.

In 1964-1966 the guerrilla movement spread all over the northeast. There was fighting in numerous towns and villages. But a number of difficulties affected the operation of the revolutionary forces. First, the armed struggle was an answer to ceaseless persecution and counter-revolutionary repression, not a result or the culmination of social and political struggles by masses mature enough to join naturally in struggle. In other words, it was imposed on us.[5] Secondly, account should be taken of the provocative, adventurist and divisive activity of Mexican Trotskyists in the service of the CIA who infiltrated the November 13 Revolutionary Movement.[6] Third, rightist and 'leftist' mistakes were made, which caused and hastened a split in the armed revolutionary movement late in 1967.

The Central Committee report to the Fourth Party Congress defined the various trends that developed in the Party at the time. There were signs of dogmatism and conservatism. Certain guidelines of other parties were mechanically applied to Guatemalan reality. The dogmatists' general definition of armed struggle was indicative of their poor knowledge of military matters. Bureaucratic methods of leadership prevented the Party from working out a correct line and injured its practical efforts. Conservatism, which had become widespread in the Party, influenced its Central Committee until 1965.

Reformist, right opportunist sentiments expressed themselves in overestimation of the political significance of electoral struggles, a tendency toward economism and a one-sided approach to legal forms of mass work. The class roots of these positions flourished on a petty-bourgeois ideology typical not only of the handicraftsmen, salary earners and relatively well-to-do intellectuals, but also the politically immature section of the working class.

As regards leftist views, they gained currency both in and outside the Party, especially among youth. They were a subjective, volun-

tarist reaction to conservatism, a result of ignorance regarding our Party's traditions of struggle and the inability to carry forward Marxism-Leninism and creatively apply it to our reality.

The exponents of petty-bourgeois revolutionism contended that the Guatemalan revolution was socialist from the outset. They disregarded the alignment of forces and neglected work among the masses and organizing work, laying emphasis on agitation and self-advertisement. Their concepts of struggle, organization and working methods did not go beyond narrow military bounds. They promoted leader cult and group sectarianism, called themselves a 'center' and, needless to say, laid claim to monopoly in waging guerrilla war.

'Left'-wing opportunism reflected the desire of some members of the petty bourgeoisie to usurp the role of leader belonging to the working class and secure beforehand the leadership of the revolution and its main force, the peasantry. It was an ideology of impoverished and radicalized petty bourgeois strata, poor peasants driven to despair and members of the middle strata who could not find work.

Late in 1966 the bourgeois and landed oligarchy, backed by imperialism, took advantage of the political and military mistakes of the revolutionary movement to launch a counter-revolutionary offensive.[7] They were out to crush the revolutionary movement, neutralize the petty bourgeoisie and democrats and intimidate the people. Reactionary forces succeeded in destroying a substantial part of the guerrilla units. An unprecedented reign of terror set in in the years that followed. Over 16,000 men, women and children were killed.

The reactionary offensive was a vast action against the insurgents, a combination of military, paramilitary, political, social, economic and psychological measures. Mention must be made of the CIA's sinister effort to destroy the leadership of the revolutionary movement. Sixteen members of the CC GPL, including its General Secretary Bernardo Alvarado Monzon, dozens of Party functionaries and hundreds of rank-and-file members were murdered or fell in action.

*Against fascism*

The Fourth Party Congress noted that Guatemala was in a social and economic structural crisis expressing itself in an obvious contradiction between the possibilities of speeding the country's progress and ridding our people of poverty and ignorance, on the one hand, and ossified traditional structures maintained by the ruling classes and imperialism, on the other. The roots of this national crisis closely intertwined with those of the general crisis of capitalism.

The disintegration of pre-capitalist relations of production and the slow and warped development of capitalism, which depended above

all on U.S. imperialism, no longer manifested themselves in gradual and latent quantitative changes in the social and economic spheres, but in open and violent political collisions. It was a permanent crisis involving every branch of the economy and making itself felt even when the overall situation was favorable. The only way to end it was through radical revolutionary change.

The Fourth Congress reaffirmed the Party's guidelines regarding the way of the revolution in Guatemala, the alignment of forces and the potential revolutionary situation. It came to the conclusion that the ruling classes had imposed on the people the violent form of struggle, a protracted revolutionary war. The main condition of success of the revolution, it stated, is active participation by organized and united masses. The people are being drawn into struggle in the intricate conditions of an ideological, economic, political, social and military confrontation. Success is conditional on using diverse forms of organization and struggle – legal and illegal, social, economic, cultural, political and military, ranging from the lowest to the highest level. In using them, account must be taken of the people's pressing interests and the degree to which they realize the need for deep-going change.

Armed struggle must be based on political struggle, for the latter creates conditions for the former. The two forms may be said to interlock and interact, rising to a higher stage in various fields of revolutionary activity.

Mass action has lately been on the rise again, and a movement has been developing in support of democratic rights.[8] It was in these conditions that a general election was held on March 3, 1974. General Efrain Rios Montt, candidate of the National Opposition Front, won an impressive victory by polling over 45 per cent of the votes. The official candidate obtained 30 per cent of the votes and the Center Right candidate, 17 per cent.

The ruling classes resorted to the most scandalous election fraud in Guatemala's history, with the result that the defeated candidates of the ruling coalition became 'winners.'[9] The victory of the opposition candidate, though declared void by the authorities, is evidence of the people's deep discontent and that the reactionaries today need more than electoral maneuvering, pressure and threats, to stay in power.

The people were unable to frustrate these machinations and make the regime respect their will. This was due to the vacillation shown by the National Opposition Front, the limitations of bourgeois reformist parties and persistent difficulties in the revolutionary movement. Our people must understand that the ultra-rights will not renounce power even in favor of the reformist section of the bourgeoisie. This shows again that the workers and peasants can win power in our country

provided they use revolutionary against counter-revolutionary violence.

Considering the corrupt, anti-democratic and treacherous policy of the regime and the danger of continued fascization, our Party's tactic is to rally the broadest possible sections of the population on the basis of the coinciding views of the democratic and revolutionary forces fighting against reactionary policy, for the deliverance of Guatemala from dictatorial ultra-rightist rule.

We have said that the economic and political crisis lays a heavy burden on the masses. This makes it possible to set up a united front of urban and rural workers, peasants, the middle strata and the petty and middle bourgeoisie, enables them to fight in common and in organized fashion, and paves the way for the progress of the democratic movement.

Some sections of the petty and middle bourgeoisie tried to remove from power only the ultra-rights, replace one group by another and pursue a policy which implies some limited reforms but may sooner or later, depending on the course of events, lead to a return of repressive and anti-popular rule. The democratic and revolutionary forces must fight for the removal of the ultra-rightists. After that it will depend on the masses to bring about a new upsurge in the revolutionary movement and pave the way to victory of the revolution and to a popular government that will accomplish the much needed changes. This implies actively using every form and method and bringing into struggle all the social forces interested in barring the way to neo-fascism.

The Guatemalan Party of Labor, being a genuinely national party, expresses the interests of the workers and peasants and the people as a whole. By virtue of their revolutionary patriotic mission, the Communists of Guatemala have been and remain genuine internationalists who link the struggle for national interests with struggle for the interests of all the peoples. They identify themselves with the peoples fighting for national liberation, against capitalist tyranny, and with the peoples who are in the front ranks, notably the Soviet Union, building socialism and communism.

The international situation has changed radically in the past 25 years. The growing power of the socialist community and the gains of the international working class and the national liberation movement impart an unprecedented revolutionary content to our epoch. This is a source of inspiration for the peoples who, like ours, suffer from oppression and exploitation. The new alignment of world forces is favorable to all who are fighting for democracy, socialism and peace. International détente, an expression of the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence, compels world reaction to take a more realistic and sober approach to the important problems of today.

Temporary setbacks notwithstanding, we are certain of our ultimate victory. To quote Lenin, 'selfless devotion to the revolution and revolutionary propaganda among the people are not wasted even if long decades divide the sowing from the harvest' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 18, p. 31).

1. Work on the historic task of founding a party of the Guatemalan working class began as far back as 1922, when the Guatemalan Section of the Communist Party of Central America was formed. It was on the Section's initiative that trade unions were organized and the first strikes, May Day celebrations and international solidarity campaigns took place. In 1928 the CP of Guatemala joined the Communist International. However, persecution made its development difficult and prevented it from holding out against the fierce attacks of reaction. In February 1932 Party activity stopped.

2. Afterwards (May 1960) the Third GPL Congress noted that the Guatemalan revolution was composed of two closely interconnected stages. The first stage was the agrarian, anti-imperialist popular revolution, and the second, the socialist revolution.

3. CC report to the Third Congress of the GPL.

4. Earlier, in December 1959, the reactionaries rigged the elections. In 1963 it was ex-President Juan José Arevalo who had real chances of winning. But though Arevalo voiced anti-communist views and even tried to secure President Kennedy's backing, he was unsuitable for the domestic reactionaries.

5. Resolution of the CC GPL, March 1972

6. The Trotskyists strove for what was a strategic goal of U.S. imperialism – stamping out the armed movement so as to break off the revolutionary process and destroy its staunchest and most consistent exponent, the GPL.

7. The strength of the army and police had doubled by 1965. The United States increased its military aid. The regime obtained an average of $5 million a year from the United States for these purposes. The number of U.S. instructors in the army and police grew. America's 'experience' of Vietnam was cynically transplanted to Guatemala. U.S. troops, including the Green Berets, joined in anti-guerrilla operations.

8. Nationwide strikes of teachers, bank employees and municipal personnel took place in 1973. Strikes were also called by staff members of the Social Insurance Institute, the workers of an electrical company, workers in the paper and tobacco industries, municipal bus drivers, printers and bakers.

A noteworthy gain of the working class was the establishment of the National Advisory Trade Union Council which tries to unite the trade union centers and independent union defending the working people's interests. Once again peasants join in action against evictions. Students fight for university autonomy, a higher standard of teaching and the right to have their own organizations.

Late in 1973 action by the working people was touched off by a government decision to raise public transport fares. Faced with massive popular resistance, the government had to make concessions for the first time in a decade.

The early days of 1974 saw a big strike by railwaymen who demanded payment of arrears, a 50 per cent pay increase and payment of pensions. This time the government had to meet the strikers' demands.

On May Day demonstrations took place in the capital in spite of an official ban. They drew 50,000 workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, housewives and family members of repression victims, who demanded an end to terror and the restoration of democracy. – *Ed.*

9. The National Opposition Front won 335,147 votes, the official ultra-rightist coalition 209,934 votes and the so-called Revolutionary Party (Center Right) 114, 117 votes. The Congress, however, approved the following returns: the official coalition 298,953 votes, or almost 90,000 more than was actually registered, and the opposition 228,067 votes, or 107,080 votes less than it had actually polled. – *Ed.*

---

## Party news

*As told to our correspondents*

# WE RELY ON YOUNG PEOPLE

*Jacques Hoffmann*
Member, CC Executive
CP of Luxembourg

*Q.* Your Party attaches great importance to increasing its membership, especially by enrolling young workers. How do you go about it?

*A.* To begin with, we keep abreast of the problems of young workers. For example, recently young worker Communists brought their fellow-workers to meetings at which we discussed their problems in an informal atmosphere. The very first interviews revealed numerous problems that we had to discuss again at subsequent meetings. A burning issue was the exploitation of young people by the employers, who encroach on their interests, pay them less than adults for the same amount of work, increase working hours and cut holidays. Young factory workers, who came to these meetings in growing numbers, discussed the shortcomings of vocational training, the difficulties they had to overcome to get a secondary education, and much else.

After studying all these problems in depth, our Party drew up and published in its press a program of youth demands. We distributed a special issue of the Party newspaper with the text of the program at factory gates. The employers were forced to take note of the young

people's problems, especially after our Party prevailed on three other youth organizations and even the trade unions to join in the campaign for these demands.

This had its effect on the government decision instructing the commission on labor to draft a law on the rights of youth and submit it to parliament. The Communists and Socialists on the commission had the draft amended somewhat but it remained largely unsatisfactory. For instance, in some cases the law allows employers to make young workers put in more than 40 hours a week.

*Q*. How does the Communist Party carry on its ideological work among youth?

*A*. Every year, from October to April, we organize fortnightly classes conducted by experienced and well-informed comrades. The classes are held on Saturday evenings and Sunday mornings because most students work on three-shift jobs and so have to be given a choice. It is gratifying that the majority of our students are young men and women who have joined the Party only recently.

The subject of each seminar is worked out and approved by the Party leadership. Here is a sampling of the topics dealt with: 'Why is the Communist Party a party of the working class?,' 'What is the substance of our opponents' opportunist views and why do we fight against "leftism" and sectarianism?,' 'What are the reasons for the oil crisis and how do the capitalists exploit it?' 'what is communist philosophy?' Seminars also concern themselves with the policy of the Luxembourg government and the Communists' tasks in the trade unions.

The Party publishes a 12-page weekly which reprints important articles from the daily *Zeitung vum Letzeburger Vollek*. The weekly is distributed in factories and door to door, reaching a wide range of readers.

Last, a noteworthy feature of Party work is the distribution of leaflets and newspapers at factory gates and in industrial communities. Our activists do a good job in this respect with help of their young comrades.

## ORGANIZATION AND MILITANCY

*Lalleshwar Kümar Singh,*
Member of the Leadership
People's Progressive Party of Guyana

Our Party has appreciably heightened its efficiency and enriched its experience by fighting day after day for the working people's interests. Once an amorphous mass organization, it has become a party

of the Marxist-Leninist type. We have restructured it and it is now a militant party based on Leninist organizational principles.

We give much attention to ideological work and to the selection and training of cadres. In spite of the obstacles raised by the authorities, we have set up a network of Party study centers, including eight-week education classes, summer schools for Marxist students and theoretical classes by correspondence. We now put more exacting demands to applicants for Party membership.

Our Party builds up its strength by establishing closer links with the working class and other working people. Party activists go often to factories and farms and help in organizing local political action groups.

We consider work in the trade unions very important. Our aim is to help build up the prestige of progressive union centers and unite the forces fighting against imperialism, for democracy and socialism.

## RESOLUTIONS AND STATEMENTS

### SRI LANKA
*Decision to Restore Unity*

The CC CP of Sri Lanka has adopted a decision on unity.

After the Eighth Party Congress (August 1972) there were some differences in the Party leadership. The main issue was the attitude to continued membership of the United Front. In September 1973, these differences led to a formal division into two groups. However, the dominant mood in both groups was in favor of reunification. The constructive talks held by them lately were crowned with complete success. The negotiating committee drafted a document on the principles and procedure of reunification.

On July 2, the unifying plenum of the Central Committee consolidated the progress made. A communique adopted by unanimous vote says that Party unity will be re-established by recognizing the political and organizational reports unanimously approved and endorsed by the Eighth Congress. It notes that work is to begin on preparations for the Ninth Congress. Before the Congress meets the Party committees will be reorganized in keeping with reunification tasks.

The communique expresses confidence that the restoration of Party unity will stimulate the struggle of progressive forces against domestic and foreign capital, which is trying to overthrow the United Front government. The experience of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka shows, the communique says in conclusion, that the Party can overcome differences and achieve unity provided it firmly adheres to the

principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and defeats the attempts of imperialism and subversive elements like the Maoists to aggravate differences and smuggle anti-Sovietism and anti-communism into the working-class movement.

## SCANNING THE PARTY PRESS

### L'HUMANITÉ (FRANCE)
*Party branch leaders*

On a proposal of the Political Bureau, the Central Committee of the French Communist Party set an extraordinary Party Congress for October 24-27, 1974. There will be one item on the agenda, 'Alliance of the French People for Democratic Change.' Georges Marchais, General Secretary of the FCP, will be the main speaker.

*L'Humanité* carried an article by Gaston Plissonnier, Political Bureau member and Secretary of the CC CP, about promoting new people in the pre-Congress period to be Party branch leaders.

As the Congress will be a special one, the article notes, it will not have to elect a new Party leadership. However, preparations for it will make it possible to reinforce the leading bodies of Party branches, sections and federations so as to expand the scope of the Party's political struggle.

The article stresses the increased role of Communists as political leaders of social struggles. After the 20th Congress the Party cadres grew in numbers and gained greater political maturity and experience. In campaigns of the latest period, thousands of comrades proved their worth as competent and promising leaders.

The Party is open to new members and we must encourage the election of activists to leading posts on all levels. It invites stagnation if it does not keep pace with the times, and does not promote new people to leadership. This means that the federations must elect to their leading committees comrades who can impart a collective and dynamic character to Party work. Federations and sections alike should give priority in this respect to young people and women, who are coming to play an increasing role in the Party and its struggles.

In this pre-Congress period elections of secretaries of Party branches, first of all in the enterprises, are particularly important. Enterprise branches should see to a well-considered distribution of responsibilities among Communists and choose the best equipped comrades as secretaries. If necessary, we should not hesitate to transfer comrades from one branch to another. It might be advisable to release some from certain functions on section or federation com-

mittees so that they may be elected branch secretaries in decisive sectors. Lastly, it would be a good idea to train branch secretaries at special classes, offering them constant help and encouraging them to read *l'Humanité*, which is indispensable if they are to cope with their important duties.

In short, Gaston Plissonnier writes in conclusion, the pre-Congress period should be used for promoting a new generation of Communist leaders in all Party echelons.

## NEWS IN BRIEF

### ARGENTINA

The Communist Party of Argentina has launched its 28th annual fund-raising campaign. The goal is 1,200 million pesos. Contributions are expected to be made by 400,000 people, including 100,000 workers in big factories.

### BANGLADESH

The first Party cards were issued in a festive atmosphere at CPB headquarters. The recipients were members of the Central Committee and its Secretariat. Number 1 card was issued to Moni Singh, veteran Communist of the South Asian subcontinent.

Mohammed Farhad, CC General Secretary, said that the issue of new Party cards would help the Party to close its ranks and consolidate itself organizationally.

### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

A spokesman of the German Communist Party Executive said recently that the Cologne 'congress' of the left sectarian group calling itself the 'CPG' was devoted entirely to anti-Communist and anti-Soviet propaganda and attacks on the German CP. Its participants maligned those who fought steadfastly for peace, détente and security. The 'congress' showed that the so-called 'CPG' had nothing to do with either the Communist and working-class movement or the Communist Party of Germany – Ernst Thälmann's Party.

### DENMARK

A poll on the popularity of political parties held by the Gallup Institute in Denmark last June revealed that, as in the three previous monthly polls, 5.6 per cent back the Communist Party of Denmark, whereas in the elections of December 4, 1973, the Communists polled 3.6 per cent of the votes.

SOVIET UNION

For many years, V. Batossky, Director of the Lenin Museum in Striya, Lvov Region, Ukraine, has been collecting the autographs of well-known revolutionaries, people prominent in the peace movement and leaders of Communist and Workers' parties.

Khaled Bagdash, General Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party, autographed an Arabic edition of Lenin's *The State and Revolution*, published in Syria, on display at the museum: 'This work, like numerous other immortal writings of Lenin's, is a key source on which fighters and most of our people have drawn for guidance over a long period in their sacred struggle for independence, drmocracy and social progress.'

Among the exhibits is Luis Corvalan's book *The Road to Victory* and a collection of political articles published in Uruguay which includes an article by Rodney Arismendi with his autograph.

JAPAN

In the elections to the upper chamber of parliament on July 7, the Communist Party won almost twice as many seats as previously and now holds 20 seats (as against 11).

## FORTHCOMING PARTY CONGRESSES

The Communist Party of Cuba, which has 170,000 members, will hold its First Congress in 1975.

The CC CP of Finland has resolved to hold the 17th Party Congress in the first half of 1975.

The 11th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is to meet in March 1975. A commission has been formed under Janos Kadar to draft the new Party Program.

The Italian CP Leadership has resolved to propose at the next plenary meeting of the CC and CCC that the 14th Party Congress be convened, in accordance with the Rules, in January 1975.

The CC Rumanian Communist Party and the Supreme Council of Social and Economic Development decided at their joint meeting that the next, 11th Party Congress shall be convened on November 25 this year.

A meeting of the Executive of the Left Party – Communists of Sweden set the 24th Party Congress for March 12-16, 1975.

theory

# Economic integration and the world revolutionary process

## INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL CONFERENCE

An academic conference in Prague, held recently under the auspices of *World Marxist Review* to discuss socialist and capitalist economic integration and related problems of Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics, was attended by Marxist scholars representing the Communist and Workers' parties of 33 countries – Algeria, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Senegal, Sweden, the USA and USSR.

Introductory remarks on behalf of the *WMR* Theory Commission were made by *Laszlo Nagy* (Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party), member of the journal's Editorial Board. He described the conference as a continuation, and in a certain sense culmination, of the debate on economic integration begun by the journal in July 1973. In the course of the year-long debate, views concerning the nature and implications of integrational processes were advanced by a number of research institutes and Marxist study centers, and by political leaders and scholars of different countries. The debate yielded ideas about the objective basis, motives and distinctions in class content of the two – socialist and capitalist – types of economic integration, demonstrated the usefulness of comparative study, and the common ideological and theoretical approach of Marxist scholars. By virtue of this groundwork, Nagy said, we can now examine in greater depth the effects of integrative processes on the world revolutionary movement and on the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. That is the purpose of the conference as conceived by the *WMR* Editorial Board and Editorial Council.

It is now possible to analyze the new factors that socialist and capitalist integration have introduced into the class struggle at na-

tional and international levels, into the economic competition and confrontation between socialism and capitalism, into the national-liberation movement, and the policy of peaceful coexistence. The key to these questions is to be found in the collectively elaborated judgements of the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, the recent Brussels Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Western Europe, and the CMEA Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration.

Working out the Communist standpoint on integration, the participants in the conference followed these guidelines, drawn from Marxist studies, including those made in the *WMR* debate:

– Economic integration is an objective development propelled by the need for further progress in expanding the productive forces within the framework and on the basis of the two opposite social systems, the capitalist and socialist. Hence, integration trends must be taken into account in the strategy and tactics of the anti-monopoly struggle and the policy of the socialist countries.

– The Marxist-Leninist conception of integration is based on a class approach, distinguishing between its two types – the socialist and capitalist – and assessing the course and social consequences of the two integrative processes from the standpoint of the working class and the interests of socialism and world peace.

– The objective basis of integration and its concrete forms in socialist and capitalist societies must be clearly set apart. The specific integrative forms created by monopoly and the capitalist governments in their own interest, are not unavoidable. Communists offer a democratic alternative to state-monopoly integration. It is also realistic to assume that some countries will eventually withdraw from capitalist integration communities, and that new states could be prevented from joining them. The objective of combating the pernicious effects on the working people of capitalist integration is also a realistic one. Furthermore, the main point is that an alternative solution for the problems of the world economy, socialist economic integration, does exist.

## INTERNATIONALIZATION OF PRODUCTION AND LABOR

The conference took note of the intrinsic connection between the internationalization of the productive forces and the changes wrought by integration in socialist and capitalist reproduction, on the one hand, and the internationalization of labor conditions and the workers' struggle, the expansion of the international base of the revolutionary movement, on the other.

*Margarita Maximova*, department chief of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, pointed out that the monopoly bourgeoisie combines old methods of oppression with new techniques based on the state-monopoly mechanism of integrative groups, and working out common social policies. It uses integration to put working people of different countries against each other, and assaults the nationalized sectors and nationalization in general. This is witnessed specifically at times of crisis.

By consolidating the forces of monopoly capital, capitalist integration adds to the possibilities of joint international action by the working people. It gives an impetus to the growth of enterprises located in different countries but owned by the same giant companies, and with the same technological process and a common system of control. This facilitates closer contacts and coordination between workers and unions of different countries, first and foremost in the factories and in the framework of large industrial complexes. The migration spurred by the removal of barriers between member-countries of integrative groups crowds an ever larger number of workers and specialists of different nationalities into the same factories.

Economic integration, said *Daniel Debatisse*, member of the economic department of the CC French CP, has extended the international basis of the revolutionary movement and the objective economic premises for the passage to socialism. Modern capitalism holds back and distorts the internationalization of production. The intensive interpenetration of capitals, the integration of markets, financial structures and monetary policies make the capitalist national economies increasingly dependent on the conjunctural situation, the inflow and outflow of capital, and speculative operations, leading to ever growing waste and to an impairment of the economic and technical independence of the integrated countries. Capitalist integration, the facts show, tends to intensify exploitation, depresses the living standards and working conditions of a substantial section of the people, and creates ever greater hardships for workers, farmers, tradesmen, and small business people.

The aim of the imperialists in the EEC – to place the main burden of the crisis of capitalism on the working people through agreed moves – could not be more obvious, said *Yerzy Pawlowicz*, of the Higher School of Social Sciences, CC Polish United Workers' Party. On the plea of international competition, capitalists oppose the workers' wage demands, hold up social legislation, and work to reduce monopoly taxes while urging higher taxes for the people. On the pretext of 'competent management' they also try to keep the masses from participating in production control. This shows that monopoly

forms of capitalist integration, though yielding a relative improvement of the workers' economic situation, are in fact profoundly inimical to the essential interests of all wage and salary earners.

To study new developments in the capitalist countries, including economic integration, said *Fritz Rische*, consultant of the Board of the German CP, we must follow the principles of Lenin's analysis of the economic essence of imperialism. Capitalist integration is pushed first and foremost by finance capital, monopoly and the powerful multinational companies. In 1971, the assets of the five biggest banks in the FRG totalled DM 190,100 million, or half the assets of all financial enterprises active in the country at that time. The power of the financial tycoons merges with that of the state and industrial capital. They are stimulating the interlacement of monopoly capital and the constitution of EEC-associated multinational concerns.

Internationalization of the capitalist labor market was and is a typical feature of state-monopoly economic integration. This has a highly adverse effect on the economic development of other regions and countries in and out of the EEC. The so-called free flow of capital and manpower has not eliminated unemployment. Neither has it resulted in a truly free choice of jobs. In fact, it has created a variety of acute social-economic and political problems related to foreign workers.

Among the more recent effects of capitalist integration is the emergence and rapid growth of a new type of international monopoly, known as multinational companies (not an entirely satisfactory term), said *Jacques Nagels*, CC member of the CP of Belgium. In Belgium, multinational companies (most of them of U.S. origin) control more than one-quarter of industrial production and more than one-third of exports. They account for 18 per cent of the industrial labor force, with much higher percentages in specific industries: chemicals 46 per cent, rubber and petroleum 40, and paper 36. Their transactions tend to accelerate the inflation spiral and exercise a pernicious effect on employment. Takeovers of Belgian firms by multinationals are accompanied by 'rationalization' measures resulting in the closure of factory shops and entire factories. Dismissals have become widespread. Insecurity has become a prevailing state of mind. Working conditions have deteriorated. The more rapid rotation of personnel, the 'American' organization of work, its greater intensity, are not compensated by the somewhat higher than average earnings. Last but not least, the multinationals impinge seriously on the production and trade-union rights of workers, technicians and engineers. But the multinationals ought to be viewed dialectically: though they depress working conditions and intensify exploitation, they also create new opportunities for closer interaction by the workers of different coun-

tries. It is highly important for Communist parties to account in their strategy for the objective tendency toward internationalization of labor and capital.

The multinationals, these leviathans of the 20th century, participants in the conference said, were propelling significant changes in the conditions of the class struggle. Now, large sections of hired labor, organized chiefly along national lines, are opposed by capital organized along international lines. As a rule, the multinationals have interests in many industries, whereas the working class is economically organized by industries or on an even narrower basis. This provides the monopoly capitalists with considerable freedom of maneuver. However, integration may soon become an additional stimulus for international joint action by the working people, for a break with isolationism, for the emergence of militant organizations that will adequately represent the interests of the working class.

For socialist economic integration it is important theoretically and practically to find the right forms of international concentration of production consistent with the nature of socialism, said *Oleg Bogomolov*, Director of the Institute of the Economy of the Socialist World System, Academy of Sciences of the USSR. We have seen how monopoly capital does it through giant transnational companies, through concerns with subsidiaries in many countries, and through international finance capital. This is now a part of capitalism. Socialism, of course, could not use this approach to organize international economy. But certainly that is no reason to turn our backs on the advantages and benefits of concentration. Differences in national management patterns in industry, wage and price systems, taxation and financing, should be no obstacle. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has adopted measures laying the ground for international industrial agencies and joint enterprises. But much still depends on the appreciation of their great future as forms of cooperation, and on the willingness of the partners to adapt their internal economic arrangements to these joint ventures.

The essential difference of the two types of integration, said *Ferenc Kozma*, Secretary of the World Economy Council of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, stems from a variety of factors, including the manner in which the integrative mechanisms were shaped in either case. Western Europe already had industrial structures when these mechanisms came into being, the development of the countries concerned was roughly the same, and they had long-standing mutual economic ties. In the socialist world the need to integrate arose at a time when the foundations of a large-scale modern industry had been laid in most of the countries, but there was not yet an integral industrial structure. Prior to the inauguration of CMEA the

development and economic potentials of the national economies were dissimilar, and in effect, there had been no developed economic ties qualifiable as international division of labor. In effect, Western European capitalist integration is an international intertwining of big capital, redistributing the productive forces within that part of the continent. The shaping of socialist relations was for a long time confined to national frameworks; not until recently did international forms of socialist property begin to appear. All this has affected the essentially different integrative processes and mechanisms of the two communities: CMEA and EEC.

Joint enterprises of CMEA countries occupy a prominent place in the long-term economic development plan of the Mongolian People's Republic, said *Pagmyn Nergui*, chief of department of the MPR State Planning Commission. Some of them are already in operation and contribute effectively to the Mongolian economy. Cooperation by CMEA countries in building and operating these enterprises helps to balance out the economic levels, to surmount the contradiction between the international character of the modern productive forces and the limited internal markets of individual countries.

There are, of course, other bilateral and multilateral forms of economic collaboration. *Willi Kunz*, deputy director of the CC SUPG Central Institute of Socialist Economic Management, referred to Assophoto Agency, which pools GDR and Soviet potentials in the manufacture of X-ray film and photochemicals, employing 70,000 workers, technicians and engineers. Its annual output is worth 3,500 million marks and amounts to about one-eighth of the world output.

The differences in the class essence and social consequences of the two types of integration are so great, said *Barbu Zaharescu*, member of the CC Rumanian CP, that it is doubtful whether we should use the same term, 'integration,' to denote such dissimilar processes. What we call 'integration' is not integration in the etymological sense of the term. Admittedly, unsuitable terms have been used before, and gradually acquired an entirely different meaning. What is there in common between CMEA and the EEC apart from their being economic alliances? They are entirely different groupings, with different economic bases, different aims and entirely different ways of reaching them. As I see it, they should not be described as two different types of one economic phenomenon, integration. But since the term has gained currency we might as well use it. All the same, I feel we ought to have a good scientific term, lest we confuse what there is in the socialist world with what there is in capitalist society, creating unnecessary confusion.

Use of the same terms to describe economic and social-political processes working differently in the different social systems (e.g., the

state, classes, wages, and the like), said *Aloyse Bisdorff*, member of the Executive Committee, CC CP of Luxembourg, is quite common. Nor does it create any confusion, because Marxists never fail to determine the class essence of all the phenomena and processes in society. Speaking of economic integration, we always emphasize the essential difference of its class content in capitalist and socialist society. We are perfectly justified to refer to integration of different orientations, for even the natural sciences have concepts identifying the orientation of an action.

Arguments over the fitness of some term, L. Nagy said, should not obscure the main thing – the processes as such, their impact on the development of society, the tasks entailed for our countries and parties. Rejection of the term 'integration' may create the impression that we reject what it stands for – the process of a mutual merging of the national economies of the socialist countries along lines defined in the Comprehensive Program.

The Communists' approach of principle to the class character of integration is reflected in the terminology as well, observed W. Kunz. Such terms as 'West-European' and 'East-European,' for example, are unacceptable. The scientific concepts are 'socialist' and 'capitalist' economic integration.

Internationalization of production on the socialist basis was powerfully stimulated by the Comprehensive Program, participants in the conference noted. It bagan a new stage in the international economic cooperation of the CMEA countries. Socialist economic integration intensifies production and broadens the access to the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. It stands for a further convergence and approximation of the economic levels of the fraternal countries.

## THE ECONOMY AND POLITICAL TENDENCIES

Economic integration, participants in the conference noted, cause visible political changes, a realignment of class and political forces on the international scene.

Socialist integration, said W. Kunz, is an important vehicle of socialist influence on the entire international economic and political situation. The CMEA integration region is, in effect, the economic foundation of the developing socialist world economy. The CMEA countries are a large and dynamic industrial region. In 1951-1973 their national income went up 5.7-fold and industrial production 8.4-fold, whereas the national income of the developed capitalist countries went up 2.8-fold and industrial production 3.4-fold. While accounting for 18.5 per cent of world territory and 9.5 per cent of world popula-

tion, the CMEA countries produce about 33 per cent of the world industrial output (as compared with the 16 per cent of the EEC Nine). The socialist community is a mighty force in the international contest with imperialism, facilitating the solution of essential international problems in favor of peace and social progress.

The advantages Cuba derives from participating in the socialist international division of labor, are incontestable, said *Roberto Villar*, economic advisor of Cuba's CMEA representative. One of the results are stable sales and prices of Cuban exports. No longer are our exports dependent on the ups and downs of the capitalist world market. Cuba is involved in a number of concrete CMEA undertakings, including in agriculture, transport, chemicals, mining, consumer industries, etc.

The principle of socialist internationalism, the basic guideline of Marxist-Leninist parties, said *Vladimir Wacker*, department head at the Higher Political School of the CC CP of Czechoslovakia, imparts new socio-economic content to the cooperation of socialist countries. It provides good conditions for attaining national interests and aspirations through international unity. The convergence of the socialist states is based on the affinity of their goals and the identical objective laws governing socialist development. True, the identity of aims does not totally eliminate problems and difficulties in the practical operation of the principle of socialist internationalism in economic relations, requiring continual improvement of the international division of labor and concentrated political and ideological efforts. *Tsogtyn Namsarai*, alternate member of the CC Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, said this was greatly facilitated by the political and ideological unity of the fraternal parties and their appreciation of the objective need for the further consolidation of the socialist world system, which instils the necessary social and class orientation in the process of socialist integration.

Socialist economic integration, said *Ladislav Janci*, deputy chief of the Economic Department, CC CP of Slovakia, helps surmount historical disparities between economic regions of the same country, as well as disparities in development levels of different socialist states. The much greater postwar dynamics of the Slovak Socialist Republic's economy is a good example. If we look at the integrative processes, we shall see the advantages of the socialist type of economy from the standpoint of the productive forces, their use for the good of all working people. Socialist economic integration is obviously vital and has a broader perspective than its capitalist counterpart.

Socialist integration, O Bogomolov stressed, is the material foundation of the socio-political unity of the socialist countries. The closer the

economic integration of the CMEA countries becomes, the more favorable the conditions become for closer bonds in social relations and culture, and in the drive for higher standards of living. This is a specific feature of socialist integration, a dependable factor of success in the contest against capitalism. Joint handling of major economic and science-technical problems and coordination of economic policy for the long term are evidence of the high degree of mutual trust prevailing among the fraternal countries.

When the socialist countries exchange commodities they are motivated less by material interest and much more by the impulse of mutual assistance and comradely unity. When they undertake large-scale joint projects, develop advanced technology, or promote cooperation between enterprises, the economic rationale also serves a loftier purpose: unification into a fraternal community of like-thinking peoples.

CMEA is an example of how complicated international problems may be solved on a basis of equality, free will, respect for national sovereignty, and the renunciation of mechanisms that may impinge on the rights of any of the partners or restrict their competence in economic or political areas. The manner of reaching international economic and political decisions does not allow any country to impose its will on any other. And free will assures harmony of interests, paving the way for effective joint action.

There is a connection between economic integration and political, cultural and ideological internationalization also in the capitalist world. But there it works in an entirely different way. Efforts to build a political, let alone a military alignment, upon the economic and monetary foundation of the EEC, have put the socialist countries on their guard, prompting Communists to draft a strategy and tactics against these trends, which imperil the working people, European security and world peace.

The tie-up between the capitalist internationalization of the productive forces and the internationalization of political affairs is complicated and ambiguous, said *Martin Jacques*, member of the Executive of the CP of Great Britain. While stimulating inter-state economic integration, internationalization of the productive forces does not lead automatically to political unity. The chances of complementing economic integration with political integration depend on a combination of may factors. The continuous clash of centrifugal and centripetal tendencies within the EEC, the appearance of new inter-imperialist contradictions and the aggravation of the old ones (some of them as a result of the EEC's expansion), the instability of the 'social blocs' on which the capitalists rely in their integrative policy, are strongly obstructing capitalist integration. But the main obstacle to

the ultra-imperialist aims of the capitalist class is the international working class and its capacity to counter monopoly strategy with a strategy and tactics of its own. The EEC should not be pictured as a classical and universal type of capitalist integration. There are several disparate forms of it in the capitalist world, both at inter-state level and at the level of monopoly alliances.

Integration has not eliminated uneven economic and political development as the central feature of capitalism, said *Tsvetan Tsanev*, Prorector of the Academy of Social Science and Social Administration, CC Bulgarian CP. On the contrary, new factors of imbalance are in motion now, such as the scientific-technical revolution, the higher degree of concentration and monopoly, and state-monopoly regulation. Integration is at once the result and premise of uneven development. Contradictions arise not only between integrating groups, but also between countries within integrated communities. It depends on the general correlation of class and political forces whether the function of assuring the common interests of the capitalist class takes priority, or whether integration becomes the handmaiden of competitive struggle to redivide the capitalist world. These two key functions of capitalist integration are intertwined, for integration is, in effect, a bid by monopoly capital to adapt to the changing world, to find new ways of preserving the capitalist system.

Lenin's idea that under capitalism 'no other basis and no other principle of division are possible except force' (Vol. 21, p. 341), is still entirely valid, said *Ib Norlund*, member of the Executive and the Secretariat of the CP of Denmark. Capitalist integration spawns supranational directive-issuing bodies. But nation-states have not been abolished. Therefore, the cumulative power of the directives depends on the 'right of might.' Countries with sufficient strength do, or could, violate agreements if these are contrary to their interests. But if smaller countries with insufficient strength ignore instructions, they are sorely punished. Capitalist integration is an additional burden on the lesser states, much like the dual exploitation suffered by nationally-oppressed peoples. The Communists and the people of Denmark are disturbed by the efforts of forces dominant in the EEC to spread integration to the political and military fields, though Danish advocates of the EEC keep saying that integration is an exclusively economic thing.

The general crisis of capitalism is growing deeper, said *Maria Prasca*, of the Gramsci Institute. The old contradictions are augmented by new ones, stemming from the unprecedentedly sharp monetary and energy crises, the sharper inter-imperialist antagonisms between Western Europe, the United States, and Japan, and the far-reaching changes in the balance of world forces to the disadvan-

tage of imperialism. In the circumstances, the Italian Communists are working to prevent the EEC from becoming an appendage of U.S. imperialism.

In examining the essence and perspectives of inter-imperialist contradictions, said D. Debatisse, we must also take into account the successes of socialism, the national-liberation struggle and the class battles in the developed capitalist states. We must bear in mind that inter-imperialist contradictions are not confined to the rivalry between the three power centers of modern imperialism. There is a crisis in the very logic of the development and functioning of state-monopoly capitalism – a crisis the monopoly bourgeoisie is trying to defuse chiefly by external expansion.

Nowadays, said A. Bisdorff, the imperialists are banking on economic integration, among other things, to lead them out of a crisis they would formerly have tried to resolve by war. Their strategy of 'peaceful compromises' includes attempts to subordinate the economies of other countries to their own, currency manipulation, export of profits, control of raw materials sources, and the like.

The social-economic and political consequences of capitalist integration are felt not only in capitalist Europe, but also in many other regions of the non-socialist world, said *John Pittman*, member of the Political Committee, CC CPUSA. First, the Common Market countries are trying to draw the African states into their orbit, repattern their economic structure, and make it easier for the monopolies of the EEC countries to exploit them (this is aptly described as 'collective neo-colonialism'). Secondly, Japanese imperialism has taken actions designed ultimately to merge the countries of the Pacific and of Southeast Asia into an international economic complex. Lastly, U.S. imperialism is applying considerable efforts to integrate the entire Western hemisphere. There already are integrative bonds of a relatively high order between the USA and Canada. U.S. imperialism has also accomplished changes in the economic structure of some Latin American countries, notably Puerto Rico, binding them to the U.S. monopolies.

Developments have come to a point, said *Amath Dansoko*, member of the Political Bureau of the CC, African Independence Party of Senegal, where we can speak of much more than just Common Market attempts to draw African countries into the orbit of its activity and influence. The problems springing from their associate membership in the EEC have become all too real. Nothing has changed in the basic character of their so-called underdevelopment. On the contrary, the economy of the associated states is still mainly agrarian, dependent in most cases on just one or two export crops. Its 'center of gravity' is abroad. The new national states are beginning to understand that

elimination of the unequal imperialist-imposed international division of labor is tied up with expanding and consolidating cooperation with the socialist countries. This is essential to safeguard their independence and assure truly independent development.

The socialist countries' economic, science-technical and cultural cooperation with the developing countries, said P. Nergui, is of the utmost significance for the long-term objectives of the national-liberation movement, the growth of the struggle for national liberation into a struggle against exploiter relations. The content of the economic and technical cooperation between the socialist and developing countries, its trends, forms and methods, are shaped by the identity of the main long-term interests and aims of world socialism and the national-liberation movement.

The expanding cooperation between the CMEA countries and the Third World states paves the way for truly independent national economy. The CMEA countries' economic and technical aid is designed first and foremost to lay the foundations for, and consolidate a state sector in national industry. By assisting the developing countries to modernize and diversify their economy, the socialist countries help them shake off the trammels of neo-colonial dependence. This is encouraged, among other things, by the special fund formed by the International Investment Bank of the CMEA to finance economic and technical assistance to the develping states (the fund will in due course amount to 1,000 million transferable rubles). The rapid economic, scientific and technical growth of the CMEA countries offers new opportunities for versatile cooperation with the developing states, helping the latter solve their vital economic problems and acting as an important factor of the anti-imperialist struggle.

## IDEOLOGICAL SHIFTS

Bourgeois ideologists are shrouding the class content of monopoly economic integration in a cloud of mystification, Y. Pawlowicz remarked. In the initial stage of EEC integration the ideological accent was on economic factors. Indeed, an era of de-ideologization was proclaimed, with the disappearance of class conflicts. In the late 60s, when integration had spent its initial momentum, the accent was shifted to ideological and political factors. This was accelerated by U.S. economic expansion in the integration zones. Its ideological dressing was the vaunted 'American challenge.' And there were the appropriate new concepts: rationalization and strengthening of national and international political structures to give integration a more authoritarian character. Accordingly, there were moves, encouraged

by the international monopolies, to downgrade the role of the national state and speed up political integration.

From the very outset, the monopolies regarded capitalist integration as a means of uniting Western Europe ideologically and politically, into a military-political bloc and isolating the socialist states economically and politically, said *Lutz Maier*, deputy director, GDR Institute of International Politics and Economics. The bourgeoisie wanted to exploit Europe's historical and cultural traditions to exclude socialism from any concept of Europe. Now it is clear that this ambitious plan has failed, for the socialist countries, the communist and democratic forces have presented their own, progressive concept of Europe and an all-Europe movement. Nonetheless, attempts are still being made to breathe new life into the old concepts of 'Atlanticism' and 'Europism.'

Discussing monopoly efforts to give capitalist integration a suitable ideological cover, M. Maximova remarked that the bourgeois ideologists have not given up their positions: they have only coined new myths for the old ones. For instance, 'social alliance' within the Common Market, a major long-term social and ideological project designed, ostensibly, greatly to improve the 'quality of life,' completely 'integrate' the worker in capitalist society.

There has been definite shift in the ideology of 'Europism' – there is a tendency to separate it from 'Atlanticism.' Expanding economic and trade ties between states with different social systems have led some bourgeois ideologists to suggest that we are advancing toward 'worldwide integration.' The future of Western Europe, the character of its relations with the socialist and developed countries and with other centers of world capitalism, hold a prominent place in the ideological struggle. These concepts can be effectively countered only by a concrete and carefully worked out alternative.

In the FRG, Fritz Rische said, the right-wing Social Democrat and trade-union leaders have been especially active in attempts to 'integrate' the working class and other working people in state-monopoly capitalism's economic and political structure. They want to tie the working class to an integrated monopoly system. We urge workers' organizations to follow an independent class policy toward all the institutions of capitalism.

Another speaker, Daniel Debatisse, said that reformist theories and right-wing Social Democrats were contributing to the political and ideological aims of capitalist integration. In fact in recent years elements of reformist ideology and practice have been taken over by all the forces ranged against the revolutionary workers' movement. For instance, imperialist reaction supports a labor-capital association as part of the integration structure, as sort of alliance of the exploiters

and the exploited. However, the worsening conditions of the workers and their growing political understanding tend to narrow the social base of reformism and of Social Democracy. Indeed, many of its supporters are turning to the Communists for an answer to the questions that are agitating their minds.

The British Labor Party's attitude toward Europism is somewhat different, Martin Jacques said. The Labor Party is divided on this issue, with most of its members and trade unionists opposed to British membership of the Common Market.

In Belgium, Jacques Nagels said, there have been substantial changes in the Socialist and Social-Christian parties. At the beginning both were zealous supporters of European integration, but today there is mounting doubt about certain of its aspects, chiefly the role of the multinational companies, with a sizable section of Socialists and Social-Christians demanding control over them. More important still, the two main trade-union centers are coordinating their actions. There is growing understanding within the Socialist Party and the trade unions that the Common Market primarily serves the monopolies. In fact there have been demands – so far limited and modest – for democratization of Common Market agencies. While supporting the demand for control of the multinationals, we combat reformist illusions and explain to the workers that only nationalization will put an end to the multinationals' stranglehold on the Belgian economy.

In Latin America as elsewhere, *Teodosio Varela*, alternate member of Executive, CC CP Colombia, said, bourgeois ideologists present capitalist integration as a universal cure for backwardness and dependence, so that now, they argue, there is no need to fight for national liberation. Closer united action against the compromising bourgeoisie and imperialism in Latin American countries in one or another way involved in integration groupings, will largely depend on Communist ideological work to expose the social substance of integration, its consequences and repercussions.

## FOR AN ANTI-MONOPOLY ALTERNATIVE

There was a consensus of opinion that the contradictions of capitalist integration – as all the contradictions of capitalism in general – can be resolved only through fundamental and revolutionary transformations aimed at liquidating the political and economic domination of monopoly capital. That is the fundamental long-range Communist position in the capitalist countries. The Communists are also concerned for the day-to-day struggle against the negative consequences of capitalist integration, its state monopoly forms and tendencies. The

situation differs from country to country and this has a bearing on the Communist position. But irrespective of these differences, the West European Communist parties emphasized at their Brussels Conference that 'a joint answer to the policy of monopoly economic integration is possible and necessary. To that end the Parties will work together to find solutions for the problems facing the West European peoples that accord with their interests and for genuine democratic European cooperation in keeping with the interests of each country and the common interest of all.'

The starting point in our common reply, Ib Norlund said, must be opposition to the methods the monopolies are using to find a way out of the social crisis that suits their interests. The integration policy must be countered by uniform alternatives based on the concept of Europe as a community of equal cooperating partners, a community that would contribute to peace and democracy throughout the world. All-European cooperation based on equality is of decisive importance in the battle against imperialist integration and its tendency to limit national sovereignty. Promoting equality in relations between capitalist and socialist countries would militate against inequality among the capitalist countries themselves. Promoting security and cooperation on an all-Europe basis would provide an effective alternative to the exclusive groupings resulting from imperialist integration.

At the same time we must exercise the greatest tact and show the greatest understanding of the problems that arise in different countries. As in other new EEC recruits, there is still a sharp controversy in Denmark over membership in this exclusive monopoly grouping. And the opposition comes not only from the working class but also from many other sections of the population. Favorable possibilities are opening up for broad anti-monopoly alliances based on this opposition.

We are justified in suggesting that, in the new EEC member countries, capitalist integration can be reversed. Considering the scope of the capitalist crisis in Europe and the strength of anti-Market feeling in Denmark, Britain and Ireland, we can hardly say that the prospect of these countries withdrawing from the EEC is unrealistic. It would be worthwhile also to reflect on whether the struggle in those countries which have been subjected to capitalist integration for quite some time, could lead to situations in which liquidation of integration methods and institutions would become inevitable. We do not believe that at the present stage the EEC superstructure can play a progressive role.

These are our Party's tasks: resist every step toward further integration, organize resistance to EEC in cooperation with all democratic forces; use every opportunity to bring Denmark out of the EEC;

support measures toward joint action in all EEC and other European capitalist countries' against monopoly integration and its consequences; work for European security and cooperation, and closer cooperation of all European Communist parties.

Britain is one of those countries, Martin Jacques said, where the anti-Market fight is by no means over. Significant social forces in Britain, above all the working class, are against Common Market membership. And this opposition is based on different but deep-rooted social and economic factors. Britain's economic structure is very uneven: alongside a fairly large number of highly competitive international firms are inefficient branches of industry. This, incidentally, is the cause of Britain's constant balance of payments difficulties, further aggravated by EEC membership. There is also this consideration: the bourgeoisie is finding it especially hard to secure working-class support for EEC, since EEC membership eliminates many hard-won gains of the working class (e.g., in food prices, etc.).

The British working class is footing the bill for Common Market membership. That is why there is such broad opposition to the EEC, and this finds expression in the attitude of the present Labor government, the result of strong anti-Market pressure. There is, therefore, the possibility of reversing the integration process and of Britain's withdrawal from the EEC. That would be a major victory for the working class and a defeat for the British monopoly bourgeoisie.

In formulating an anti-monopoly alternative, Fritz Rische said, we have to reckon with the cardinal law of modern capitalism, uneven economic and political development, which determines the perspective of the revolutionary process. As for the attitude to integration, a question discussed here, we have to remember that my country, the FRG, has been a Common Market member for 16 years. Its economy is so tightly integrated in the EEC that it would be unrealistic for us to demand withdrawal from the EEC as our Danish and British comrades are doing, though we fully support them. Consequently, in the present situation we are concentrating on the struggle against the strength and power of the multinational concerns, which we consider a specific form of internationalizing the class struggle within each country and the EEC as a whole.

And in this context we are investing much effort in upholding the rights of foreign workers. In many instances we have the support of the French, Italian and Belgian Communists. And there has also been successful bilateral and multilateral cooperation by our parties in a number of factories run by the multinationals. One example: when the West German chemical giant Hoechst merged with a leading French concern, representatives of the French Communist Party came to Frankfurt to discuss with our Party a concrete program of joint action at Hoechst enterprises.

Our Party is conducting similar work for joint trade union struggle against the multinationals, and here too we could cite examples of concrete and effective cooperation. But very much remains to be done to build up a system of close trade-union cooperation for the whole of Europe. Such a system would be an effective reply to monopoly integration.

Our Party has come out against U.S. plans to control the EEC. Our strategy is, first, to reduce the influence of U.S. monopolies and U.S. imperialism generally within the EEC. If this were achieved it would, I feel, be of immense importance for the development of an all-Europe anti-monopoly movement and for practical implementation of détente.

In their fight against monopoly leadership of EEC, Daniel Debatisse emphasized, the French Communists are focussing on bringing about the necessary changes on a national and world scale. In particular we are working toward joint and coordinated action in Europe. We have to reckon with the fact that EEC integration has, to one or another degree, securely tied the member countries. The need, therefore, is for action to neutralize the more damaging consequences of monopoly integration, action always directed against the monopolies. But such action aimed at changing the very substance of monopoly integration presupposes a struggle for democratization of EEC institutions and cannot be confined to the EEC framework.

The French Communists, in their fight against the more damaging consequences of monopoly integration, proceed from the need and urgency for a new pattern of relations with the socialist and developing countries. The aim is to unite the anti-imperialist forces to overcome the present crisis and establish a new type of international economic and political relations. This is inseparable from the fight for a new pattern of social relations in each country through nationalization of leading branches of the economy, ousting of the big bourgeoisie from government and subordinating production to the requirements of the people. The joint government program of the Left parties calls for deep-going democratic changes that will lay the basis for transition to socialism.

In Italy, Maria Prasca said, there is a growing understanding among workers and progressives generally of the need for joint struggle against the monopoly orientation of EEC economic integration. The aim of that struggle will be to secure measures guaranteeing the interests of the working people, safeguarding the economic potential and independence of our countries and favoring genuine international cooperation. The multinational monopolies, the capitalists, are trying to make the working class bear the consequences of the economic chaos resulting from capitalist anarchy of production. In this situation, one of our main tasks is to prevent capitalism shifting the burden

of the crisis on to the working people, and the dominant groupings shoring up their positions by curtailing and suppressing democratic rights. Solution of the problems posed by the present crisis in linked also with democratic restructuring of the world economy. Lastly, EEC integration, if it is to become a factor of peace and détente – and some maintain that that indeed is the purpose – must be neither anti-Soviet nor anti-American, but a bulwark of security and cooperation. The state of the world capitalist economy is such that only a policy of peace and security can guarantee its harmonious development.

The formula proposed by my Italian colleague for defining the international political position of a democratic Western Europe has to be amended, Y. Pawlowicz said. In my opinion, any definition of the place of the future democratic Western Europe in the world must include support of progressive and anti-imperialist forces.

Many difficult political problems have to be solved before we can attain our goals in the fight against monopoly integration. For instance, the democratic alternative advanced by some West European Communist parties provides for more influence by the trade unions and other working people's organizations on integration agencies. In particular, a greater role and wider jurisdiction for the European parliament in relation to the EEC executive, coupled with its democratic reorganization by including trade union representatives, would be of immense importance for uniting the anti-monopoly forces. But considering the present EEC balance of forces, how realistic is this aim? If we assume – and in the short run this is highly probable – that the democratic forces will not gain preponderant influence in EEC elective bodies, then strengthening the role of suprantional bodies at the expense of the sovereign function of EEC countries, would mean furthering integration on the worst of all possible bases, the monopoly basis.

Another element of the democratic alternative is closer joint action of the Left forces, the working people of the EEC countries and their joint struggle against the monopoly orientation of the EEC. Cooperation with the Social Democrats is bound to hold an important place in this alliance. The Social Democrats are often critical of the negative aspects of the EEC, its relations toward outsiders, for instance, but on the whole they take a positive view of capitalist integration. That attitude was expressed by Francois Mitterand, the French Socialist leader, when he declared: 'To build socialism we have to build up Europe.'*

This idea of making progress toward socialism dependent on progress in integration poses some knotty problems for the Communists,

**Le Monde*, Dec. 18, 1973.

even in the setting of close cooperation with the Socialists. It is therefore necessary, I think, to make sure that joint political action with the Socialists does not tend to obscure the Communist position in the fight against monopoly integration and its relation to the revolutionary process.

U.S. imperialism's policy of economic integration calls for joint action by the working class and its vanguard in the EEC countries, the Western hemisphere and in all other parts of the world, John Pittman said. Recent events suggest that the need for anti-imperialist unity is gaining realization and support in the Western hemisphere. This has found expression, at government level, in wider nationalization in a number of countries, in plans to pool resources and efforts, e.g., the Andes Pact, that counterweight to the imperialist-controlled Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association, and in recent joint actions by Latin American countries.

The working class is taking action too. Mention should be made of agreements between Communist and Workers' Parties of the Western hemisphere, resulting from bilateral and multilateral negotiations on the struggle against imperialist integration, and the agreement concluded on March 22, 1972 by the Communist parties of the USA and Canada. Coordination of the working-class struggle in the Western hemisphere was the central question discussed by the World Trade Union Assembly in Santiago, Chile, on April 10-15, 1973. These and other manifestations of proletarian solidarity are evidence that we are on the threshold of a new stage of working-class cooperation in the Western hemisphere.

It was generally agreed that the Communists regard their anti-monopoly alternative as but a stage on the road to restructuring the world economy along socialist lines. Their maximum program envisages a world economy run by the working class according to a single plan, that is, socialist economic integration encompassing all countries of the world. And there is this important fact: in the battle against capitalist integration the Communists have something very real to oppose to it – the existing socialist type of international economic cooperation. And socialist economic integration has solved many of the hard international economic problems that are insoluble through capitalist integration, thus laying a firm foundation for internationalizing production for the benefit of the working people. Economic ties between the socialist countries are increasingly influencing world economic relations, helping eliminate discrimination, inequality and other consequences of imperialist and neo-colonial policy.

## INTEGRATION AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The two social systems are mutually opposed. That rules out integration of socialist and capitalist countries, but certainly does not rule out their broad economic cooperation. Quite the contrary, such cooperation is an objective requirement of the world economy, an imperative of our time. And speakers noted that elimination of the imperialist-engineered artificial division of the world economy would improve the international climate, which is in the interests of all the revolutionary forces.

The democratic alternative to the capitalist integration groupings, notably the EEC, Margarita Maximova said, is inseparable from continued active struggle for European security and world peace. Resolute opposition to all plans of political and military integration worked out by the reactionaries is an organic part of that struggle. For such plans are contrary to the very nature of détente and to the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, and to equal security for all. They can only encourage the reactionary forces in Western Europe, precipitate a new round of the arms drive in Western Europe and the world, promote militarism and, consequently, increase the menace from the right in the main EEC countries.

Rapid expansion of international economic ties, Maximova said, has been accompanied by their stronger impact on the economic life of every country, the structure and growth rate of production. The effect of this, already tangibly felt, is bound to increase. Our institute estimates that international trade of the capitalist world will increase, in physical volume, by between 300 and 330 per cent by 1990 compared with 1970, and will grow at a rate 50 per cent higher than the growth rate of GNP. Foreign investments are likely to increase by 300-400 per cent and international license exchange by as much as 1,000 per cent. The impact of foreign contacts on the national economy will increase also because practically every sphere of economic endeavor will be involved in international cooperation – science and technology, designing and construction, industry and agriculture, tranport and communications.

Integration, Tsvetan Tsanev remarked, is no obstacle to international economic cooperation of all countries, though the cold war markedly changed and complicated relations between states with opposite social systems and retarded the objective tendency toward expansion of international economic contacts. Despite Common Market efforts to maintain unequal trading relations with the socialist countries, the general situation has changed for the better. Relaxation of political tension and wider acceptance of peaceful coexistence add

a new dimension to the problem of cooperation in Europe, in particular between CMEA and the Common Market. We can reasonably forecast that in future integration within the communities and cooperation between countries with differing social systems will develop parallel to each other. The trend toward more mutually advantageous trade in the interests of all European countries is steadily hewing a way for itself.

The changeover from cold war to détente and the achievements of socialist economic integration, Kunz said, offer many opportunities for multiform cooperation between socialist and capitalist countries in economics, science and technology. In fact, this might produce temporary shifts in cooperation between the CMEA countries themselves, some of which are increasing their trade with capitalist countries, especially in certain capital goods, at a faster pace than trade with other CMEA members. That trend could continue but, of course, it will not lead to disintegration of the socialist community. On the contrary, cooperation of CMEA countries with capitalist countries can, and will, be based on growing consolidation of the socialist community. Expanded mutually advantageous economic cooperation does not eliminate contradictions between socialism and capitalism, nor does it cancel out the class struggle in the international arena.

The statistics show, Ferenc Kozma said, that trade between CMEA and the EEC, though developing dynamically, is still on a very modest scale. Exports of CMEA countries to the Common Market are equal to about four or five per cent of their national income and the corresponding figure for Common Market exports to CMEA countries is between one and two per cent. There is a pressing need, therefore, for broader economic contacts between the two, all the more so since both are interested in this. But there are many political and economic difficulties that have to be overcome. Taking a long-term view, the present structure of trade and production cooperation will have to be completely overhauled.

If the Common Market is sincere in its professions for enlarging trade with socialist countries, it must abolish discriminatory tariffs, dismantle import barriers and apply the principle of equality. But the fact is that the EEC countries – and the rest of the capitalist world, too, for that matter – do not appreciate the very real fact that planned-economy countries offer a more capacious market, though in a different form, than market-economy countries. The CMEA Comprehensive Program takes account of the fact that socialist integration provides more opportunities for economic cooperation with developed-capitalist and developing countries. We believe that contacts between the two economic organizations are both necessary and possible.

The positive, stabilizing role of the CMEA countries' foreign economic activity in promoting international economic ties, Maria Prasca said, stands out in bold relief against the background of crisis developments in the capitalist economy and the disorganization of the capitalist trading system. The socialist countries' immense economic potential can and should play an important part in European economic cooperation. The struggle to democratize capitalist integration, the achievements of socialist integration, the promotion of European cooperation, are all closely linked. We Italian Communists hope that the successes of socialist integration will have a positive impact on the democratic, anti-monopoly orientation of decisions and reforms in the interests of the workers of our country.

Only if we reckon with the peoples' desire to choose – independently, without outside interference or pressure – the path and forms of their social and economic development, and only if we take into account the common destinies of mankind and all the consequences following therefrom, can we correctly define the motive forces and prospects of international economic cooperation, said *Costin Murgescu*, adviser to the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Rumania. The choice in favor of cooperation is not only an indispensable condition for the economic development of each country, but the only alternative to mankind destroying itself. Plans for all-European economic cooperation, though still in the initial stage, reflect real requirements which we can no longer afford to underestimate. The scientific and technological revolution poses new problems upon the solution of which depends the development of all nations. These problems cannot be solved on a regional or even continental basis. Some of them directly influence the life of a country, even if it holds aloof from joint effort on such problems as raw material resources, exploitation of the seas and outer space for peaceful purposes, and so on.

The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, Barbu Zaharescu said, is by all its activity powerfully assisting international détente, security and peaceful coexistence. First because it is composed of states sharing common interests, with a common social and political system and philosophy and this rules out sharp, irreconcilable contradictions or relations based on submission and exploitation. Second, because CMEA is an open community, and third because it does not obstruct wider cooperation of its members with other countries. The Common Market presents an entirely different picture. It is imbued with the spirit of rivalry, is based on the weak submitting to the strong; there are sharp differences and contradictions; there is a high customs barrier against the rest of the world. The economy of EEC countries is subjected to the multinational monopolies which in most

cases represent foreign, primarily North American, rather than national, capital. All these factors inhibit positive EEC influence on European cooperation. Of course, inhibit does not mean prevent, for a number of factors stimulate broader cooperation with CMEA countries. But as far as peaceful coexistence is concerned, the main role, we believe, belongs not to international organizations but to cooperation between individual countries irrespective of their affiliation to one or another international community.

The socialist countries must always coordinate their dealings with the capitalist world, Vladimir Wacker said. Indeed, that is the only method to follow in relation to the capitalist blocs, for their policy always aims at dividing the socialist community and weakening it economically and politically.

Referring to the international role of socialist integration, Lutz Maier noted that the rapidly growing economic potential of the CMEA countries is enhancing the anti-monoply and anti-imperialist trend in the world economy.

The trend toward a new pattern of economic contacts stems from the impact of diverse factors and phenomena: socialism's stronger economic position in the world, development of socialist integration, expansion of economic ties between socialist and developing countries, growing scope of equal economic contacts between socialist and capitalist countries, encroachment on the positions of international monopoly and, last but not least, the crisis of West-European integration, its state-monopoly mechanism, etc.

The volume and pattern of economic relations with the socialist countries has become the subject of much controversy in EEC countries and an important factor in the fight against the more reactionary forces of monopoly capital. Its ideologists, Tsogtyn Namsarai remarked, cannot conceive of international economic cooperation that does not further the economic interests of the monopolies and does not keep the weak in submission to the strong.

The problem of CMEA-EEC relations is economically and politically a complex one, Oleg Bogomolov said. If the EEC wants to achieve a measure of stability in its foreign economic contacts, it would be well advised to do business with the CMEA countries, for their foreign trade is based on the five-year development plans and they favor long-term, large-scale agreements. Furthermore, state regulation of foreign trade in CMEA countries and major integration projects provide additional opportunities for cooperation with the West, but only if the West is prepared to follow a new pattern of relations with the socialist countries.

CMEA and the EEC have different reasons for wanting to cooperate with each other, but whatever the motives, the fact remains that

there is a wide area of mutual advantage. And the area will be enlarged in the norle too distant future, when Europe will have to tackle projects involving the entire continent. This will require coordination of investment policy between CMEA and EEC countries, the founding of new international organizations and big banking consortia. But the overall result will be to build a Europe of peace, confidence and cooperation.

In his concluding remarks, Laszlo Nagy said that the discusssion had been fruitful and had revealed identity of views, though there were differences on some aspects of the questions discussed. This is only natural, for each Party, in its Marxist-Leninist analysis of integration processes, is guided by the conditions in which it has to wage the struggle. And this has enriched our understanding of the problems discussed and contributed to a common policy. The main element integration brings into the class struggle, nationally and internationally, and into the confrontation of the two social systems is that it enhances the objective basis and subjective requirements for international working-class solidarity. The role of national revolutionary initiatives increases as international anti-imperialist action is more closely coordinated.

Marxist analysis has given us concrete forms of struggle against monopoly integration and also a democratic alternative to it. But there is another, socialist alternative, and in this context realization of the CMEA Comprehensive Program of socialist economic integration is of immense social and political significance.

It was generally agreed that further study was necessary of integration processes, notably their impact on the specific features and prospects of the world revolutionary process. *World Marxist Review* will continue to publish the results of such research on the following subjects: effective ways, means and forms of deepening socialist economic integration as a cardinal factor in consolidating the community of socialist countries in their class confrontation and economic competition with capitalism and in securing favorable international conditions to accelerate the progress of socialism and the struggle of all revolutionary and peace forces; the role and significance of integration processes in the economics and politics of contemporary capitalism; the link between the anti-monopoly struggle in each country and joint anti-imperialist action of progressive forces on an international scale; critique of Social Democrat ideology and theory, notably the contention that West-European integration must precede the transition to socialism; realistic opportunities for the fight for democracy and socialism in the integrated countries. The editors invite readers to suggest theoretical and political questions of special interest in their countries.

# The approach to the study of developed socialism

*Richard Kosolapov*,
Dr. Phil. (USSR)

Discussions about the essence of socialism, the criteria of its maturity, its stages, and the specific qualities of developed socialism, have been dragging on for years. Different approaches and standpoints have been put to the test. With the now abundant conceptual and factual material there is a need to synthesize it along scientifically precise principles that should, desirably, be acceptable to the majority of scholars.

First *about the necessity of a single scientific conception of the essence of socialism*. Though this is a seemingly elementary point, it is all too often approached from different angles. For example, the cooperative (group) forms of socialist economy are still sometimes contraposed to the commonly-owned (state) forms. Some even give preference to the former, which is obviously contrary to the leading tendency and perspective. One more example is the advocacy of 'pluralistic socialism,' that is, a mechanical blend of private and collective modes of production which, in substance, would never assure the spread and victory of socialist principles. Bourgeois propaganda is trying to capitalize on these differences of approach by claiming that socialism is 'indefinable,' 'has no clear boundaries,' and the like. Leading personalities of the world Communist movement, notably Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the CP of Czechoslovakia, have pointed to the harmful ideological consequences of this 'erosion' of certain basic concepts (including the concept 'socialism'), which strips them of the necessary precision.

Apart from the politically conscious proletariat, the world revolutionary movement with its ultimately socialist orientation encompasses hundreds of millions of people of non-proletarian origin, status and mentality. A correct understanding of what determines the transition to socialism is therefore doubly necessary.

Continuing the discussion of developed socialism. See *WMR*, Nos. 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 1973; Nos. 1, 2, 4, 1974.

The most accurate criterion is *Marx's law of the socialization of labor and production,* which gains impetus in capitalist society and begins to propel private property relations toward their doom.[1]

Highly significant, too, as a principle of approach based on this law is Lenin's elucidation that 'Marx deduces the inevitability of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society wholly and exclusively from the economic law of the development of contemporary society. The socialization of labor, which is advancing ever more rapidly in thousands of forms and has manifested itself very strikingly in the growth of large-scale production, capitalist cartels, syndicates and trusts, as well as in the gigantic increase in the dimensions and power of finance capital, provides the principal material foundation for the inevitable advent of socialism' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 21, p. 71). Hence the *aim* (and *essence*) of socialism: the transfer of the land, factories, and in general *all* the means of production to the ownership of the *whole* of society and the replacement of the capitalist mode of production by production according to a common plan in the interests of *all* members of society.[2]

It follows that the progressive socialization of labor and production, directed toward their superior forms, is the *focal law,* as it were, of socialism's destiny, and that the working class is its leading subject and bearer. That is the common strategic guideline for Communists of all countries.

The criteria of socialism's maturity are sometimes related to the main spheres of social life – the sphere of production, the socio-political and the cultural spheres. But that, as we see it, sometimes leads to an error of approach – underestimation of the fact that maturity factors are not only coordinate, but also *subordinate* to each other, comprising a hierarchy, as it were, reposing, in the final analysis, upon the economy as the foundation.

Socialist socialization of the means of production should not be reduced to mere acts of nationalization or cooperation. It is not enough to convert the means of production into collective property and put them to work in the new conditions. They must be geared to the requirements of the material and technical basis of socialism. Lenin distinguished between nationalization or confiscation of capitalist and landlord property by a popular government, on the one hand, and socialization, on the other. 'Today, only a blind man could fail to see,' he wrote in 1918, 'that we have nationalized, confiscated, beaten down and put down more *than we have had time to count.* The difference between socialization and simple confiscation is that confiscation can be carried out by "determination" alone, without the ability to calculate and distribute properly, *whereas socialization cannot be brought about without this ability*' (Vol. 27, p. 334). Lenin's

plea to distinguish between formal and real socialization (stemming from Marx's *Capital*), we shall see, is also highly important for defining the specific qualities of developed socialism.

To *really* socialize production in the conditions of Russia, to 'introduce socialism,' Lenin said, involved two things: 1) strict and universal accounting and control of production and distribution, and 2) a general ever-rising productivity of labor.

The first point implies that the economy, all its available resources, must be geared to socialism's aim – the fullest possible satisfaction of the people's material and cultural needs, while the second point implies modern industrial, power and scientific facilities, highly trained personnel, and adequate organizational, technical and cultural provisions for the publicly-owned property. Any other way, particularly a premature sense of satisfaction with having formally converted to socialist property, coupled with neglect of the organizational and technical aspects of socialist socialization, as in the case of the Maoists, is bound to hold back the development of the new system, or to cause stagnation. Statistics of socialization, past experience has shown, give no idea of the socialist maturity of a country. There can be no talk of developed socialism until there is evidence of a high degree of real socialization or, what amounts to the same thing, of production that organically combines the achievements of the modern scientific-technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system – a historic task.

Socialism is a genuinely collectivist system. This basic quality is impregnated in all its social relations and institutions, culture, ethics and law. For this reason alone, though *economic* criteria are basic, there are other criteria of socialism's maturity that we must also take into account. It is impossible to assess a developed social system more or less thoroughly by one factor precisely because it is a *system*.

One may ask if it is possible to single out some *general criterion of developed socialism*.

The way suggested by Marx appears to be fruitful, though it involves considerable supplementary research. 'We should remember,' Marx wrote in his *Critique of Political Economy*, 'that the new productive forces and relations of production do not grow out of *nothing*, out of the air or the core of a self-conceived idea; they develop within, in struggle against, the existing production and the inherited traditional property relations.' This establishes the connection between the new system and the old, the element of continuity and negation.

'In a consummated bourgeois system,' Marx amplified, 'one economic relationship presupposes another of a bourgeois-economic type; thus, every proposition is also a premise. This is true of any

other . . . organic system. As an aggregate entity, this organic system has its own premises. Its development toward integrity consists precisely in subordinating all the elements of society or creating from it the still missing organs. This is how the system becomes an integrity in the course of historical development. The system's growth into such an integrity makes up a moment of it, of the system, of the process, of its development.'

This, we hold, is also applicable to socialism. After it wins a complete victory and becomes an 'organic' social system, every socialist socio-economic relationship presupposes (and this to an increasing degree) the appearance and development of other relations. It acts as their premise, on the one hand, but also stems from them, on the other. At a certain stage, the socialist system becomes a qualitative *integrity;* subordinating to its principles one sphere of society after another, and purging all recurrences and alien social phenomena of the private-property system. *Precisely this stage of the socialist system's growth into an integrity is the stage of developed socialism,* with all the elements of the society's mode of life adopting the essential collectivist principles. The 24th Congress of the CPSU singled out the principal indicator of these changes. In the present conditions, satisfying the needs of the people and raising their well-being (as an aim of socialist production) is becoming one of the leading economic premises for the rapid growth of production, a more and more important requirement of economic development.[3] The organic unity of socialism's main aim and the means of achieving it, the identity of the direct and 'reverse' connections, 'man-production' and 'production-man,' stands out more clearly.

Some scholars define the two main forms of socialist property (state and cooperative) and the classes with a common socialist character as 'universal features' of socialism.[4] Their fundamental importance and existence in different countries building socialism, is of course beyond question. But, as we see it, this definition is not adequate in the case of developed socialist society. To begin with, it does not entirely conform with the conception of developed socialism as an integrity in the act of consummation.

Communism is invariably conceived as a classless social system in which all means of production are owned wholly by the people. And one would naturally expect these qualities to emerge during the emergence of the premises for the second, higher phase of the new society, and mainly before rather than after the passage to full communism, that is, within the framework of socialism. The dialectics of history shows that the gradually increasing degree of socialism's maturity implies a gradual disappearance of the allegedly universal features given in the definition. So, we hold, especially in the case of the

developed, final stage of socialism, they not only contradict socialism's essential tendencies, but also obscure the concept of how socialism turns into communism.

The new society's trend toward integrity is in full accord with the law of the socialization of labor and production. The convergence of state and cooperative forms of property, of cultural conditions and the way of life in town and village, becomes more and more evident with the industrialization of all economic branches, gradually moulding an identical relation of workers, farmers and intellectuals to the means of production. The distinctions between classes, between mental and physical labor, become erased. As we see, in its essential features developed socialism resembles the definition given by Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Program,* defended and further developed by Lenin. The most significant *integrational* social phenomena occur in the framework of developed socialism. The finest socio-political and moral qualities of the working class spread to all sections of the population, resulting in an increasingly close socialist alliance of all working people and in a growing degree of politico-social and ideological unity.[5] Those are the social premises for the growth of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people – a substantial step closer to the future communist public self-administration.

The principle of integrity applies to all social phenomena and processes in an organic social system. They must ultimately be agreed and coordinated. Under socialism the personal well-being and dignity of each depends entirely on the constructive contribution made by each to the common labor of society. There is therefore a different 'system of accounting' and appraisal, a different gauge of interests and requirements, than under capitalism.[6]

In this connection there is the important question of *correctly understanding the advantages of socialism as a social system.*

In theory as well as practice, socialism is a *scientifically optimalized system of social relations.* The main axis and measure of optimality is the *human being,* the creative, spiritually rich and harmoniously developed personality. The way to this optimality is paved by the collective nature and organization of socialized socialist production, its harmonious growth according to plan in the interests of the working people. Its successive stages vary from country to country, of course, but everywhere they are merely stages of the growing domination of people over their social relations.

The obstacles met on this road are due, first, to imperialist attempts to check the consolidation and perfection of socialism as the alternative to capitalism by various means, such as blockade, aggression or imposed competition in armaments[7]; second, to the historical limita-

tions of the economic opportunities and culture of the countries building socialism and to survivals of the past and outdated traditions, and third, to the fact that the laws governing the development of the new society are not always fully reflected and not always taken into enough consideration in management.

The development of socialism is accompanied by a continuous demonstration and build-up of its advantages over any system based on private property. It should be remembered that while the socialist system has as yet a relatively smaller production potential, it can provide the people with more than capitalism as regards the *sum total* of material and spiritual benefits and social opportunities and prospects. The growing proportion of quantitative results and the effort to raise the quality of consumer goods should not make us lose sight of the main thing – the *characteristics of the way of life in terms of its content and atmosphere,* the synthetic notion of man's living and working conditions, his inner world and his relationships with other people, which under capitalism give rise to decadent, pessimistic tendencies while under socialism they are a source of *social optimism*.

Take, for instance, the abolition of the exploitation of man by man in the socialist countries. Its vastly beneficial impact on the creativity and moral character of the citizens of the new world is beyond question. Indeed, they are free from the depressive and mind-deforming feeling born of economic, political and national oppression and discrimination, a concomitant of the life of the masses in an exploiting society. The price which the working people of the more developed capitalist countries have to pay for the relatively higher standard of living they have won cannot be fully expressed in terms of money, for there are also *social stress and chronic social and cultural underconsumption*. The bourgeoisie would like to conceal this fact, for it would become bankrupt if it had to foot the bill presented by this reality.

'What is placed on the scales now is the overall quality of life,' said Gus Hall in his speech at the 24th Congress of the CPSU. 'Standards of physical comforts remain very important in determining the quality of life, but the yardstick is much broader now. It includes the total spectrum of human values, the order of priorities, dictated by the inherent laws of each system. It includes the moral, cultural and philosophical concepts nurtured by each system. Many of the new components that add up to a quality of life cannot be measured by charts.'

Socialism is incomplete communism. But even as the lower phase of the new formation, it is far from having reached maturity in all brother countries, and nowhere is it consummated. 'The socialist

world today, with its gains and prospects and problems,' said L.I. Brezhnev at the 24th Party Congress, 'is a young, growing social system in which not everything has settled into shape and many things bear the imprint of past epochs. The whole socialist world is in motion and is continuously perfecting itself.' Trying to make an absolute of this or that stage of its development is incompatible with dialectical and historical materialist methodology and narrows the scope of both theoretical research and political activity. We believe attempts of this nature are particularly harmful when they result in counterposing a hastily generalized practice limited by a nation-state and temporal framework to the scientific forecast (often poorly studied and inaccurately interpreted) of the main features of the new society made by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Study of the experience of building socialism and communism in the Soviet Union affords, as is generally acknowledged, ample opportunities for a retrospective and prospective view of the new formation. And the fact that the Soviet Union has travelled a longer distance on the road to communism than any other country is important in this respect. Among other things, this allows us to use the Soviet example in *setting the following periods of the first phase of communism:*

1. The *period of transition* from capitalism to socialism, which means, first of all, the adoption throughout society of socialist forms of management and a corresponding social structure under the political aegis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The nominal socialization acquires a real content as a material and technical basis adequate to socialism is brought into being (if society did not have it). The fulfilment of this last task may go beyond the transitional period if the provision of the material and technical basis for socialism requires more time than nationalization and cooperation in production.

2. The *initial stage* of socialist development, which in all countries implies consolidation of the new social and economic system, growth of the productive forces and the solution of other problems assuring *real socialization* everywhere. Socialism demonstrates its superiority over capitalism in a given country by achieving higher productivity than before the revolution.[8] A non-antagonistic social structure comes into being, made up of friendly, socialist classes and strata of working people.

3. *Developed socialism,* which continues the process of socialization, eliminates all its nominal elements, and in its closing stage creates the main prerequisites of communism. As a definite period of history, it falls into two stages according to major characteristics:

(a) The stage at which the two forms of socialist property draw closer together and fuse under the influence of the material and

technical basis of communism that is being built, a stage coinciding with an intensive obliteration of class distinctions, which, however, remain substantial;

(b) the stage at which socialist property as property of the whole people becomes virtually universal and society assumes a classless character (i.e., 'there is no distinction between the members of society as regards their relation to the social means of production' (Lenin, Vol. 25, p. 462), which, however, does not yet mean its final transformation into a socially homogeneous society.

Considering the present pace of change, it will take less time to accomplish this than to achieve complete social homogeneity as a prerequisite of communist equality, that is, eliminate every vestige of the previous division of labor into mental and physical, creative and mechanical, organizing and executive. According to Marx, Engels and Lenin, this is one of the most important dividing lines between the first and second phases of communism.

Authors rarely go into the distinctions between contemporary societies effecting the transition from capitalism to socialism and those that have already done so. They describe either society as socialist, bearing in mind their common goal rather than their actual condition.

Yet, to quote M.A. Suslov, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC CPSU, 'the socialist phase has its stages of maturity depending on the level of the productive forces and production relations and the concrete historical situation . . .

'The time it takes to carry out socialist tasks, especially to form mature socialism with an adequate material and technical basis and developed social relations, varies from country to country. Building socialism is relatively easier for countries which were economically developed when they took the new road. As for countries which had an underdeveloped material and technical basis at the initial stage of socialist relations, they have to travel a long road and solve a greater number of problems.'

This problem has been discussed by Communists for a long time. The Program of the Communist International, drawing on Lenin's propositions, stated that *'the diversity of path and pace of the proletariat's advent to power,* the necessity in a number of countries for certain transitional stages leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and then the *diversity of forms in which socialism is built in this or that country,'* are all historically inevitable. In line with this postulate, the Comintern Program divided all countries into three main types: (a) highly-developed capitalist countries, (b) capitalist countries with a medium level of development, and (c) colonial and semi-colonial countries. Of the countries which at different times took

the socialist path, Germany and Czechoslovakia were on the eve of their revolution in the first group; Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Rumania and Yugoslavia in the second; and Albania, Vietnam, China, Korea, Cuba and Mongolia in the third. This pattern has undergone a qualitative change by now due to the operation in the socialist community of the law of equalizing political, social, economic and cultural development levels. However, it would be out of keeping with objective reality to regard all socialist countries as already being equally developed. This is stated in program documents of the fraternal parties.

*First*, what is generally taken into account in assessing the maturity of socialism in a country is the percentage of the socialization of the means of production, or more precisely, their transformation into public property. It is considered that the higher this percentage is, the closer society has come to completing the transitional period. The socialist world system is fairly homogeneous in this respect. Only in Poland and Yugoslavia is the private sector still extensive in agriculture[9].

Since the degree of socialist maturity is gauged by real socialization, there is this *other important criterion:* extent of industrialization, scientific and technological progress, predominance of mechanical over manual labor, and the like.

There is a dialectical contradiction here. Poland, for example, has not completed some of the changes usually made in the framework of the transition from capitalism to socialism. On the other hand the Sixth Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party, taking the potentialities of the sector owned by the whole people into account, rightly advanced the slogan: 'The 70s must become a period of further progress in forming a developed socialist society in our country.'

Countries like Democratic Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia, which have outpaced Poland in adopting socialist economic *forms*, do not have, nor as yet plan, as developed an industry as Poland's.

It follows that even by purely economic standards (not the only ones, of course, that must be taken into account) the socialist countries belong to *three* principal groups: the group which has completely socialized the means of production and commands a material and technical basis in the main adequate to socialism, comprising mostly countries engaged in building or perfecting a developed socialist society; the group which is close to the first in production potentialities but lags behind it in the scope of socialization; and the group which has completed socialization but not, as yet, the material and technical basis for socialism.

To be sure, some socialist countries inevitably are nearer to mature socialism and communism in some respect or respects than others.

Nevertheless, no country can be permanently classed in one or another stage of the complex and long process of transition from capitalism to communism. Indeed, the exceptional dynamism of the socialist system, its irresistible urge to advance and ascend, logically makes for a faster growth rate the less developed a country was in the past. Of course, the actual operation of this law depends in appreciable measure on how far the ruling Communist Party has mastered this law and takes it into consideration.

Speaking of the world system as a whole, the experience of the socialist community shows that all its members, however greatly they may differ in cultural history and nationally, are effecting what is in the final analysis a law-governed evolution. As this evolution goes on, headway is made toward the scientifically demonstrated but as yet unattained type of 'socialist society in its developed form' (Lenin, Vol. 27, p. 147) described by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

1. See Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Ch. 24.

2. See Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 275.

3. See L.I. Brezhnev. Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th Congress of the CPSU.

4. See 'The Theory and Practice of Present-Day Socialism.' Prague, Peace and Socialism Publ., 1973.

5. As we see it, one cannot refer to the convergence in socialist society of the working class, the collective farmers and the people's intelligentsia, and for all that deny the fact of their partial fusion. The convergence of classes and social groups cannot lead to a classless society unless it brings about their gradual fusion. The intensive convergence of the technical intelligentsia with the working class under socialism should not be confused with the social processes in developed capitalist countries, where the nature of relations between these social strata is essentially different, often opposite.

6. Comrade Fidel Castro, for example, said that 'our consumption standards should not be oriented on the standards in the developed capitalist societies based on exploitation, anarchy and economic waste, which totally neglect moral and human values' (*Pravda*, Jan. 31, 1974).

7. See V.I. Lenin, Better Fewer, But Better, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33.

8. The Soviet Union exceeded the pre-revolutionary level of productivity in the first half of the 30s.

9. Polish authors rightly point out that individual farming in Poland differs in many respects from the old small-commodity farming, for it cooperates extensively with socialist state farming in production and sales.

In Yugoslavia, the 10th Congress of the LCY found it necessary to more intensively promote socialist relations in agriculture and closer relations between individual producers and the public sector through diverse forms of association and economic cooperation.

political panorama

# Communal and power crisis in Belgium

*Louis Van Geyt*
Chairman,
Communist Party of Belgium

The 60s and 70s are a distinctive period in the postwar development of Belgium. Acute social and economic problems, stepped-up class battles and increased political struggles dispelled the myth of 'peaceful' and 'prosperous' Belgium, made out for a long time to be a 'classical country of compromise.'

In the past decade Belgium has been a 'sick' country going through a political crisis due to far-reaching changes in its social and economic structures. This restructuring is a result of the scientific and technological revolution and Belgium's membership of the European Economic Community, dominated by West European monopolies and multinational companies. Economic and social problems as well as the ethnic problem connected with them are particularly pressing.

The ethnic problem arose at the turn of the century out of the unequal economic, social and political development of the two large ethnic regions which together with Brussels make up Belgium: French-speaking Wallonia and Flanders, a region close to Holland in culture and language.*

In the last century, substantial coal deposits put Wallonia in a favorable position as far as its industrial development was concerned. The Walloon working class, with its high degree of concentration; keen class awareness and militant traditions, has been in the van of the labor movement for decades.

Flanders, on the other hand, remained for a long time an underdeveloped, chiefly agrarian region with a small and less organized working class. Economic backwardness told seriously on the condition of the Flemish working people, who were, moreover, discriminated

*Of the 9.7 million inhabitants of Belgium, 5.5 million are Flemings, 3.1 Walloons and about 1 million Bruxellois, who generally do not regard themselves as either Flemings or Walloons but most of whom speak French. Besides, 60,000 Belgians living in the 'eastern cantons' speak German.

against in language and culture. The Belgian bourgeoisie of the last century, chiefly French-speaking (even in Flanders), treated Flemish as an inferior language and, in general, denied Flemish culture the right to exist.

These were the causes of the rise of a Flemish national movement inspired by petty-bourgeois nationalism and influenced, first of all, by the largely populist small and medium Catholic clergy. The bourgeoisie took advantage of national discord to further its own interests. By playing off Flemings against Walloons, it strengthened its positions against the Walloon working class, which demanded a higher standard of living. At the same time it consolidated its rule over the super-exploited Flemish working people.

*The ethnic problem*

The intensification of national differences over the past decade is a result of a downward trend in the old and the rise of new industrial areas. Whereas in the last century the industries based on coal and ferrous metals were concentrated in Wallonia, today enterprises of the most promising and fast-growing industries (built mostly by foreign, primarily U.S. companies) spring up mainly in Flanders. This development is due, in particular, to the proximity of seaports, a more up-to-date infrastructure, cheap labor power and the fact that in Flanders the working-class movement is influenced more strongly than in Wallonia by Christian Democrats and Social Democrats who preach 'concord' with capital and urge the working people to 'moderate' their demands.

Belgian capital concentrates in certain geographically favorable areas and gives priority to capital-intensive industries (petrochemical plants, marine metallurgy, etc.). This policy spells doom for large areas. Nor does it affect only the greater part of Wallonia, where the situation is in places dramatic, but also some areas of Flanders.

Of the 81,000 million francs invested by foreign companies in the Belgian economy in 1960-1970, only 27,000 million went to the southern areas. As a result, the Flanders economy developed twice as fast as Wallonia's and soon overtook it.

Meanwhile the thousands of millions of francs budgeted for economic aid to lagging areas are still unused due to inertia, and this at a time when Wallonia is hard hit by unemployment, especially among youth. Within the Common Market, only South Italy may be compared to Wallonia in scale of unemployment.

Industrialization did not, therefore, equalize the development levels of the country's two major regions and, indeed, gave rise to new imbalances. An excellent illustration of the anarchic development of capitalism, this. Economic imbalances, a catalyst of social dramas,

made for a keener national consciousness in both communities each of which advances its own, often vastly different, demands.

Walloon workers and democrats insist that the state follow an industrial policy meeting the interests of their region. They demand real democratic rights to change the trend of industrial development in the working people's interests. They distrust the policies of a centralized, unitary state doing big capital's bidding. They are concerned about the fact that in what is a unitary state, the Flemish big bourgeoisie and its allies have secured a dominant position.

The dominant social forces of the Flemish community (the big and petty bourgeoisie), for their part, are set above all on achieving 'cultural autonomy' and safeguarding the language rights of the Flemish-speaking minority of the fundamentally bilingual Brussels area. These forces try to stop the expansion of the Brussels area at the expense of adjacent Flemish areas. As for the Flemish community's economic and social demands, they have so far been less persistent. The industrialization of a sizable part of Flanders makes the bulk of its population believe that the interests of the forces controlling a unitary state in the service of big capital accord with the interests of the Flemish community.

Thus, the Walloons, Flemings and Bruxellois alike are faced with serious problems. However, these problems cannot be solved within the framework of centralized institutions dating from the time when the Belgian state was founded. (1830). If there is to be a fair settlement of the ethnic problem, or the 'problem of communities,' as it is called in Belgian politics, the unitary political structures based on the 1831 Constitution must be thoroughly recast.

In September 1970 the Eyskens government, composed of Social Christian and Socialist ministers, carried out a series of constitutional reforms. The amended Constitution recognizes the existence of three cultural communities in the country (French, Flemish and German) and four linguistic areas (French, Flemish, German and the bilingual Brussels area). Next year, 1971, a cultural council was set up in each of the three communities, with a French and a Flemish councils for Brussels.

The amended Constitution also provides for the establishment of three regional authorities – for Flanders, Wallonia (including the German-speaking cantons) and Brussels – which in principle are to have vast economic and social powers. Yet no pertinent law has been passed so far. The fact is that the big unitary bourgeoisie and the forces backing it are reluctant to infringe the fundamental prerogatives of the central authority they directly control. The big bourgeoisie is agreeable to the idea of 'cultural autonomy,' extensive enough to be close in some cases to linguistic separatism. Nor does it

object in any way to a certain decentralization of key, possibly even governmental agencies in favor of the regions. But it is emphatically against granting the three regions any real political autonomy likely to curtail its rule. It fears, in particular, that the establishment of democratic regional authorities may result in the formation, primarily in Wallonia, of a representative majority of workers and popular forces comprising the Socialists, Communists and Christians, and capable of effecting economic and social reforms that would detract from the monopolies' omnipotence and super-profits.

This is why the Leburton cabinet of Socialists, Social Christians and Liberals, which had promised, like the Eyskens government, to set up regional authorities, confined itself to forming in all three regions institutions lacking any powers or funds and tightly supervised by the central executive authority. The big bourgeoisie and its allies, who stop at nothing to block the democratic demand for genuine regionalization, have done everything to bring into being a growing number of decentralized institutions, mostly quite undemocratic and lacking real power and popular support. This aggravates discord in each region and speeds a process which tends to strip elected bodies, above all parliament, of their basic prerogatives. As a result, real power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the central executive authority rigidly controlled by the monopolies.

All this lends special importance to the Communist Party's proposals for granting the three regions real political, economic and social powers.

The Tindemans government, formed by the Social Christian and Liberal parties after the latest elections, is committed to the same policy of 'mini-regionalization.' This policy is now accepted by the communal parties of the 'new Right' (to be dealt with later), which have thus given up their fundamental demands for professedly federative programs.

*The advantages of federalism*

The Communist Party has for many years advocated democratic federalism. To be sure, federalism is not a panacea. In fact, in some countries and in some periods (e.g., the Jacobin period) centralism helped the democratic movement to eliminate particularism, a phenomenon dating from the pre-capitalist period. Given a different set of circumstances, especially in developed capitalist countries of the imperialist epoch, centralism may become a hurdle to democratic progress, a political instrument for bolstering the rule of the monopoly bourgeoisie at the expense of legitimate national and regional demands.

Federalism, however, is something else. Where industrial de-

velopment has not definitively gained the upper hand, decentralization may rekindle particularist sentiments inherited from the pre-capitalist past. But once this stage is left behind, the democratic movement develops in many cases in favor of extensive autonomy for ethnic groups and areas. History furnishes us with many examples. For one thing, the federal principle is at the basis of all multinational socialist states, first of all the Soviet Union. In many capitalist countries, too, it is a political form guaranteeing the democratic coexistence of diverse ethnic groups within one state.

In Belgium, a developed capitalist state made up chiefly of two cultural and national communities almost equal in population and having a strictly centralized political system, federalism would provide a number of advantages. First of all, it would help in large measure to eliminate the immediate causes of conflict between the populations of the diverse regions, in particular over language problems. On the other hand, the establishment of autonomous rule in each of the three regions – Flanders, Wallonia and the Brussels area – would bring decision-making bodies closer to the population. In other words, federalism would make for greater democracy and social progress and help to fight against monopoly.

Federalism on these principles would not endanger the country's unity. Indeed, it is probably the only means of preserving unity. Coordination of nationwide activites would be based on sounder and more democratic principles.

Democratic federalism, which the Communist Party champions, provides, first of all, for setting up in each major area an assembly elected by universal suffrage, with executive authority accountable to it, and with adequate powers and funds to ensure the economic, social and cultural advancement of the area concerned.

The Party's approach to communal problems is anti-capitalist. The far-reaching economic, social and political changes proposed by the Party will not only do away with national antagonisms and give rise to new democratic institutions but bring the socialist perspective nearer.

The big monopoly bourgeoisie of Belgium and its political spokesmen cling to centralized structures which now clash with the interests of the majority of the population of the main regions. This us understandable, for a centralized state meets monopoly capital's needs best of all. Business quarters have no intention of giving up the enormous advantages – credits, financial aid, subisdies, contracts – provided by the policy of a centralized state which 'appreciates' their interests more readily than local self-government bodies. Furthermore, the big bourgeoisie fairly often uses the communal problem to cause a split, especially in crisis situations endangering this or that aspect of its policy or its power. In fact, the existing state of affairs enables the big

bourgeoisie to promote its interests by setting one ethnic group against another. The bourgeoisie deliberately maintains tensions and in many cases foments linguistic discord, for fruitless controversies and conflicts of this nature have helped it more than once to divert the people's attention from key political problems. It capitalizes on inter-communal friction to strengthen its domination in many economic and political spheres.

Rightists try to turn action for constitutional reform into a manifestation of national enmity. They want the movement for a federal system developing in Wallonia to lead to stronger anti-Flemish sentiments, that is, to commit nationalistic mistakes like those that have fairly often been made in Flanders, which demanded and obtained 'cultural autonomy.' At the same time the bourgeoisie tries, with support from the more backward sections of the Flemish population, to prevent the growth in the region of a federative movement that would be directed against capitalist monopoly and might join up with an identical movement in Wallonia against the common enemy – big capital and its rule.

The tandem of the Social Christian and Catholic People's parties, which also includes most of the political spokesmen of the Christian workers' movement, is the principal exponent of the aspirations of the big bourgeoisie and wants the centralized state to retain all power. However, it is also compelled to take into account the autonomist aspirations of the Flemish community (especially in the cultural field) so as not to lose electoral ground in Flanders, where its influence is greatest.

The traditional political parties, organized on the principles of a centralized state, proved unable to stem centrifugal trends generated by the development of the communities. With the Social Christians, the split into two wings is now a fact. The French-speaking Social Christian Party and the Flemish-speaking Catholic People's Party are two separate organizations having their own leaderships which sometimes differ completely over regional policy issues.

As for the Freedom and Progress Party (the former Liberal Party), it had, for its part, to adapt to communal differences after fruitless attempts to perform the role of the 'last stronghold of centralized government,' so that both its 'wings' are gradually becoming a regionalist party.

In addition to the traditional bourgeois parties, so-called communal parties of the 'new Right' have appeared in recent years. They are the Walloon Association and the Brussels Democratic Front of French-speaking people, and also the Flemish Volksunie Party founded several years earlier. All three parties advance demagogic national slogans. Their rightist leaderships exploit the antagonisms between

the Flemings and Walloons as well as between Bruxellois speaking different languages. They make capital out of the dissatisfaction of both sides with the centralized structure of the state. Fomenting chauvinist passions has become a political method with these parties' leaders, who try to break through to power by pressing their services on the traditional bourgeois communal groupings.

The big bourgeoisie's anti-democratic game is made easier by the fact that the Belgian working-class movement encounters serious difficulties because of the unequal degree of organization and differences in political orientation of its two contingents, the Walloons and Flemings. This has long been an obstacle to a united front for solving communal problems on a federal basis.

Until recently, difficulties were aggravated by support for the big bourgeoisie's unitary policy on the part of the top leaders of the Christian Democrats and the right-wing leadership of the Socialist Party. Indeed, the Socialist Party for a long time restricted its activity to attempts to bring about a series of decentralizing reforms that would leave the principal political institutions of the centralized Belgian state intact. However, pressure from the left, in particular the trade unions (above all in Wallonia), made the Socialists support a number of demands for setting up in the three major regions economic bodies having proper powers and funds and capable of meeting to some extent the particular needs of each region. Besides, shortly after the beginning of the recent election campaign (caused by the Socialist Party leadership's withdrawal from the three-party government coalition dominated by right-wing parties), the Socialist Party signed an agreement with the General Federation of Labor (FGL) declaring explicitly for genuinely regional authorities in the form of assemblies and executive bodies elected by universal suffrage. In this way the Socialist Party virtually joined up with the left trade unions and political forces, including the Communist Party.

It is interesting to note that the Socialist Party has been able, unlike the traditional bourgeois parties, to retain on the whole its unity. This is because it has moved closer, if at the price of serious internal contradictions, to positions from which it can, following the Communist example, harmonize the particular aspirations of the workers and democrats of the three regions with the necessity of an alliance of these forces against the big unitary bourgeoisie and its rule.

### *Needed: a federal democratic state and anti-monopoly structural reforms*

It is primarily the working-class movement that can pave the way for resolving the 'communal crisis,' that typically Belgian variety of the political crisis in the capitalist countries of Europe. It can do so by

virtue of its tradition of unity and solidarity, developed in more than a century of struggle against the bourgeoisie and its political spokesmen; by virtue of its militant struggle for guaranteed jobs and a secure existence, in defense of trade union and democratic freedoms against monopoly capital's authoritarian political tendencies; and by virtue of a joint movement of Walloon, Flemish and Bruxellois working people and democrats toward a renewed Belgium that would courageously embark on democratic economic and political reforms holding a socialist promise.

This is why the Communist Party has always devoted much attention to the progress of those trends in the working-class movement which demanded political reforms recognizing the rights of communities and districts, and has closely associated them with the working people's social and economic demands and with their overall struggle against monopoly domination. These trends went farthest in the main industrial areas of Wallonia shortly after the great social and political strike in the winter of 1960-1961 which involved a million working people. They found organizational expression, specifically, in the Popular Walloon Movement, which came into being under the influence of a large group of left trade-unionists and politicians of Wallonia, mostly Communists and Socialists, headed by the late Andŕe Renard. The movement was founded under the slogan 'For a Federal Belgium and Structural Reforms' – an unmistakable indication of the desire to link up the program of anti-monopoly reform advocated by the left wing of the working-class movement with the democratic demand for regional autonomy. In view of the continuing decline in Wallonia's economy and the permanent threat of more unemployment, the Walloon working people realized that the most acute economic and social problems could be solved only if the state was federalized.

Those trends in the GFL and Socialist Party which leaned on the Popular Walloon Movement for support came up against numerous difficulties. They had for years been opposed by rightists calling for collaboration with big capital and the conservative forces and for the preservation of centralized political structures. The rightists, who until recently had supremacy in Flanders, contrived for a long time to restrict the influence of new trends on the working-class movement even in Wallonia. But as the crisis of the economic and political system of monopoly went from bad to worse, above all under the impact of the monetary and energy crises, and as the big bourgeoisie betrayed its inability to solve communal problems the rightists tended to lose their dominant position in the working-class movement. As a result, the GFL a few years ago set up a body to coordinate the activities of Walloon regional organizations in which currents favoring

federalism and anti-monopoly structural reform enjoyed widespread influence from the outset. A similar body set up by the Flemish regional organizations of the GFL recently tried after several years of nominal existence to evolve a new line taking into account the particular needs of the Flemish working people, economic demands affecting monopoly domination and the demand for political autonomy in Flanders.

These qualitative changes in the trade union movement represented by the GFL plus the sustained struggle of the political Left, primarily (but by no means exclusively) the Communist Party, had a certain effect on the Socialists' position. This largely accounts for their recent swing to the left.

This evolution also had its effect on the Christian workers' movement, whose Walloon wing declared, in spite of the strong influence of the Social Christian Party, in favor of autonomous and effective democratic regional bodies.

And so, the 'communal crisis,' which is inseparable from the general crisis of monopoly power, and above all the approach taken by left-wing trends in the working-class movement, in particular by the Communist Party, which properly combines demands for economic and administrative structural reforms, have created more favorable conditions for a broad alignment of the working-class and popular forces – Socialist, Communist and Christian – of the three regions and the country as a whole against monopoly power and the conservative political forces that are its mainstay. Whether these conditions will lead to real steps toward a broad-based alliance aimed at changing the course of development depends on the scale of mass struggle for guaranteed employment, social security, freedom and peace. It also depends on how far the unity of action of trade union and political forces of the working-class and democratic movement in enterprises and residential neighborhoods will be strengthened. This is why the Communist Party has resolved to concentrate on this line so that the working-class and democratic movement of our country may take up a fitting place in the struggle of the progressive forces of capitalist Europe to transform it into an area of social progress, genuine democracy and peace, a region where the working people will play the leading role.

'There can be no question of separating the fight against capitalist monopolies from the fight against the political structures and the governments that serve them,' says a resolution of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party.

'We must prepare for the formation of a popular majority pivoted on the working class and its organizations. This majority would serve as the basis for the democratic transformation of economic and politi-

cal structures, to be effected by a government of progressive unity . . .

'On the institutional plane, we must pursue objectives such as achieving democratic federalism through an agreement between the progressive forces of the two communities and the three regions; giving regional bodies real powers and means; electing a regional council by universal and direct suffrage; bringing into being, through a merger of the communes, administrative entities capable of playing an autonomous economic, social and political role and of operating as centers of a genuinely democratic life; and simplifying political structures by abolishing intermediate bureaucratic echelons. We must subordinate to the attainment of this political goal the struggle to safeguard and extend trade union rights, the demand for new freedoms and rights for the working people and all other citizens, the advancement of genuine democracy, that is, organized interference by the masses in the solution of political problems, application of what we call the tactic of counter-power, or, in other words, the use of political and other positions already won by progressive forces to resist the policy of a monopolist regime.'

---

# Friends look at Bulgaria

## THE LIFE AND DESTINY OF A COUNTRY AND PEOPLE THAT HAVE CHOSEN SOCIALISM

Following are the impressions of a visit to Bulgaria by members of the journal's Editorial Council Pavel Auersperg (Czechoslovakia), Ali Ashur (Israel), Georges Batal (Lebanon), Pedro Vasquez (Paraguay), Vasilis Venetsanopoulos (Greece), Rudolf Wettengel (GDR), Silvio Gomes (Brazil), Baldomero Gonzalez (Panama), Amath Dansoko (Senegal), Georg Kwiatowski (FRG), Idris Cox (Britain), Paul Courtieu (France), Felipe Malaya (Philippines), Catarina Mendes (Portugal), Tsogtyn Namsarai (Mongolia), Luis Padilla (Bilivia), Kostas Pafitis (Cyprus), John Pittman (USA), Otto Sanchez (Guatemala), Hamid Safari (Iran), Betty Sinclair (Ireland), Felipe Suarez (Chile), Satiadjaja Sudiman (Indonesia), Erwin Zucker-Schilling (Austria), Jaime Schmirgeld (Argentina) and Rodney Öhman (Sweden).

The readers probably know about our trip and its purpose from the article elsewhere in this issue by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC BCP, Chairman of the State Council of the PRB. We would

now like to give our eyewitness impressions of socialist Bulgaria. Though ours is a documentary account, we do not intend to conceal our sympathy. Yes, it was Communist friends who went to Bulgaria. Yes, it is Communists who tell here about the effort of their Bulgarian friends. The unity of our views is based on fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, and our perception of today's Bulgaria is inseparable from analysis of how the theory of scientific communism is being carried into practice. Those of us who are fighting in a society based on exploitation and social inequality compared life in socialist Bulgaria with life in their own countries and with the destiny of their own peoples, thinking of their socialist future. Those who had come to Bulgaria from socialist countries compared what they saw there with their own countries.

The Bulgarian people are marking the 30th anniversary of their rising on September 9, 1944, which Georgi Dimitrov said paved the way for building socialism. In laying a wreath at the mausoleum of Dimitrov, a fiery internationalist revolutionary, we said to ourselves that his dreams and aspirations had come true in today's Bulgaria.

We begin our collective account with the contributions of those who knew Dimitrov and were fortunate enough to be at the fountainhead of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria.

*Idris Cox,* member of the Communist Party of Great Britain since 1924:

I met Georgi Dimitrov before his name became known all over the world. We met briefly on two occasions in Berlin on my way from London to Moscow, the first time in 1929 and then in 1930.

Our third meeting took place in 1935, at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, which I attended as a member of the British delegation. Dimitrov presented his historic report on working-class unity against fascism, a report which greatly stimulated the struggle on an international level. Not yet fully recovered from his nazi imprisonment, he had to break off his report several times for a brief rest. But each time he reappeared at the rostrum his voice was as firm as ever.

Our delegation met Dimitrov at the end of the Congress, after he was elected General Secretary of the Comintern. Questions were put on what was thought to be the main conflict in the imperialist world, namely, the antagonism between the British and U.S. imperialists. Dimitrov agreed that this antagonism did exist, and was an important factor, but then added something I shall never forget. For a long time to come, he said, the conflict with Nazi Germany will be the most serious of all.

Dimitrov had the unique characteristics of a revolutionary leader. He was uncompromising and ruthless in exposing reaction and combating with revisionist trends in the communist movement. But when

arguing with genuine Communists who needed political guidance he showed admirable patience, and set a splendid example of friendly persuasion.

I was not destined to see Dimitrov in Bulgaria. I went there for the first time in 1951, when he was no longer among us. But each time I revisit his homeland I am more keenly aware of his presence. His image is indelibly engraved on the people's memory. The economic and cultural progress made by Bulgaria shows that his revolutionary ideas and work have prevailed. We still look back to his words and example for guidance in championing peace battling with reaction, in striving to be genuine internationalists at all times and in every respect.

*Erwin Zucker-Schilling,* member of the Communist Party of Austria since 1919:

Dimitrov had an amazing ability to get to the root of a phenomenon or process with an isolated fact or event for a starting point, and did so unerringly. From leading the struggle of the working class of his own country he went on to the struggle for the worldwide unity of the working class, from the anti-fascist revolt in Bulgaria – the first ever – to anti-fascist resistance on an international scale, and from analysis of people's democracy in his country to analysis of an entire stage of the world revolutionary process.

Speaking of all this, I recall an episode which might seem to be politically irrelevant but is inseparable from my impression of Dimitrov.

At that time I was attached to a Moscow institute. It was shortly before nazi Germany's attack on the Soviet Union. We were all in a state of nervous tension and, seeing that, Dimitrov suggested that we lay out a kitchen-garden in the courtyard to grow tomatoes, carrots and other vegetables. We did so and it turned out to be interesting and worthwhile, and helped us relax. Being a Bulgarian, Dimitrov knew about vegetable gardening and showed us how we should go about it, offered advice and encouraged us in every way. I remember his friendly smile as he watched us at work. He was fond of that small garden on the outskirts of Moscow and did his best to help those who worked there.

Looking at the new life in Bulgaria today, I recalled Dimitrov's smile and said to myself: Here is Dimitrov's big garden, a magnificent socialist garden that means a lot to both the Bulgarian people and to the destiny of the working class, the Communists and other progressives all over the world.

*John Pittman,* member of the Political Committee, CC CPUSA:

*December 1946.* The night was cold and very dark, but I could see the young soldier, rifle in hand, waiting for the ferry carrying me

across the Danube from Giurgiu, Romania. When the ferry docked it turned out that this young member of the Bulgarian People's Army had been instructed to meet the correspondent of the New York *Daily Worker,* who had been invited by the Fatherland Front to visit Bulgaria. He hoisted my bag to his shoulder, and I followed him along twisting paths and deserted streets to the local office of the Fatherland Front.

Soon I was on the train to Sofia, meditating on the strangeness of my reception. Before sleep came I had found the explanation: a workers' government which only two years before had taken power and was still engaged in class struggle with enemies at home and abroad had need to be particularly vigilant. I had come at a most critical moment in Bulgaria's history, when the question of 'who will win' was yet to be conclusively decided, and when the first stones of the foundation of a socialist society were about to be laid. Three months previously an overwhelming majority of the population had voted to abolish the monarchy. And in October, only two months earlier, the Fatherland Front's candidates won three-quarters of the seats in the Grand National Assembly, with Communist candidates winning more than one-half of the seats. My program included interviews with Dimitrov, Kolarov, Dragoicheva and other Bulgarian comrades.

My first day in Sofia began with one of the highlights of the visit: an hour in the visitors' gallery of the Parliament, where I heard Dimitrov denounce the intrigues of one of Bulgaria's richest men who even then was conspiring with United States and British imperialists to overthrow the new democratically-elected government. This was a glimpse of the fierce class struggle still raging in the country.

A trip with other correspondents of the foreign press to the frontier with Greece enabled me to see the international ramifications of this class struggle. On the heights overlooking Bulgarian villages the batteries of the Greek fascists were in plain view, waiting for the word from Washington and London to launch attacks in concert with the armed uprising of monarcho-fascists they confidently expected.

My trip helped me to visualize the dimensions of the task confronting the people's government. The people were hungry, wretchedly clothed and shod, wearing on their faces the marks of years of deprivation and oppression. Peasants shivered in the bitter cold, and the feet of many were wrapped in rags. The condition of the women was shocking, and from the rutted and broken road I saw them beating their washing against the rocks of the stream below – no soap, no detergents, not even an old-fashioned wash-board my grandmother and mother used.

How long, I wondered as my visit ended, how long would the

young workers' state require to wipe out this legacy of backwardness and create a new life for the Bulgarian people?

*May-June 1974*. Sofia again, but now it is a thriving modern city of new apartment buildings, of bustling thoroughfares thronged with people and automobiles, of well-stocked shops and huge department stores, of beautiful parks with fountains and foliage ablaze with color.

From my room in the 16th story of Park Hotel Moskva, I gaze with amazement at the city's panorama. All this in less than three decades!

As our itinerary unfolds, the dimensions of the gigantic step which Bulgaria has taken become more apparent, and the standards achieved by it record the maturity of its development. We pick orange-sized strawberries at the Pervenets Agro-Industrial Complex near Plovdiv. Plovdiv, moreover, is the site of the biggest textile works in the Balkan countries and of Bulgaria's largest non-ferrous metal works. Here also are electronic plants and a factory producing computer parts.

We take note of the care lavished on the country's children in creches and kindergartens, of the tribute paid to heroes of the struggles for liberation and of labor, of the encouragement given exponents of folk and classical culture. Everywhere the workers welcome us. And leaders of the Party and the government give us candid explanations of the progress made and the difficulties still to be overcome in building an advanced socialist society.

I was received by Tsola Dragoicheva, member of the Political Bureau. She is as full of inexhaustible energy as ever. And while no one has become any younger over the past 28 years, she still embodies the indomitable will of her heroic fellow-Communists – Dimitrov, Kolarov and other comrades –whom I was not fated to see again.

As our visit ends, I recall my question on leaving Bulgaria 28 years ago. What I had seen on this visit had answered that question. In less than 30 years the Bulgarian people, led by their working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, had transformed one of Europe's most backward countries into a prosperous socialist state.

## REBORN

*Travel notes*

Visit to a computer plant in Sofia. The electronic computers made here carry out 12,000 operations per minute. They are exported to the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, India. Parts come from many socialist countries. The main computing devices are manufactured in Bulgaria.

In Varna Region we were shown around the Devnya industrial complex built in recent years. It comprises major chemical and machine-building plants.

In a conversation in Sofia Penya Kiratsov, Secretary of the CC BCP, told us about the industrial development problems of socialist Bulgaria.

*Embodiment of progress*

*Hamid Safari,* alternate member, Executive Bureau of the CC, People's Party of Iran:

The computer plant is an embodiment of the progress made by Bulgaria. A formerly backward country, it today manufactures sophisticated electronic computers. Every fourth worker at the plant has a higher education. The overwhelming majority of the personnel have secondary education. The average age is 23 years, and all the specialists were educated after 1944. In fact, by far most of them were born much later. It is to socialism that these people owe their knowledge and skills.

The career of Atanas Shopov, the 38-year-old manager, is typical. He is a scientist and able organizer. The son of a worker, he received secondary education and took a job at the plant. He continued his studies without leaving his job. In due course he became an engineer and then was appointed chief engineer at a research institute. He has headed the plant for several years now. It is only the socialist system that enables workers' sons to make such a career.

Soviet specialists took an active part in training personnel for the plant and designing electronic computers, and they go on helping the personnel. The manufacture of electronic computers in Bulgaria shows that cooperation among socialist countries helps to equalize economic development levels. This is something inconceivable in the capitalist world.

In the region where Iran lies, not a single country with a development level comparable to that of pre-revolutionary Bulgaria has been able over the past 30 years to advance as far as Bulgaria has. In 1944, Iran had more advanced capitalist relations than Bulgaria. It is richer than Bulgaria in both natural and manpower resources. Nevertheless, 70 per cent of its population cannot read or write to this day and, moreover, 8,000,000 children under 15 never went to school. According to data released by the Ministry of Labor, only 24 per cent of the workers have acquired skills. The rest of the urban working population is unskilled.

*Satiadjaja Sudiman,* member of the leadership, Communist Party of Indonesia:

Bulgaria has a new vast industrial complex at Devnya, a seaport

that can accommodate more ships than all the other seaports of the country combined. The Devnya thermal power station is the biggest in Bulgaria. The 12 enterprises making up the complex employ over 26,000 workers. Among them is a chemical plant, one of the biggest mineral fertilizer plants in Europe. The very first question one feels like asking is: how can a small country afford to build on so large a scale? The construction of the chemical giant did not overtax the national budget, for it was financed by a CMEA bank, with the credit repayable in produce.

Now for my own country. The measures being carried out in Indonesia by its anti-popular regime are called a 'five-year plan' and the regime resorts to Japanese and U.S. aid on a large scale. This means high interest on credits, easy terms for foreign investors and other privileges for foreign monopolies. The creditors determine what plants Indonesia shall or shall not build.

In recent years Indonesia has received credits worth several thousand million dollars from capitalist countries. Though it was to have used them for growing more rice, the rice price is steadily rising, and according to official data, Indonesia imported 1,400,000 tons of rice in 1973 against 193,000 tons in 1965. Japanese capital exploits every sphere of Indonesia's economy, from mining, fishing and farming to spices. The profit it makes is taken out of the country. Unchecked exploitation of the population and natural resources is the price that has to be paid for 'cooperation' with capitalist countries.

Many thousands of young people took part in building the Devnya chemical plant. Where did they go after the project was completed? Some of them went to new building sites and others got skilled jobs at the plant.

There is construction in Indonesia too, and yet unemployment is growing, so that there are now 15,000,000 partially and 6,000,000 fully unemployed. There are reasons for this paradox. In Indonesia building workers are discharged as soon as the job is over and have to fend for themselves. Besides, most enterprises are owned by foreign monopolies, primarily Japanese, and employ foreign workers and engineers.

From the Devnya plant we went to the fine modern community that has sprung up not far from it. The houses built in Indonesia today are not for working people but for foreign employees, their assistants, and for government officials.

# BACKGROUND OF RAPID AND SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS

From remarks by *Penyu Kiratsov,* Secretary of the CC BCP

For 66 years – from the time it was freed from the Turkish yoke to 1944 – Bulgaria developed slowly, remaining, in effect, a backward agrarian country, a raw-material appendage of the developed countries of Europe. Except for a few munition and transport repair plants, industry was made up of small, primitive workshops.

After the victory of the socialist revolution workers' control was introduced in the enterprises. In 1947 they were nationalized. Production was specialized and centralized and steps were taken to expand industry.

*Industrialization* became a key problem in reorganizing the economy on socialist lines. Dimitrov called on the country to accomplish in 15 to 20 years what other countries accomplished in 100 years. In carrying out this historic task, mistakes and indecision were inevitable. They were due to both the objective difficulties we encountered in setting up a material basis for socialism in a backward agricultural country and to the fact that the role of collective leadership declined in the period of the personality cult, a phenomenon alien to Marxism-Leninism.

In April 1956 the Central Committee of our Party restored the Leninist principles and standards of Party life, initiated important changes to promote the economy and gave a powerful spur to industrialization. We did not have to wait long for results – output in heavy machine-building showed a sharp increase and the national income began to grow much faster. The power, mechanical engineering, iron and steel and chemical industries made noticeable headway.

Bulgaria became a socialist state with a rapidly developing industry. Before the revolution our industry hardly exported anything. By late 1972 exports of machinery stood at almost 40 per cent of our total exports.

Our industry is now developing at a high rate. We are already short of manpower and the problem is bound to become more acute. This means that we can increase industrial production and improve the quality of output provided industry continues to develop intensively. To achieve this, our Party has worked out a program of continuous modernization and reconstruction.

Industrialization is being evenly spread throughout the country. There is not a single town without an industrial enterprise. In recent years industry has also been developing in large villages.

Assistance from the Soviet Union and other members of the

socialist community, and increasing socialist economic integration, enabled us to promote specialization and concentrate on important fields. Bulgaria has become a leading manufacturer of conveyers and machinery handling plant. The manufacture of electronic computers has been growing at a very high rate.

Increasing economic integration with the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries will make for further significant progress in building the material and technical foundations for a developed socialist society.

*Question, answer and comment*

*Georg Kwiatowski*, representative of the German Communist Party on the journal: How do Bulgarian workers participate in the management of enterprises?

*Penyu Kiratsov*. The workers exercise their rights at the enterprise primarily through general meetings which discuss the economic and social policies of the enterprise and elect its economic council. Proceeding from the state plan, the council draws up the output plan and a comprehensive social development program for the entire collective. It takes part in distributing the incomes of the enterprise, primarily in allocating funds for social amenities.

*Kwiatowski*. During our tour of Bulgaria we talked with workers and saw real, living working-class democracy. When power is in the hands of the workers and peasants there is every condition for them to really participate in the management of their enterprises and the state.

That is very unlike the workers' condition in my country, where they win certain rights only through hard struggle. In our country, too, the workers elect production councils to uphold their interests at the enterprise. But unlike their Bulgarian counterparts, these councils have no say in making decisions on investments, the nature or amount of output or the use of profit. When an enterprise is transferred to a new place and numerous workers are laid off, the enterprise council may take part in solving the problems that arise but only on the condition that this is regarded as 'economically' advisable. We in the FRG have in recent months had many cases of workers even with high seniority being sacked or given notice after having worked for decades. 'What an enterprise needs,' the manager of the Badische Anilin und Soda-Fabrik AG in Ludwigshafen admitted, 'is not people but performers of definite functions. People as such mean nothing, what they do is all-important.'

*Pattern of Bulgaria's national income (per cent)*

| | 1948 | 1972 |
|---|---|---|
| Industry | 23 | 51 |
| Agriculture | 58 | 23 |
| Other fields | 19 | 26 |

In 1975 the share of industry in the national income will increase to 54.6 per cent.

*Employment*

| | 1939 | 1972 |
|---|---|---|
| Total population | 6,319,000 | 8,595,000 |
| engaged in industry | ca. 100,000 | ca. 1,337,000 |
| engaged in agriculture | 3,100,000 | 1,370,000 |

*Output growth in key branches 1939 = 1*

| | 1952 | 1960 | 1973 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Electric power | 4.9 | 18 | 75 |
| Iron and steel (including ore mining) | 3.3 | 53 | 553 |
| Mechanical engineering and metalworking | 18 | 86 | 629 |
| Chemical and rubber | 6.9 | 37 | 285 |
| Building materials | 5.3 | 24 | 105 |
| Food industry | 3.3 | 6.5 | 17 |
| Textiles and clothes | 4 | 11 | 29 |

In 1972 productivity in the national economy was more than twice as high as in 1960. Over 97 per cent of the increase in the national income achieved during the fifth five-year plan (1965-1970) was the result of higher productivity.

In 1950-1973 foreign trade increased 23 times over, exports increasing 26 times and imports 20 times. In 1973 exports were 27 times as great as in 1939.

## TRIUMPH OF COLLECTIVE LABOR

*Travel notes*

Visit to the Georgi Dimitrov agro-industrial complex in the village of Pervenets, Plovdiv Region. The complex cultivates 16,000 hectares of

land. Much of it is orchards and vineyards. The complex has a cannery with an annual capacity of 10,000 to 15,000 tons. Its yearly output is worth 48,000,000 leva.

Vylkan Shopov, head of the agricultural department of the CC BCP, told us in an interview about the latest development trends in agriculture and the farmers' use of the latest scientific achievements.

*Lines of experiment*

*Tsogtyn Namsarai,* alternate member of the CC, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party:

The present-day development of socialist agriculture furnishes many examples of high concentration of production. The Dimitrov complex, for one, covers an area with 23 villages inhabited by 45,000 people.

The complex has enormous opportunities to maneuver with its material and technical facilities. It has 600 tractors and 200 trucks and is able to use industrial methods in agriculture – from soil cultivation to processing the produce.

The Dimitrov complex annually spends a million leva to modernize villages and provide facilities for sports, rest and recreation. All children are accommodated in kindergartens and nurseries free of charge. The complex pays the expenses of the summer holidays of school children and their meals during the school year. All its members are supplied with free overalls. In winter when there is less work many members, including the manager, attend classes.

Bourgeois propaganda talks about what it calls the 'standardization' of political and economic life in socialist countries. We were told by many Bulgarian comrades that the form of concentration of agricultural production chosen by them meets primarily local conditions. The organization of agricultural cooperatives in my country likewise went through several stages but they were different from what we saw in Bulgaria. We began with *arat* production associations, that is, cooperatives of a semi-socialist type. That was in the 30s. Today the whole of Mongolia's farming is based on socialist collectivization.

In studying the experience of socialist countries, we discover more and more facts bearing out Lenin's forecast that each nation will contribute its distinctive features to the character of socialist change.

*Cooperative farming popular with peasants*

From remarks by *Vylkan Shopov,* Head of Agricultural Department, CC BCP:

Addressing the Fifth Congress of the Communist Party in December 1948, Georgi Dimitrov said Bulgaria could not follow the socialist path if heavy industry were not matched by a modern agriculture.

The Party's work toward that goal was made easier by the popularity of cooperative farming, largely due to the success of collectivization in the USSR. Agricultural cooperation was started as early as 1938, with a few cooperatives organized by the Communists, members of the People's Agrarian Union or cooperative enthusiasts of no party affiliation. In 1944 there were 29 cooperative farms.

The Party decided that, in Bulgarian conditions, socialist reconstruction of agriculture could be carried out without land nationalization. Cooperative farmers leased their plots to the cooperative and up to 1955 were paid rent. Later, by decision of general meetings, the system was gradually abandoned.

In 1950 the cooperative farms accounted for 51 per cent of the land that could be brought into cooperatives and by the close of the first five-year plan the figure was 60.5 per cent. In the second five-year plan the accent was on reorganizing the farms into bigger units, increasing farm output and completing the cooperation process.

Shortage of trained personnel made things difficult. The Party sent many of its young members, some of them ex-partisan fighters, to study agronomy so that the country would have a cadre of competent specialists.

The next period, from 1959 to 1970, was largely devoted to mechanization and wider use of efficient cultivation methods. We were thus prepared for a completely new stage, the organization of agro-industrial complexes, of which there are now 163.

The purpose is to make maximum use of land, technology and personnel to boost production of wheat, maize, vegetables and fruit. Some of the complexes run their own processing plants.

Modern agriculture requires big capital outlays. We have invested 3.2 billion leva in the current, sixth five-year plan now drawing to a close, and the figure will be nearly doubled, to about 6 billion, in the next five years (1976-80). We have every reason to anticipate quick and tangible returns. Much is also being done to improve irrigation, and by 1990 all water-hungry lands will have been irrigated.

In less than 30 years we increased cereal, vegetable and fruit yields several times over. We produce enough for domestic needs and a sizeable surplus for export.

Besides the Dimitrov Agricultural Academy, we have 68 research and experimental centers employing about 2,000, and all advances in agricultural science are immediately applied on the farms.

Of course, it hasn't always been smooth sailing. There was a time when our farmers were paid one-fifth of a leva per workday. It would be naive to think that all our difficulties are now in the past; there are still many problems. The ways of solving them were mapped out by the 10th Party Congress.

*Baldomero Gonzalez,* alternate CC member, People's Party of Panama. What features of your agricultural development can benefit countries fighting for social liberation?

*Vylkan Shopov*. We have had to contend with many problems some of which, I think, also confront socialist-oriented developing countries. For instance, large-scale farming, its organizational forms; collectivization, its forms and pace; use of modern technology.

*Baldomero Gonzalez*. The experience of socialist construction becomes available to countries where the workers are still fighting for power. It influences the struggle of the working people. In Panama, as in pre-revolutionary Bulgaria, farming machinery is a rarity. Most farms rely on manual labor. The patriotic officers who took over in 1968 made agrarian reform a top priority. What we needed was an organizational model that would be understood by the peasants and would unite them. We studied the experience of socialist countries and chose the *asentamientos,* a rudimentary form of cooperative farming. They already account for nearly one-third of total farm output.

I need hardly say that these are not socialist farms, nor could they be, considering the domination of the bourgeoisie and landowners. Nevertheless, our People's Party is working for *asentamientos* as a school in which the peasants learn socialist farming. I do not doubt that the experience of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and other socialist countries will prove valuable to us in the near future.

In 1939, Bulgaria had about 3,500 tractors used mostly to run threshing machines. Today there are 122,000 tractors, 20,000 harvester combines and 590 cotton-harvesting combines.

*Per hectare yields (centners)*

| | 1939 | 1948 | 1961-65 | 1973 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (annual average) | |
| Wheat | 13.1 | 11.6 | 18.1 | 34.9 |
| Maize | 13.6 | 11.2 | 25.1 | 41.0 |
| Grapes | 53.2 | 34.6 | 59.9 | 70.2 |
| Sugar beet | 176.7 | 160.2 | 205.4 | 290 |
| Cotton | 6.9 | 4.5 | 7.5 | 10.2 |
| Sunflower seeds | 9.6 | 9 | 13.4 | 17.7 |

Bulgaria holds third place in the world in per capita wheat output. sixth place in maize, first in sunflower, 14th in sugarbeet, second in tomatoes and seventh in grapes.

| | 1939 | 1948 | 1960 | 1973 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Average milk yield (litres) | 450 | 403 | 1,402 | 2,182 |
| Average wool clip (kg.) | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.6 |

Meat output ('000 tons)

| 1939 | 1960 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 201.8 | 307.1 | 521.1 | 564.9 | 565.5 |

## A PEOPLE EDUCATED

*Travel notes*

In Sofia we attended the education, culture and press festival, an annual event on the anniversary of the adoption of the Cyrillic alphabet. More than 200,000 marched through September 9 Square. The demonstration took several hours.

We had long talks at the Sofia University (15,000 students), the Academy of Sciences and the Committee on Science and Technology. The question and answer session with the students lasted several hours.

Here are some of the delegates' impressions.

*Betty Sinclair,* National Executive Member, Communist Party of Ireland.

This spring I addressed an attentive student audience at the Queen's University of Belfast. If I were to speak there now, after my trip to socialist Bulgaria, I would have many interesting things to tell the students.

First, I would tell them about this impressive festival of culture and education, a festival that entered every home, for in Bulgaria every family enjoys the fruits of socialist education and culture.

I would tell them that, standing on Sofia's central square and waving to the marchers, I was happy, for, having crossed the threshold of three-score years, I found my dreams come true, the ideals for which I had fought all my life brought to reality.

And I would suggest that my audience reflect on this fact: on this holiday all the schools in Bulgaria were closed, with teachers and students sharing in the festivities; in Belfast all the schools were closed on that day because of the emergency in Northern Ireland.

I would tell the students that education, and not merely learning a trade, could help to bridge the gap between the generations and

between the sexes. This conviction was reaffirmed and fortified by what I saw in Sofia. Small children were marching with university students and elderly professors.

Today's Bulgarian students are not of the first generation of workers' and peasants' children given every advantage to reach the very summits of knowledge. People living in socialism cannot conceive of the capitalist reality, with its poor, for whom education is inaccessible, and its rich, who make up the intellectual elite.

I would tell them that Bulgaria holds a top place in the world in the number of students, and that one in four of the population is studying.

I hope that I will have the opportunity to describe all this to the students of Queen's University in Belfast.

*Jaime Schmirgeld,* CC member, Communist Party of Argentina:

Our meeting with students of Sofia University was a gratifying occasion. Several hundred gathered in the main hall and we were showered with questions. We were asked to comment on developments in Portugal, France, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, Latin America, about life in the USSR and other socialist countries. The students wanted to know more about the Communist parties and what we thought of the suggestions for a new conference of Communist and Workers' parties. There were many questions on the ideological problems Communist parties in the various countries have to contend with, particularly the negative influence of Maoism on the liberation struggle.

In talking with these young people, and listening to the answers given by my colleagues, I could not help thinking how unconvincing bourgeois propaganda was in trying to get people to believe that in the socialist countries young people are not allowed to exchange views, conduct political discussions and are sealed off from the outside world. These Sofia students showed a keen interest in the outside world, which they saw from the standpoint of the revolutionary process and proletarian internationalism. The questions they put were evidence of a high political and cultural standard and broad vision.

Ideological education is closely linked with the activities of the Dimitrov Young Communist League. But the system of education plays a big part too. And education is premised on the belief that the student is not the object but rather the subject of the teaching process – he must constantly enlarge his knowledge, think out his conclusions, always try for scientific truth. That can be achieved only by combining teaching with production and public activity.

The life of Bulgaria's students is an excellent example for the Argentine students fighting for a university open to the people.

*Amath Dansoko,* Political Bureau member, African Independence Party of Senegal:

At Sofia University we could barely keep up with the questions put by the students, and I therefore had no opportunity to share with them my thoughts about the highly valuable experience of Bulgaria's socialist development. I shall try to do so in this letter to the Bulgarian students.

We, who came to Bulgaria from another world, in which there is still exploitation and social oppression, especially appreciate the advantages of socialism. I shall dwell on only a few points, for I believe that one cannot be a devoted fighter for socialism without reflecting on the fate of those who do not yet enjoy its benefits. It is only by comparison that one can fully appreciate the achievements of one's own people.

In Bulgaria the right to education is legally guaranteed. Higher education is open to all. Students receive government grants. This each of you, young Bulgarians, inherits from preceding generations.

That inheritance does not exist for the people of my and other developing countries. In Senegal, 61 per cent of the population are below 25, but only 15 per cent of school-age population attend secondary school, and only 1.3 per cent have any hope of attending higher schools.

Education in socialist Bulgaria is deeply national, cultivating love of one's country, its history and traditions and closely related to the country's economic and cultural development.

The school in the developing countries differs very little from the school under colonialism, where the aim was to erase national roots and traditions. Yet economic backwardness can be wiped out only if education and occupational training are geared to economic and social development, but this requires complete overhauling of the educational system, abandonment of foreign models in favor of a genuinely national and anti-imperialist policy. It is for this that our people are fighting.

*Otto Sanchez,* member of CC Ideological Commission, Guatemalan Party of Labor:

The Guatemalan constitution provides for free, compulsory and democratic education, with the state employing every available means to put an end to illiteracy.

But the statistics tell a different story. The 1964 census revealed that 63.3 per cent of the population above the age of seven were illiterate. Nor did the position improve in the next five years: in 1969, the 5 to 20 age group comprised more than one-third of the total population, but only 29.8 per cent attended school. To this should be added that education is of a low standard and is dominated by the ideology of the ruling classes and American imperialism.

The Bulgarian constitution provides for compulsory eight-year

schooling and the state is preparing all the conditions for universal full secondary education. The constitution was adopted in 1971 and all its provisions are being carried out. But socialism is forging ahead much more rapidly, and this finds expression in legislation. In accordance with the Communist Party's 10th Congress directives, a uniform system of occupational training is now being introduced. This and many other facts are proof that in a socialist society the people often enjoy more advantages than those provided by the Constitution, whereas bourgeois democracy cannot guarantee the people even what it has itself proclaimed.

More than 1,500,000 attended schools and colleges in the 1973-74 academic year.

Bulgaria is ahead of Federal Germany, Austria and Spain in the number of students per 10,000 of the population; its figure, 118, is one of the world's highest.

In 1951, Bulgaria had 99,500 specialists, of whom 42,000 with higher education; the respective figures today are 625,000 and 189,000.

## THE SUPREME AIM

*Travel notes*

In Sofia, Plovdiv, Gabrovo and Varna we studied housing construction. In Borvets, the popular health resort, we saw the palaces and villas that accommodate thousands every year. We travelled along the Black Sea coast stopping at some of the new holiday resorts and tourist centers, and in Varna we were shown the Chaika (Seagull) day nursery and kindergarten.

We interviewed Grisha Filipov, Political Bureau member and Central Committee Secretary of the Communist Party. He described Bulgaria's economic development, the basis for raising prosperity standards.

*Observations on living standards*

*Felipe Malaya,* CC Member, Communist Party of the Philippines:

The socialist way of life cannot be measured by the bourgeois concepts of prosperity. To properly assess the life of a citizen of Bulgaria, we must take into account the socialist system of relations, based on complete equality irrespective of origin, nationality, religion and age. We must consider the pattern of relations between the individual and the community in a society which has abolished all exploitation and all forms of social oppression and racial discrimina-

tion. I made notes throughout the trip to compile comparative tables. This is one of them.

| *Philippines* | *Bulgaria* |
|---|---|
| More than 10 per cent of able-bodied population unemployed | Unemployment completely wiped out long ago |
| Most people go through their lives without knowing medical care | Medical care free, medicines sold at minimum prices, one doctor for less than 500 of the population |
| Average schooling is four years | Eight-year compulsory schooling and compulsory full secondary education now being introduced |
| Private kindergartens accessible only to the wealthy | Kindergartens cater to 68.6 per cent of all pre-school children |
| Majority of population not covered by government or private pension schemes | Pensions for women at 55 and men at 60 |

What is true of the Philippines today was largely true of Bulgaria in the past.

*Kostas Pafitis,* alternate CC member Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL):

In our day, 'way of life' has much wider implications and includes many new elements.

Every year Bulgaria spends large sums on industrial hygiene and safety. This has gone a long way toward eliminating industrial accidents and occupational diseases. In the capitalist countries millions are every year the victims of industrial accidents or suffer from occupational diseases. In recent years Bulgaria has been allocating large sums for ecological protection, and this, too, has helped to improve the way of life. In contrast, pollution is assuming catastrophic dimensions in capitalist countries, particularly the U.S. and Japan.

And still another element that goes into the concept of way of life: safety from fear of being robbed or killed. In Bulgaria one can walk the streets at any time of day or night in complete safety – a far cry from capitalist reality, with its constant fear of being attacked.

Lastly, the man-hating propaganda, which has reached a stage

when people feel they are no longer free to think. That, too, should be considered in the light of the harmonious development of the personality under socialism.

Socialism does more than assure high material and cultural standards. It offers normal conditions at work and at home, guarantees a tranquil, wholesome and dignified life. That is why millions of working people in capitalist countries are eager to build a socialist society.

## BROAD PERSPECTIVES

*From remarks by Grisha Filipov:*

A group of Western journalists visiting Bulgaria shortly before the war concluded that it would take 1,000, probably even 2,000, years for us to catch up with European civilization. That skeptical view was not entirely unfounded, for Bulgaria was a very poor and backward country. Today it is a socialist industrial-agrarian country with a rapidly developing industry and highly mechanized agriculture. Our achievements are rooted in the nature of our society and in the economic aims we have set ourselves. The Party's supreme aim is full satisfaction of the people's fundamental needs. This is the main factor in all our economic development.

Our economic policy is based on scientific analysis, and framed and operated in full accordance with the requirements of economic laws, which are also observed in formulating our long-range plans. In developing our economy we are also concerned to make a meaningful contribution to strengthening the socialist world system.

All this has paid off in high and stable socio-economic growth rates. Unemployment is no more than a memory, and life expectancy has increased by 20 years.

The task ahead now is to complete the material and technical basis of socialism and give final shape to the economic structure of developed socialist society.

In working toward these goals the accent is on full use of all the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution to assure high growth rates in industry, primarily heavy industry. But at the same time we are narrowing the margin between the producer and consumer goods industries. Priority is being given to the more effective branches, those that play a decisive part in technical progress and contribute to economic integration with other socialist countries. Production specialization and cooperation is becoming the chief factor. This will necessitate forming bigger production units, giant factories, as part of a system of cooperation within the country and

internationally. The next few years will see more mechanization and automation, complete electrification and chemicalization, wider use of new materials and other measures.

In agriculture, the aim is accelerated introduction of industrial technology so that, in time, it will be run along industrial lines. Expansion of productive forces will be accompanied by perfection of socialist relations of production. Uninterrupted development of both state and cooperative property and their mutual enrichment will lead to their gradual merger into a single socialist property of all the people.

All this will change the nature of work in industry: the share of heavy physical and unskilled labor will be reduced as intellectualization of industrial work proceeds apace.

We shall also have to devise better technical and economic methods of measuring remuneration. Nominal wages will play a bigger role in stimulating productivity. Average incomes in urban and rural communities, in conformity with skill standards and job loads, will be gradually equalized. Material incentives will be complemented by moral incentives.

Perfecting the social structure of society is still another element of economic policy. There will be more industrial workers, with a larger share of workers operating sophisticated machinery. The leading role of the working class will be enhanced. Agricultural industrialization will bring the farmers and workers closer together in terms of working conditions, earnings, social status, cultural amenities, and so on.

We are steadily perfecting economic management. We have set up a Council on Social Management under the State Council and an Academy of Social Sciences and Social Administration under the Party Central Committee. We have tackled the problem of all-round efficiency, raising responsibility for one's job, cutting out unnecessary conferences, paper work, reducing inflated staffs. Active and direct worker participation in management is a very essential element in improving direction of the economy.

We want to satisfy the requirements of the people. The program adopted at the December 1972 CC Plenum for a steep rise in living standards has become a national goal. And we do not consider it merely a consumer program, because living standards are the result, and at the same time an essential factor, of accelerated social development.

In the next few years we will provide day-nursery and kindergarten accommodation for all the children and solve the housing problem. Thirty years ago, 76 per cent of the population lived in rural communities, compared with only 43 per cent now. If every family is to have a separate fiat, we must build 800,000 flats. At the December

plenum it was decided to build 250,000 in the present five-year period and another 600,000 in the next, 1976-1980.

We must also increase the free time, the real free time our people enjoy. We are consistently reducing the work week, but real free time depends largely on the efficiency of the service industries. And the plan is to reorganize trade, the health services, transport, etc., in line with our general social and economic development.

Thanks to a correct financial policy, the Party and state are in a position to provide for the aged. Pensions and other grants are systematically being increased and this makes for a longer life span.

The building of a developed socialist society entails a new approach to the problems of the family and the younger generation. Measures have been taken to encourage a higher birth rate. It is increasing and we hope that the trend will continue.

*Question, answer, comment*

*Rodney Öhman,* representative of Left Party – Communists of Sweden:

How are you solving the problem of the family and of equality of the sexes?

*Grisha Filipov:* Our Constitution guarantees full equality of the sexes. The Party and the government make a special point of providing as much free time for women as men have. This is being done by a series of measures to make things easier at home and at work, so that women could have more time for professional and cultural interests.

*Rodney Öhman.* I have talked to many people. There are achievements not only in industry and agriculture. There is a new attitude to children's upbringing, to the family, to woman's place in society. The state gives special assistance to families with two or more children. Apart from a fully paid maternity leave, working women may stay home another six to eight months after childbirth, depending on whether it is the first, second or third child. During this time they receive an allowance and may then extend their leave without pay until the child is three years old.

Women make up 46 per cent of the industrial labor force, and in agriculture – more than 48 per cent. There are still too few women in positions of leadership in factories and offices – about 17 per cent. It is therefore doubly gratifying to note that the matter is now getting the closest attention.

Women's participation in political affairs is another matter. Here, Bulgaria's achievement is beyond question. Out of the parliamentary deputies 19 per cent are women, and out of the deputies to local councils – more than 36 per cent. In the regional committees of the CP

of Bulgaria 8.3 per cent of all secretaries are women, and 25.2 per cent in the primary branches. The place women occupy in leading Party and government bodies shows that Bulgaria is much ahead of the developed capitalist countries, which are so fond of referring to their long-standing democratic tradition.

*Silvio Gomes,* member of CC, Brazilian CP. Foreign tourists come to Bulgaria in ever larger numbers. Does this affect the Bulgarians' own vacation opportunities?

*Grisha Filipov*. Bulgaria with her population of 8.6 million is annually visited by more than 3 million foreigners. We are always prepared to show others the splendours of the country, and also her socialist way of life. I would not say this interferes with the vacation opportunities of our own citizens. The state and the trade unions, and now also the economic amalgamations, agro-industrial complexes and regional people's councils, are investing in vacation resorts. The number of Bulgarians going to sanatoria, holiday homes and holiday hotels is rising steadily: 287 thousand in 1960, 448 thousand in 1970 and 488 thousand in 1973, which does not include the 270 thousand in students' holiday homes and camps.

*Silvio Gomes*. The Bulgarian resorts make a very good impression. Brazil, too, has fine beaches. But there is a tremendous difference in attitude to holiday facilities.

Much of the Brazilian seacoast is inhabited by peasants and fishermen, who live in wretched poverty. The resorts near the big cities are owned by foreign interests and only the rich can afford them.

In Bulgaria, on the other hand, the large number of hotels, holiday homes and sanatoria, with all modern amenities and facing splendid beaches, are meant first and foremost for the working people. We did not see ostentatious edifices that stagger the imagination with their pomp and glitter, like those in Brasilia, Guanabara or Sao Paolo. But neither did we see anything like the 'malocas,' the dreadful slums on the fringes of Sao Paolo, the 'squatter settlements' around Brasilia, or the 'favelas' on the hills of Rio de Janeiro. Millions of Brazilians live in demeaning squalor.

In 1935-39 the life expectancy of men was 51 years and women 53. In 1969-1971 it had risen respectively to 68 and 74.

In 1973 real incomes were 260 per cent higher than in 1952. Nominal wages and salaries were more than 160 per cent higher.

In 1973 the state spent 11 leva to every 1 lev in 1952 for services and benefits freely dispensed to the public (through what is known as the public consumption fund).

Sums paid to pensioners in 1948 totalled 45 million leva; the 1973 figure was 854 million leva.

In 1972 there were 23.6 doctors per 10,000 population (USSR 29.4, FRG 21, USA 19.9, France 17.5, Britain 15.7, Japan 14.7, Turkey 5). Hospitals and other medical institutions had 83.8 beds per 10,000 population against 62.5 in 1960.

The 1973 output of consumer goods was 25 times that of 1939.

## THE SOCIALIST ATMOSPHERE

*Travel notes*

We visited Sofia's Bulgarian Revolutionary Movement Museum, met officials at the Plovdiv Region Party Committee, saw monuments of the Bulgarian liberation struggle in the Stara Planina mountains. At Shipka, monuments of the decisive battle Russian and Bulgarian troops fought against the Turks in August 1877. In Buzludzh National Park the tomb of Hadj Dimitr, the legendary leader who fell with his comrades in unequal combat against the Turks in 1868. Twenty-three years later it was the venue of the First Inaugural Congress of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Workers Party, and in the fascist years an area of partisan activity.

We had a talk with Comrade Alexander Lilov, Political Bureau member and CC Secretary of the BCP.

*An instructive example*

*Rudolf Wettengel,* department chief, CC Socialist Unity Party of Germany:

We met workers, cooperative farmers, the new intelligentsia. We met the people who have in the past 30 years stormed the summits of industrialization, modern science and technology, and who are marching forward to a mature socialist society. We have met the successors of Blagoyev and Dimitrov, the men and women of the Bulgarian Communist Party who are now directing the building of a developed socialist society.

More than 763,000 of the 8.6 million population are members of the BCP. They are workers, farmers, scientists, and managers of industry. To their mates and colleagues they explain the Party's policy and go in the vanguard, the initiators of every new undertaking.

In Plovdiv, where Blagoyev had been active, we met officials of the local Party organization. It numbers 56,000 members. In industry every seventh person is a Communist, every eighth in agriculture, every fourth in education and other fields. Sixty per cent of the local

Communists are employed in production. They promote labor discipline, high productivity, and better working conditions.

This applies, among others, to the 1,669 BCP members of the 10,000 personnel of the Georgi Dimitrov Agro-Industrial Complex in Plovdiv's vicinity. And also to some 3,000 Communists of Bulgaria's most up-to-date Devnya industrial complex with its work force of more than 26,000 workers, technicians and engineers.

Party members are trained for political and ideological work under a broad scheme encompassing some 630,000 Communists, or 83 per cent of the total membership, and some 260,000 non-members and members of the YCL.

Marxist-Leninist theory is spread among the masses by 33,000 propagandists, Party functionaries, scholars, and university instructors. About 200,000 are enlisted to study Marxist-Leninist philosophy, 300,000 political economy, 220,000 scientific communism, and over 100,000 the history of the BCP, CPSU and world communist movement.

The Bulgarian Communist Party, which has its roots in the thick of the people, follows in Lenin's footsteps, forging great changes in the country.

*Luis Padilla,* member of CC, CP of Bolivia:

One of the decisive factors behind the victory of people's power and the successful building of socialism in Bulgaria was the socialist community, the political, economic, and military assistance Bulgaria received from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Thanks to this community Bulgaria could be sure of its independence. Its security and sovereignty were dependably guaranteed by the might of the socialist community and its own fidelity to its internationalist duty.

Confidence in the future and in national independence, felt everywhere in Bulgaria, is something I'd like to contrast with the situation in my own country. Like pre-revolutionary Bulgaria, Bolivia is a victim of predatory imperialist exploitation. Its vast natural resources are attracting foreign monopolies. These act hand in glove with the local oligarchy to destroy the country's unity, promoting 'frontier zones of inter-ethnic development' and plotting to set up a separatist state in part of Bolivia's territory (Santa Cruz department). Hanging on to the apron strings of international imperialism, the capitalists are openly hostile to the country's national interests.

Safeguarding national sovereignty is the strategic objective of the working class, which occupies an increasingly decisive place in the political struggle. We Communists are firmly convinced that the alliance of democratic and revolutionary forces opposing the Banzer regime, Brazilian fascist interference in our country's affairs and the

U.S. imperialists, will lead the country to independence, facilitating the establishment of a popular government and paving the way to socialism.

The Bulgarian working class and people have accomplished this long ago. The struggle of the Bulgarian Communists, their perseverance and dedication in building a developed socialist society, are an instructive revolutionary example.

*Pedro Vasquez,* member of Political Commission, CC Secretariat, Paraguayan Communist Party:

The greatest impression of the Bulgarians is their vital, real and palpable sense of internationalism. Real internationalism is inconceivable without sincere gratitude to friends who help you and loyalty to the common struggle. 'This factory was built with the assistance of the Soviet Union.' 'We are proud that our enterprise contributes to socialist economic integration.' We were told this at various factories. In Sofia University they told us appreciatively of the special agreement with the Soviet Union, under which university graduates do post-graduate work at Soviet institutes.

The Communists of Paraguay know that imperialists bank on nationalism and anti-Sovietism to divide the peoples, to create suspicion and malice in their relations. Georgi Dimitrov and his comrades said this should be countered with the friendship, solidarity and mutual assistance of all those who aspire to peace, democracy and socialism. We wholeheartedly agree with Dimitrov, the ardent revolutionary, that the attitude to the Soviet Union is the measure of proletarian internationalism.

## IDEOLOGICAL WORK IS CENTRAL

From remarks by *Alexander Lilov,* Political Bureau member and CC Secretary of the BCP:

Our Party is one of the oldest Marxist parties in Europe. Three years ago we celebrated its 80th anniversary. Founded at the end of the past century, it passed many stages of struggle in performing its historic mission. It has a wealth of experience, including in the ideological field. The main lesson is that the Communist Party cannot cope with its strategic or tactical tasks in fighting capitalism or building socialism, unless it has a well organized ideological front, which spreads its theory, explains its policy and mobilizes the masses to implement it, elucidates the problems of the future, and combats bourgeois ideology and opportunism.

As for the building of socialism, experience shows that it is impossible unless the building of the corresponding material and technical

base is accompanied by the forming of the new, socialist individual, the new, socialist public consciousness, and by elaboration of ideological problems.

The BCP Central Committee held a plenary meeting this February on ideological work. What made this special meeting necessary, what is behind the special attention to ideology in the proceedings of the meeting?

I want to make it clear that the meeting was not convened because of any failures in our ideological work. Our Party has always had an exceedingly stable ideological front, which has stood firm on Marxist-Leninist positions at all periods, whatever the changes that may have occurred in the international situation and the class struggle. Certainly, there are shortcomings, some fairly substantial. And we see it as an urgent task to eliminate them. But they do not characterize the development of our ideological front, and were not the reason for the CC meeting.

Measures to improve ideological work are aimed at aligning the multifaceted ideological activity, primarily its effectiveness, with the new objectives facing the Party and country in the stage of building a mature socialist society.

What main objectives has our Party tackled in the ideological field? We have set out to link ideological work with present-day life, with the main problems the Party faces in economy, politics, international relations, culture and the social field.

We want our ideological work to take still fuller account of the natural link between society and the ideological process, and give impetus to the mechanism of this interconnection. We want to raise to a higher level the patriotic and internationalist education of the working people and the youth.

New problems and tasks have also arisen in view of the changes and new processes in the present-day international situation. As we see it, the main objective of the ideological front is to make the maximum use of the new conditions for a powerful offensive of communist ideas, to acquaint more millions of people throughout the world with the successes of existing socialism.

The part of the social sciences in the ideological process must continue to expand. The main problems of our time must be still more deeply conceptualized in the Marxist-Leninist spirit, and the system of ideological work must be improved. A material and technical base should be built up for our ideological activity, and we must assure a continuously higher level of Party guidance in ideological work.

In 1944 Bulgaria had 423 periodicals with an annual circulation of 126 million. In 1973 there were 1,459 with a circulation of 772 million. The

average Bulgarian family gets 32 newspapers and two magazines monthly.

Bulgarians have 1.5 million radios and 1.3 million TV sets. The evening radio audience totals 5 million, the TV audience some 5.5 million.

In 1944 the country had 17 theatres with an annual attendance of 1,167,000. In 1972 there were 53 professional theatre companies, and their attendance was over 6 million. In 1944 cinema theatres totalled 165, attendance 15 million, and in 1973 – 3,586, with attendance at some 114 million.

## GAINS OF THE WORKING MAN

We have come to the end of our collective travel notes. We dealt with one subject each, though our impressions are far more varied. Many of us intend to write about them for the Party press of our respective countries. Our story was probably subjective in some ways, for, as we said at the beginning, we looked at Bulgaria as friends and were farthest from the thought of concealing our revolutionary partiality. There are many good reasons for it. We are convinced that socialism and socialism alone can resolve the problems of our time. We see with our own eyes that it opens the way to a new life, assuring rapid development for a nation. We know from personal experience that the victory of socialism in any country is not easy to achieve. Humanity's every new step to progress weakens the position of imperialism. 1944 and the 30 years that followed were a time of severe tests for those fighting for the happiness of their peoples, the socialist future of the world.

*Catarina Mendes,* representative of the Portuguese CP on the journal:

1944 was a year of great hope in our country. In my life it was a splendid, but also a very difficult year. I had just finished university, where I participated in Communist Party work. Now, I became an underground Party functionary.

The Bulgarian comrades are celebrating 30 years of socialist achievement. That is a source of great happiness. In the socialist environment time is measured by what has been done for the good of the people. But the Bulgarian Communists also know what life is like in a fascist environment, for there had been fascism in their country too. Only recently it existed in Portugal. The past 30 years of my life consist of 18 years underground, five years in prison, and the remainder in exile.

Today's events in Portugal show that there are many points of resemblance between my country and what Bulgaria had once ex-

perienced. Our two peoples have made incalculable sacrifices in the fight against fascism, and for democracy and progress. For one thing, the heroic histories of our Communist parties have much in common. Both were steeled in revolutionary struggles, both survived the underground and withstood the repressions. Our Parties were always closely linked with the masses, always had extensive popular support. Last but not least, Bulgaria, too, was once a backward country. Portugal is still backward, and has only now embarked on democratic social change.

It is these points of resemblance that impel us to study the experience of the Bulgarian Communists. Speaking of the popular uprising of September 9, 1944 Georgi Dimitrov said that while pursuing democratic objectives, it also undermined the pillars of the capitalist system in Bulgaria, for it is impossible to eradicate fascism, to provide democratic rights to the working people, to consolidate and extend them, without curtailing capitalist domination.

*Vasilis Venetsenapoulos,* CP of Greece representative on the journal:

Like Bulgaria, Greece was liberated from the fascist occupation 30 years ago. The liberation army had expelled the fascists from nearly all districts, and the popular power established during the occupation in a part of the country had begun to spread.

However, British imperialist troops were landed to suppress the far-flung democratic movement, and restored to power rulers culpable of treason and corruption during the occupation. This is the reason why recent Greek history has been so tragic: foreign military bases have been built on our land, and patriots were thrown into jail for a single word of truth.

Such was the result of undisguised export of counter-revolution. Quite typically, the imperialists go out of their way to distort the facts, twist their meaning, while imposing their will on the Greek nation. They are trying to tell the world that the socialist countries are 'exporting revolution.' This charge has been levelled, among others, against the Bulgarian People's Republic. But everybody knows that it is false. Upon overthrowing the reactionary regime in 1944 our Bulgarian neighbors withdrew the occupation troops stationed in Greece by the deposed fascist government.

Socialist Bulgaria's subsequent history, like that of the other countries of the socialist community, demonstrated the incontrovertible fact that revolution stands in no need of export, that socialism in these countries is built on complete respect for the independence and sovereignty of the neighboring states.

For the working people of Greece the new, free, independent and happy Bulgaria is a model of the new socialist society, a concrete

embodiment of the socialist ideal. The people of Greece, now fighting for the final elimination of the dictatorial regime, for a new democracy, will also ultimately break the road to socialist reconstruction.

*Paul Courtieu*, member of CC French CP.

If someone remembers all the dates and can recount the happenings of every day 30 years later, he must have known much suffering. On June 21-22, 1944, we were stuffed into freight cars – 2,000 people in stifling heat, without water. There was so little room that we could only stand. We were being transported to Dachau.

On September 4, 1944, I preformed on a stage. It was in Dachau. The prisoners had been allowed to hold a concert. Little did the Nazis sitting in the front seats know that the concert was arranged by the Communists among us, and that it was dedicated to the liberation of Paris.

In our grimmest hour we dreamed of the future, of socialism, which would deliver people from imperialist reaction. None knew, of course, that in those very days when we were priming for an uprising in the concentration camp, the working people of Bulgaria had opened the way to socialism. We knew nothing at all about the events in Eastern Europe.

Now, I am a visitor of socialist Bulgaria.

I am acutely aware of the many points of resemblance between Bulgarians and Frenchmen. Travelling across the country I often had the feeling that I was somewhere in the south of France. Perhaps this resemblance accentuates the thought that Bulgaria's success in socialist construction has not only changed the life of her own people, but is also an example for other countries.

Bourgeois propaganda ascribes ineffectiveness to the socialist system. But for me it is obvious that socialism facilitates the growth of all the productive forces, and the development of the individual.

I am far from the thought of comparing Bulgaria and France. They have different histories and a different development. Yet I am aware that Bulgaria has an advantage over my country: the emphasis there is on building up the crucial modern branches of the economy, which raise the country to a new level.

I can see the immense efforts to place culture within the reach of the entire people. Children of workers and farmers have free access to higher education. In contrast to my country, the Bulgarian intelligentsia comes from the midst of the people, not from an elite. I can see that here technical progress is in harmony with social progress. This is the main difference between socialism and capitalism, for the latter is unable to balance the scientific-technical revolution with social advance.

*Felipe Suarez*, CP of Chile representative on the journal:

Dear Bulgarian friends, we have visited many of your towns and villages and always remembered Blagoyev, who had given the Bulgarian nation that great vehicle of progress, the Party. The evidence of socialist construction revived in our minds the image of Dimitrov, that giant of revolutionary thought and action. We know that 1878, 1923 and 1944 are memorable years in your history, representing national independence, the first anti-fascist uprising in world history, and the socialist revolution. We are reminded of those who had shed their blood to give Bulgaria freedom, independence, and socialism. We are aware that your every gain is also a contribution to the liberation of countries suffering oppression and exploitation. Though I come from Chile, I feel that I am your brother.

I know that your hearts are aflame with solidarity toward my country. I know that you share our suffering, that your hearts bleed when you hear of the agony of my people. As long as the blood of men, women and children is being spilled in Chile, no decent person on earth could cease to protest. Nobody can breathe freely while freedom is throttled in Chile, while there is wild carnage, and thought is outlawed.

My people are suffering. But they are also fighting. And we are convinced that an end will come to the torture and persecution, and that the people will again be free. Geo Milev, the Bulgarian rebel poet, called out in hope and defiance: 'September will be May!' And that is what happened in Bulgaria. But our September was dark and tragic. Yet the struggle of my people, fortified by the struggle and active solidarity of other peoples, will bring closer the day of victory, and of retribution for the killers. We, too, shall have our May. And our people will again smile, regain the joy of living, the joy of building.

*Pavel Auersperg,* member of CC CP of Czechoslovakia, Executive Secretary of *WMR:*

The cherished aim of those who had fought fascism 30 years ago, was to pave the way for socialist revolution. What we have seen in present-day Bulgaria, which is now building a developed socialist society, has surpassed the wildest dreams of the freedom fighters of the Ninth of September.

All these achievements were made by the dedicated labor of a free nation led by the Communist Party. We can now see the results of the historic Fifth BCP Congress in 1948, which laid the basis for socialist construction. Speaking in public for the last time, Georgi Dimitrov outlined the plan for building socialism. We also see the beneficial effects of the April 1956 plenum of the CC BCP, which restored the Leninist norms of Party life and determined the democratic development of the state and all Bulgarian society for many years ahead. The present objectives of socialist development, its further perspectives,

are defined in the decisions of the 10th BCP Congress, which are being fulfilled by the entire nation.

In our talks with leaders of the Central Committee and regional Party committees, at factories and in cooperatives, we saw that friendship with the Soviet Union and Bulgaria's truly internationalist ties with the other fraternal socialist countries, have been the foundation and precondition for imposing economic, cultural and political gains. Visiting new factories oriented from the outset on socialist economic integration, studying figures of Bulgarian exports and imports, and learning from scientists how they cooperate with those of other socialist countries, we saw how great and varied the ties are between the countries of the socialist community. Conceived for many years ahead, they lay a dependable foundation for still closer bonds between the future generations.

Collective visits by members of the *WMR* Editorial Council to fraternal socialist countries have become a good tradition. Our visit to socialist Bulgaria, too, has meant a lot to us. Seeing socialism in action, examining its advantages and perspectives, we exchanged opinions and worked out a common viewpoint on topical aspects of building socialism. We saw the deep-going and complicated processes that unfold during the building of a developed socialist society. This brought home to us that we must do so much more to present in our journal the facts about the existing socialism, the main and determining force of our time.

On September 9, 1974, we are with our Bulgarian friends in our hearts. It is like being in Sofia again, marching with all the others across the square named in commemoration of that great day. The 30th anniversary of the socialist revolution is a great date in Bulgarian history. It is also a milestone in the life of each of us. Victory of socialism in any point of the world brings us closer to our historic ideal. This is why the existing socialism is a great gain for all working people. What we have seen in Bulgaria touched our hearts, because the heart of a Communist, all his life, is dedicated to the triumph of peace and socialism. And what our class comrades, the Bulgarian Communists, have achieved, is a splendid example.

# Economic chaos in Chile

*Orlando Millas*
Member, Political Commission,
CC CP of Chile

## ONE YEAR OF JUNTA MISRULE

For a year now Chile has been under a tyrannical dictatorship of the most aggressive, chauvinist, reactionary and anti-democratic groups of finance capital closely associated with the big imperialist monopolies.

And in this one year the junta contrived to plunge the country into a state of chaos, not only because of its inept policies, but primarily because of its very class essence, which conditions all its activities. The economic situation in Chile is indicative of the aims of Pinochet's paymasters and of the present regime's corruption.

### *The position before the coup*

The junta inherited an economy impaired by the reactionary plot against the Popular Government, a developing and fundamentally healthy economy nonetheless.

On July 17, 1971, the government took over the big copper mines, Chuquicamata, El Teniente, Exotica, El Salvador and Andina. Control of our greatest natural asset was thus wrested from North-American imperialism. The next task was to raise production and solve the problems left over from the Yankee management.[1] They were solved in two years, thanks to the assistance of Soviet mining experts and the enthusiasm of our workers.

Expropriation of estates over and above 80 hectares of irrigated land was completed in 1971-72, the land being distributed to peasants organized in cooperatives.[2]

To break the credit monopoly, the state took over banks accounting for 95 per cent of deposits and 96 per cent of the country's financial assets, which were now being used to boost economic development.

The state sector in industry and distribution became the most dynamic part of our economy. It comprised the country's biggest and

formerly monopoly-owned factories, accounting for 30 per cent of gross industrial output and employing 20 per cent of the national labor force.

In the first two years of popular rule the production growth rate was nearly double compared with the period of the two preceding governments. In the third year development was impeded by a combination of 'capitalist strike action,' foreign financial blockade and large-scale sabotage.

The Chilean working class and people were fully aware of what the government's constructive policy had given them. The National payroll increased from 49 per cent of national income in 1959-64, to 51 per cent in 1965-70 and to 58 per cent under popular government. No less than 99 per cent of children in the 6-14 age group were attending school, and the number of school graduates rose by 18.2 per cent and university graduates by 34.9 per cent. Infantile mortality was sharply reduced by the government distributing 50 million litres of milk a year to children and expectant mothers.

The achievements of popular rule are of historic significance, but they could not be carried to completion because of subversion, economic sabotage and widespread right and 'left' opportunist deviations.

'The bourgeois parties,' Rene Castillo, a member of the Party leadership, wrote, 'egged on the workers to put forth excessive demands in the hope that this would erode the government's social basis. Worse still, the ultra-Lefts – and indeed elements in the Popular Unity itself that had succumbed to their influence – were working in the same direction. The demands were couched in pseudo-revolutionary phraseology. The forces behind them were concerned solely for their narrow party interests and for extending their influence. Little did they care that by inciting some groups of the working people against the government they were abetting the putschists.'[3]

And there were also these manifestations of opportunism: failure to earnestly work for higher production and productivity, underestimation of planning, a light-hearted attitude toward financial problems and mounting inflation. This hampered government activity and helped the reactionaries in their dirty game.

Our experience shows that the revolution 'can make good progress if its social basis is consolidated and reinforced. This depends primarily on economic policy. After decisive political successes it is the economy that becomes the main field of battle for victory of the revolution.'[4] Formulating and implementing a correct economic policy for the transition period, the forms, methods and pace of economic transformations – these are paramount theoretical and prac-

tical problems for every contingent of the revolutionary movement.

*Direct consequences of the coup*

The fascist coup of September 11, 1973 was attended by much shooting and much printing of paper money. There was the murder of President Allende, the attack on La Moneda Palace, armed attacks on industrial centers, the savage repression, the concentration camps and martial law. The junta also inundated the country with paper money to finance its terroristic regime.

The coup was paid for in dollars from the United States. There were dollar handouts to the striking lorry owners; dollars to induce technicians and tradesmen to strike against the democratic government. Most of the generals and admirals were paid $500,000 each. with bigger sums deposited in foreign banks for the top military. Regimental commanders were rewarded on a much more modest scale. All in all, about $100 million (plus sums paid to the fascist Patria y Libertad for the purchase of weapons) suddenly began circulating in Chile and had to be changed into the national currency.

This was done through a piece of unscrupulous machination that amounted to official sanctioning of bribery by the imperialists. The government announced 'liberation' of the dollar. The law, of course, forbade the holding, buying and selling of foreign currency. Now that the junta had repealed that, the banks were exchanging dollars at the inflated rate of 850 escudos, without any questions asked. In the first few weeks after the coup, $60 million passed through the banks and the junta had to print 50 billion worth of new escudos. And this in a country where on September 11, 1973 total circulation amounted to 63.8 billion escudos.

The junta also 'liberated' capital assets. Financiers who had a part in the coup and in the economic sabotage that preceded it, could now proclaim their 'net worth' without indicating where the money had come from and without having to pay taxes.

But more money was needed to finance the coup against Chile. Apart from everything else, the salaries of top army commanders were increased several times over and more money was going into military spending. The budget deficit on September 11, 1973 stood at 47.3 billion escudos but by December 31, it had ballooned to 119.6 billion, and the junta had to issue another 72.3 billion escudos.[5]

The financial tycoons had never had it so good. They got back the nationalized, expropriated, requisitioned or sequestered industries. But they wanted more and they got it, in the form of control over the country's banks. In the closing quarter of 1973 their bank deposits increased by 104 per cent. The Central Bank issued more money, this time 40 billion escudos.

All this was virtually tantamount to outright robbery of the country. It started a process of runaway inflation. The Chileans are footing the bill of the fascist coup, for inflation has naturally meant devaluation of the escudo: its exchange rate against the dollar has gone from 50 on September 11, 1973 to 1,000 at the present time, an average increase of 1,900 per cent. And this in relation to the dollar, which is itself subject to inflationary pressures.

At this writing we have only the official financial data as of March 18, 1974. The amount of paper money in circulation doubled in six months (from 63 billion on September 11, 1973 to 120.2 billion on March 18, 1974). Under the Popular Government money in circulation increased by less than 200 per cent a year, but the increase by March 18, 1974 is as much as 461.8 per cent. Money in private hands at the time of the coup amounted to 121.2 billion; the figure for March 18 was 311.3 billion.

The regime has been able to somewhat moderate inflationary pressure by drastically depressing the living standards of the working class and the people as a whole, and by ruining the middle strata. But the pressure is still there, though people in the top income groups have nearly trebled their bank deposits, nearly doubled time deposits and convertible assets. In the first 90 days after the coup, share prices rose by 4,000 per cent.[6]

And so, Chile is paying for the treason perpetrated by the organizers of the coup. Inflation is a source of additional profit for the big capitalists. If fascism is hell for the people, it is paradise for the speculators.

*Junta policies*

The international monopolies implant fascism; the junta is their servant. It has handed back to Anaconda and Kennecott and their managers (for instance Zauchuevic) the mines nationalized by President Allende and the entire trade in copper. This is tantamount to denationalization, though the term is studiously avoided. Anaconda and Kennecott also control the supply of spare parts, equipment, transport vehicles, petrol, auxiliary materials, explosives, even working clothes and food. This means tremendous profits besides what they make on sales, transport and insurance. It has been estimated that their profit is more than 20 per cent higher than what they pay for the copper.

At present copper is selling at more than 1.5 dollars a pound and this should mean economic prosperity for Chile.[7] But the military junta has not brought prosperity because all the copper is again appropriated by U.S. imperialism. More, U.S. firms have been promised compensation, in violation of the Constitutional reform and the

appropriate laws, unanimously passed by Congress.

However, Anaconda and Kennecott are not the only Yankee monopolies to benefit from the coup. Others include ITT, Dow Chemical and Pepsi Cola, which is linked with the Chilean Augustin Edwards financial group. Cervecerias Unidas has been given back all its factories, and Standard Oil and its subsidiary, ESSO, had the contracts concluded under the Popular Government annulled, and are now being paid hundreds of millions of dollars for oil supplies to Chile. There is also talk of giving them oil concessions.

With the state sector abolished, the Chilean people have lost the biggest industrial units, now in the hands of such financial groups as Augustin Edwards, Pirania, the Central Bank, Sudamericana de Vapores, Matte-Alessandri, and others.

The agrarian reform under the Demochristian government (1964-70) led to the expropriation of 1,403 estates, with another 4,075 expropriated by the Popular Government. The military junta reversed the process, returning, fully or in part, 2,644 estates and annulling the expropriation of 1,107. That spells death to the agrarian reform and revival of landlord rule.

The fascist junta is trying to produce an ideological foundation for its activity. In speeches and official statements it juggles with three interconnected conceptions: 'integration of enterprises' under absolute owners' control, as the base for the totalitarian 'integrated society' and for the 'market economy,' whose liberalism assures power for the monopolies; it also speaks of the 'auxiliary nature' of the dictatorship, which serves the propertied class (social base) and the military leaders (the summit). Behind this verbiage it is trying to hide the regime's anti-national and mercenary nature.

Junta spokesmen trumpet about increased output. This is a lie. Even their heavily weighted figures cannot conceal the declining production. The Society for the Promotion of Industry (fascist-controlled industrialists' coordinating center) has recorded monthly declines in sales of manufactured goods against the same months of the previous year. The National Institute of Statistics, too, admitted that with the 1968 production index at 100, the December 1972 index was 132.6 and only 126.9 in December 1973. The Institute estimated that in March 1974 the index was 116.3 against 120.8 in the same month last year.[8]

*El Mercurio,* newspaper of international monopoly, admitted on June 4, 1974 that at present the drop in production and sale of manufactured goods results in excessive commodity surpluses, while the outlook for higher raw materials prices is growing dimmer due to the continuous devaluation. Owners of enterprises reckon with these factors when setting their prices, thus accelerating the inflation rate,

which already transcends the usual limits, depresses purchasing power still more palpably and, consequently, considerably reduces the market.[9]

Last summer (December-February) many Chileans escaped hunger only thanks to a relative decline of prices on seasonal products such as potatoes, fruit, vegetables, and eggs. But this led to the ruin of the so-called *chacareros,* the small vegetable farmers, and small and medium crop growers. Mounds of rotting fruit, potatoes and onions were piled along the highways, because their price in city markets was lower than the cost of transport. In winter, that is after June, these products are unavailable. Undernourishment is assuming disastrous proportions.

The financial oligarchy has taken charge of the junta and lays down the policy which the generals and admirals must follow in the economic sphere. It refuses to lower real prices, expecting to 'balance' the situation by cutting back production and pushing the weaker enterprises into bankruptcy. In September 1973 the inflation was given impulse and is now spiralling at a high rate in the 'market economy' conditions created by the monopolies.

*Pauperization of wage-earners and ruin of middle strata*

Since September 1973 Chile's internal market has shrunk greatly. Financial magnates have shovelled in money and the purchasing capacity of some of the armymen has risen. But the vast majority has sunk into poverty, as evidenced by the steep drop in solvent demand.

The main victim of the regime is the working class, on whose shoulders the burden of the crisis has been shifted. The fascists have chosen to compensate the inflation by pauperizing the proletariat. It is being enslaved, and is made to pay for it.

Prices are going up. Here is how the situation of the first six months of 1974 (fascist regime) compares with that of the same six months of 1973 (popular government):

| 1973 | Monthly price rises (%) | Rise against January (%) | 1974 | Monthly price rises (%) | Rise against January (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| January | 10.3 | 10.3 | January | 16.4 | 16.4 |
| February | 4.1 | 14.8 | February | 24.5 | 44.9 |
| March | 6.2 | 22.0 | March | 14.2 | 65.5 |
| April | 10.2 | 34.3 | April | 15.3 | 86.9 |
| May | 19.4 | 60.4 | May | 8.7 | 103.3 |
| June | 15.6 | 85.4 | June | 20.8 | 146.0 |

And here is what is happening to some of the essential products and services:

| | Unit | Price on 11.9. '73 (escudos) | Prices in June '74 (escudos) | % rise in 9 months |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salad oil | litre | 36 | 1,140 | 3,066 |
| Milk | litre | 7 | 120 | 1,614 |
| Bread | kg | 11 | 240 | 2,082 |
| Urban transport fares | | 4 | 60 | 1,400 |
| Poultry | kg | 50 | 800 | 1,500 |
| Rice | kg | 16 | 550 | 3,337 |
| Sugar | kg | 12 | 350 | 2,816 |

Wages and salaries, excepting those of commanding and higher army officers and carabineers, tail far behind the prices.[10] The calamity is made worse by the fact that more than 600,000 people are out of work. And the dismissals are continuing. On June 6 the tyrant Pinochet ordered a reduction of government employees by 20 per cent before the end of the year.

*Paeze Serra,* the Italian newspaper, described the junta's doings as 'genocide by hunger.' The ban on the trade unions, the continuing terror and the elimination of all democratic rights are, indeed, tools of genocide. But the Chilean working class is voicing its protest and resisting the regime in various ways.

The fascist chiefs promised to form mass organizations 'integrated with the nationalist military-civil movement.' They tried to follow the classical Hitler and Mussolini pattern, but failed. The results of their policy have alienated the middle strata, a considerable section of which had at first welcomed the coup of September 11. They have quickly learned from their own experience the painful consequences of fascist policy.

The National Small Farmers Confederation was disbanded by military order, and merged with the Association of Farmers controlled by the big landowners, whose vice-president, Ulpiano Villalobos, admitted in an interview to *Tersera de la Ora,* the fascist paper, on April 4 that '50 per cent of the middle and small proprietors are ruined at present. It is impossible to stand up to the runaway inflation and get along without credits.'

The communes, Indian reservations, Chacareros, colons and peasants, who had received land under the agrarian reform, are in still greater difficulties. The junta has ordered them to pay 140 times the land's 1965 value. There are also the high taxes and continuous

revaluations of debts. In most cases, people cannot pay and lose their farms.

Small-scale industries and the handicrafts were among the first victims of the shrinking market. Most of them have closed. Shopkeepers, too, are on the edge of bankruptcy. Many are unable to renew their licenses, and abandon trade. In Valparaiso Province alone, 400 bankruptcies were registered in recent months.

*Dislocation*

Never before has Chile suffered such ravage. The consequences of undernourishment will tell later. Low-income families (the majority nowadays) whose breadwinners have not lost their jobs spend 40 per cent of their earnings on bread alone.

Many died in the cold spells of the Chilean winter. Many rural areas, towns and settlements are deserted, due mostly to the climate of fear generated by the repressions, the terror, the destruction of mass and other organizations, and of democratic power. The fascists are fighting a full-scale war against the people.

As we have said, the new rulers lost no time to destroy the state sector. After turning over the nationalized enterprises to monopoly capital, they tackled the many state sector institutions. Their cars, jeeps, typewriters and furnishings have been put on sale. Schools and hospitals are being closed down. Universities have been ordered to take tuition fees and pay their own way.

But the worst of all is the country's loss of national independence. Addressing the UN General Assembly on December 4, 1972, Salvador Allende had warned against the 'frontal collision between the multinational corporations and the states. The decisions of states on vital political, economic and military questions are influenced by international amalgamations independent of any state. Their activity is neither examined nor controlled by any parliament or representative collective institution. Briefly, the world's political structure is beind undermined.' Nine months later Allende died a hero's death in the fight for Chile's sovereignty. Against him and against Chile the financial oligarchy deployed a ruthless band of army chiefs and traitors – mercenaries like those of medieval times.

The collapse of national independence and the denial of popular self-government, is not only a loss of many national values, but also a deathblow to the country's economy. Projects launched by the Popular Unity government with the generous assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also in many cases with the cooperation of capitalist states, were paralyzed in the interest of imperialist monopoly. Yet those were investments of a new type, designed to diversify Chile's economy.

On July 11, the anniversary of the nationalization of copper celebrated as National Dignity Day, Pinochet formed a new military cabinet. The only novelty about it is the presence of a Wall Street 'economic observer,' Mr. Raoul Seyes, the totally ineffectual but influential 'super-specialist' of the Alliance for Progress era. Pinochet and Seyes signed an 'Investor's Charter,' a wretched code of dishonor tearing up the Andes group agreements, opening Chile to foreign exploiter capital, and guaranteeing unlimited export of profits. The fascists are pinning their hopes on investments like those in South Vietnam, designed for quick plunder.

The Paris club's consent to let the fascist junta delay payment of 95 per cent of the country's foreign debt is probably the most disgraceful of the acts of imperialist 'assistance.' It places an additional $600 million at the junta's disposal just when copper prices are on the rise. But this will never make up for the imperialist plunder, will not stabilize the tottering economy.

*The anti-fascist front*

This monstrous economic policy would collapse if it were not held up by a reign of terror. It is contrary to the interests, needs and aspirations of the vast majority of the nation and a calamity for the working class, the peasants, middle strata, intelligentsia, the small and middle bourgeoisie. More, it makes a travesty of elementary human rights. Yet its very nature is objectively favoring a democratic alliance with the working class of broad strata, their social and ideological trends and political parties.

A decisive factor is the solidarity of all sound forces across the world, encompassing governments, political and mass organizations, democratic institutions and personalities. Nowadays, Chile's cause is identified with the loftiest human values. Freedom is indivisible. The peril that struck the towns and villages of Chile on September 11, 1973, also hangs over other peoples. And on all continents the working class stands in the van of the solidarity movement.

The Communist Party of Chile is fighting heroically, defying torturé and death. It is carrying on, though all its leading organs and branches function deep underground. Other members of the Popular Unity bloc are reforming their ranks. Experience shows that the enemy benefits from the kind of duality that had earlier bedevilled the coalition as a result of right and 'left' opportunist deviations, notably those of the ultra-left.

The fraternal unity of Socialists and Communists resisting the regime has never been closer than now. The historic May Day statement of the Political Committee of Popular Unity, met with extensive response, said to the people: '*There is only one way to reply to the*

*challenge to Chile: create a broad anti-fascist front with place for all men, women and young members of our nation, a front that would overthrow the dictatorship, reconquer democracy, and again, backed by the majority of the nation, follow the path of revolutionary transformations.'*

1. Mountains of slag, equipment sadly in need of repair, no spare parts, rapacious exploitation of the mines, with the danger of exhausting them, etc.

2. They received 45 per cent of irrigated and 35 per cent of all cultivated land.

3. R. Castillo, Lessons and Perspectives of the Revolution, Letter from Chile, *WMR*, July 1974.

4. Ponomaryov, The World Situation and the Revolutionary Process, *WMR*, June 1974.

5. A doctored propaganda report of the planning board lists among negative developments an 86 per cent increase in expenditure on the public services in the fourth quarter of 1973, with 82 per cent going to maintain the central administration, the armed forces and the carabineer corps.

6. The planning board report says that 'quasi-assets' in the private sector increased 173 per cent in the closing quarter of 1973, time deposits by 127 per cent and Central Bank bonds by 107 per cent.

7. This is how copper prices have fluctuated, cents per pound: 1965–58.64, 1966–69.47, 1967–51.13, 1968–56.10, 1969–66.56, 1970–64.10, 1971–49.27, 1972–48.55, 1973–81. The 1973-72 price declines meant a serious loss for the Popular Government.

8. At the Second National Convention of Production and Trade early this May in Valparaiso, which was in a way a summation of what capitalist quarters think about the fascist junta's policy, Sergio de Castro, adviser of the Economics Ministry, said that probably due to rising prices commerce was stagnant, and dropping. At about the same time, Chile's Association of the Shoewear Industry said that output of shoes in 1974 is not expected to exceed 27 million pairs, a 15.6 per cent decline against 1973. New cutbacks in shoe production and other consumer goods have since been announced.

9. *El Mercurio,* June 4. 1974.

10. This May the Peru Catholic University's center for social-economic, political and anthropological research has published Michel Chessudowski's paper on the redistribution of incomes in Chile, which says, among other things: 'According to official figures of the National Institute of Statistics, prices of consumer goods in Chile have gone up approximately 11-fold from January 1973 to March 1974, whereas wages and salaries in January 1974 were only 400 per cent of 1973. According to our estimates, March 1974 food prices exceeded the 1972 mean index 34-fold.' The paper shows that the purchasing capacity of low-income families had gone down 48 per cent in October 1973, and over 60 per cent in January 1974. The drop for average-income families were 75 per cent and high-income families 60 per cent.

# Difficult days for Cyprus

*Dinos Constantinu*
PB and Secretariat Member,
CC, Progressive Party of the
Working People of Cyprus

The events in Cyprus are in the center of world attention. The criminal armed coup against the legal government of Archbishop Makarios, engineered by the Greek military, has left an explosive situation. It changes from day to day and even at this writing much remains unclear.

The self-proclaimed 'president,' Sampson, brought to power by the military coup, has resigned and the duties of President have been assumed by Clerides, speaker of the Parliament. He declared that he had taken over the Presidency on a 'temporary basis.'

This, briefly, is how it all started. The main cause of the tragedy that has befallen the Cypriot people is the perfidious action of the Greek officers of the National Guard. They organized the coup with the knowledge of the Athens military junta and with the blessing of certain NATO circles who do not want an independent republic of Cyprus and are anxious to stifle the freedom of the Cypriot people, keep it in constant fear and submission and make short shrift of the progressive forces on the island.

Events have made it amply clear that the coup had factually been planned by NATO and carried out by Greece which openly, in the eyes of all, used its armed forces to intervene in an attempt to set up a fascist regime and bring Cyprus under the tight control of the imperialist NATO bloc. The Greek armed forces on the island and a handful of Cypriot puppets became the executors of imperialist aggressive plans. Were it not for the 1,500 Greek officers and soldiers, the coup would never have succeeded and the conspirators would have been defeated in a matter of hours. That is plainly suggested by the adamant resistance and heroism of the patriotic forces throughout the trying July days.

The armed intervention by the Greek junta, which led to the overthrow of the Republic's legal government, was followed by the Tur-

kish armed intervention. Our Party resolutely condemned this new aggression against our people, this attack on its freedom and democratic rights. AKEL called on the people to resist and uphold the rights they had won in long and hard struggle.

Cyprus is now under a triple occupation, by Greece, Turkey and Britain. There is the danger of the island being partitioned and its people virtually enslaved by these three NATO states. There is also the danger of suppression of the progressive movement and loss of the people's political, economic and social gains. In short, there is the danger of Cyprus becoming a NATO 'unsinkable aircraft carrier,' a tool of military provocation against neighboring Arab countries and against the Soviet Union, which has always stood up for the Arab peoples and Cyprus.

Such is the background of the tragic July events. But let us look deeper.

International reaction, the imperialist forces, have long harbored plans against the independence of the Republic of Cyprus, against its foreign policy of peace.

The Cypriots won their independence after a long and hard struggle. True, this independence, set out in the London and Zurich agreements, was never full. It was hedged off by many reservations. In fact, the agreements contained the seeds of friction between the Greek Cypriot majority and the Turkish Cypriot minority. The British colonialists kept their military bases covering about 100 square miles of the island's territory, and Greece and Turkey, the 'guarantors' together with Britain of the island's independence, have troops there, too.

Ever since independence was proclaimed in 1960, the reactionary forces, internal and external, made repeated attempts to create some pretext for foreign intervention. Instigated and encouraged from Athens, illegal terrorist organizations did not for a single day cease their subversion and the campaign for enosis. All this hampered normal relations between the Greek and Turkish communities. The first armed clashes between them, over interpretation and application of the Constitution, were provoked in 1963, and there were fresh clashes in 1964 and again in 1967. In all of them one could easily detect the directing hand of NATO, which wants the island as its military base in the Eastern Mediterranean. Besides the bloodshed, these clashes led to the intervention, first of Turkey then of Britain, and then to the stationing of UN forces.

Right up to the last few days before the putsch, negotiations were being held to work out a solution acceptable to both communities and thus settle the Cyprus problem under UN auspices. Gradually normal relations between Greek and Turk were being formed.

But peaceful development did not suit the U.S. and other imperialists. They did not like the non-alignment policy and friendship and cooperation with all countries, especially the socialist countries and the Soviet Union. Nor did they approve of the government's democratic policy at home, the legal existence and activity of AKEL, the Marxist-Leninist Party of the working people. They could not stomach the fact that AKEL was strong and influential, the result of its patriotic policy and sustained struggle for the people's political, economic and social rights.

That is why intrigue against the Republic began from the very first day of its existence. At first there were attempts to win over the government and President Makarios. When this failed there were several attempts on the life of President Makarios. Also attempts to overthrow the legal government and bring to power men loyal to NATO and U.S. imperialism. When all these plans failed, there came the coup and outright interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

Throughout all these years our people have been able by uniting their forces, to thwart imperialist plans. AKEL had an important part in this. Another major factor was the consistent championship of the Cypriot people's interests by the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and the democratic forces of the world.

Our Party declares that the Cypriot people will never surrender their freedom, will never abandon the struggle for the right to shape their own destiny, for their democratic rights. Cyprus must remain an independent, sovereign and integral state.

The Security Council ceasefire resolution of July 20 is a positive and constructive step and we will do everything to support it.

Our people demand:

– unconditional implementation of the Security Council ceasefire resolution and the re-establishment of peace;

– withdrawal of all foreign troops that interfere in our internal affairs;

– re-establishment of constitutional rule and normalcy, the return to power of the government of Archbishop Makarios which was elected by the entire people;

– an end to all interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus;

– preservation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.

That is the only way to solve the Cyprus problem in the interests of all our people.

It is gratifying to know that in these critical days for Cyprus its people have had the support and solidarity of world progressive opinion. And the first to show this solidarity, in deeds and in different forms, was the Soviet Union, the great friend of the Cypriot people.

The USSR has again shown that it is a consistent and determined supporter of Cypriot independence and sovereignty and is opposed to enosis, which the Greek military want to use as a cover for turning the island into a NATO military base. Solidarity with the Cypriot freedom fighters and AKEL has come also from other countries of the socialist community, from many non-aligned countries, fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, the World Peace Council and other international democratic organizations.

International solidarity and support is a powerful weapon in our people's difficult struggle to save their country from imperialism.

We are grateful to all who in those trying days raised their voice against the crimes of the Greek military. And we shall continue to urge all working class parties, democratic and peaceable states, democratic organizations and publications, and friends of peace throughout the world to exert every effort and use all their influence to give the Cypriot people moral and material support in their fight for the independence and sovereignty of their Republic.

Our Party will devote all its energy to assure peace and normalcy and a return to constitutional rule.

---

# The dialectics of détente

*Commentary*

Like the two earlier ones, the third Soviet-American summit has attracted worldwide attention and has produced a welter of comment in the mass media. Weeks after their publication, the new USSR-U.S. agreements are still being carefully studied, weighed and discussed. And in the judgment of most government leaders, politicians and commentators the Moscow talks produced positive results and gave an impetus to détente.

That is important, for by its very nature, détente, normalization of international relations, must be a forward-moving process. There must be no loss of momentum, no marking time, for every delay is fraught with the danger of sliding back, of a relapse into cold war. That presumably is why, on the eve of the summit, opponents of détente tried to induce pessimism about its possible outcome. All the more significant, therefore, is the fact that the Moscow summit rep-

resents continued progress toward better Soviet-American relations and solution of many problems on which universal peace and security depend.

The decision of the CC CPSU Political Bureau, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers approving the work of the Soviet delegation at the Moscow talks rightly states that they 'represent a new, major contribution to better Soviet-American relations, facilitate continued détente and acceptance in international relations of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems, which accords with the interests of the Soviet and American peoples and world peace.' The decision notes with satisfaction that, thanks to the consistent implementation of the 24th CPSU Congress Peace Program, the past two years have seen a fundamental positive change in Soviet-American relations.

The leaders of the socialist countries share this assessment of the summit, regarding it as a success for socialism's policy of peace.

Fraternal parties in the capitalist countries likewise support the Soviet effort to make peaceful coexistence the cardinal principle of international relations and remove the menace of a thermonuclear world war. Thus, Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, emphasizes that détente, so crucial in averting nuclear catastrophe, strengthens the position of all the progressive forces, for it is the only alternative to the cold war, with its rampant reaction and racism, suppression of democracy, anti-labor laws and induced anti-communism. The French Communist daily, *L'Humanité*, writes that the third Soviet-American summit 'will hold an important place in the history of peaceful coexistence.'

Consistent normalization of relations between the USSR and the USA is in the interests not only of their peoples. In this day and age, no edifice of international peace can endure if it does not rest on the reliable foundation of mutual trust and cooperation of the two great powers that head the world's two main social systems.

The Soviet Communist Party and government have rendered a great service to mankind by overcoming – in the face of numerous difficulties and obstacles – the cold-war inertia and setting Soviet-American relations on the new course of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. With the balance of world forces changed in favor of peace and socialism, the Soviet Union was able to persuade the United States to face realities and shed some of the old doctrines inspired by blind anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. By signing the May 1972 statement on principles of relations between the USSR and USA, the United States accepted, at long last, that 'in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence.' Since then the logic of coexistence, which

has brought out all the advantages of cooperation, has prompted the U.S. leaders to take one more step and agree that détente must be made irreversible. That idea was advanced by the Soviet Union a year ago. Now it is incorporated in the joint Soviet-American communique of July 3, 1974. It says the two sides are 'deeply convinced of the imperative necessity of making the process of improving Soviet-American relations irreversible.'

Some political leaders and part of the media in the West accuse the Soviet Union of being 'unfaithful,' of paying too much attention to relations with the U.S., cultivating understanding with it at the expense of third countries. In fact, some even see in normalization of USSR-U.S. relations a 'menace' to their countries.

That all such accusations are maliciously motivated is perfectly obvious. For better Soviet-American relations are only part – albeit an important part – of a much wider process of international détente open to all states, a process initiated by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with the support of the international Communist movement and the progressive world public. And who does not know that, along with this fundamental positive change in USSR-U.S. relations, there has been an equally positive change in Soviet relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. Similarly, there has been a steady strengthening of the old and close ties of friendship with France, and fruitful cooperation with Italy, Austria, Japan and many other countries, big and small. And, lastly, there is the general improvement of the international climate. No, there is no justification whatever for these charges of 'unfaithfulness.' And all the talk about the dangers of 'Soviet-American collusion' (or, in translation from the Chinese, 'collusion of the two superpowers') is only the latest fashion in anti-Sovietism, a cover for their own reluctance to participate in the détente process.

All the documents signed by the two parties – treaties, agreements, protocols, joint statements and the joint communique – were published during and immediately after the Moscow summit. There is no need therefore to examine them in detail. But there is need to re-emphasize that progress *continues in all areas of cooperation* begun at the very start of the present stage of Soviet-American relations. For the summit concretized and gave practical expression to many earlier undertakings and mapped out a program for the future. Agreement was reached on new important initiatives and on working out new accords on fundamental issues. This continuity over the three summits should be considered by everyone who wants to form a correct judgment of what has been accomplished.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev singled out the basic and crucial result of this year's summit in his speech at the jubilee session of the Polish

Sejm on July 21: 'The main thing, in our view, is that the two sides clearly reaffirmed their resolve to continue the great work begun in 1972 and 1973 and do everything within their power further to reduce, and then totally eliminate, the risk of an armed conflict between the USSR and USA, which could be the beginning of a world nuclear and missile war.'

And yet, in the United States and elsewhere in the capitalist world, opponents of détente are inclined to criticize the Moscow summit as insufficiently productive. Some argue that the negotiations produced nothing sensational, no 'dramatic' agreements, and others that its results are too modest.

'Dramatic' may not be an altogether appropriate epithet for a political document. But some of the concluded agreements, particularly on voluntary renunciation of second anti-missile deployment areas, and on a 'yield threshold' for underground nuclear tests, may be justifiably described as dramatic. However, that is not the main point. The fact that the third meeting of top Soviet and American leaders in two years was no longer treated as a sensation, is in itself a sensation. It shows how quickly the world has grown accustomed to the new, constructive nature and level of relations between the two great powers that had not so long ago stood in the center of a dangerous confrontation.

It is part of human nature to want more than you get. People who have their first glimpse of the sea are sometimes disappointed that it isn't bigger. And, certainly, it would have been splendid if the summit decisions had been still broader. The opportunities were there. For example, the Soviet Union had proposed an agreement on a *total cessation* of underground nuclear testing. It has also suggested the withdrawal of Soviet and U.S. nuclear ships and submarines from the Mediterranean. Regrettably, agreement on this score could not be reached. But we must always reckon with the complexity, intricacy and sharpness of the problems involved. Considering the shortness of the period of improvement of Soviet-American relations and the legacies of the cold war, we should rather marvel at the amount of progress made in this brief term.

Also, we must reckon with the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States belong to two opposite social systems, represent different modes of production, different property systems, and different class interests. In this context, the Soviet-American relations are clear evidence that the peaceful coexistence policy is a dialectical blend of cooperation and struggle. Promoting peace and peaceful coexistence and international cooperation in matters of concern for all humanity, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries follow a class policy of principle. In no circumstances can they be expected to sacrifice the interests of socialism, the international working class and

the national liberation movement on the altar of peaceful coexistence. However, the class approach in foreign policy does not mean lack of flexibility and ability in searching for mutually acceptable solutions. The normalization of Soviet-American relations shows what impressive results can be achieved for peace and international security *without* renouncing principle and the class approach.

True, every step to international détente has to be fought for, getting around the many obstacles. Influential imperialist quarters do not disguise their nostalgia for the gloom-ridden days of the cold war. For them the normalization of international relations is already too rapid. They allege that the United States is making too many 'concessions' to the Soviet Union. They urge slowing the process of détente, and advancing conditions obviously unacceptable to the socialist countries.

Political profiteers suggest 'selling' détente at 'a higher price.' They suggest the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community should pay for détente with ideological concessions, opening the doors to bourgeois ideology. To create the impression that this has a chance of success, the specious theory has been put into circulation that the Soviet Union and the socialist world are in desperate need of Western technology and commodities, in exchange for which they would agree to anything. Needless to say, its authors are simply deceiving themselves and others. The Soviet Union was invulnerable to imperialist blackmail during the most difficult periods of its history. So how can the blackmailers expect to succeed now, when the socialist world is at the peak of economic, scientific and technical power?

Not only capitalist leaders blinded by class egoism have proved unable to understand the motives of socialism's foreign policy, its fidelity to the ideals of peace and international cooperation. So have ultra-left elements – Trotskyites, anarchists, Maoists and other extremists. They are blind to the dialectics of international détente as a combination of cooperation and struggle. And failing to understand the special features and demands of the present time, they accuse the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of 'losing their revolutionary spirit,' denying support to revolutionary forces, 'colluding' with imperialism, etc. They want everyone to believe that peaceful coexistence is outright surrender to the class enemy.

The present-day leftist phrasemongers refuse to understand that the prime obligation of a revolutionary today is to prevent a world thermonuclear conflict and assure the physical survival of nations, otherwise all talk about their social and national emancipation would be meaningless. Attempts to contrast the humane anti-war policy of the advance detachments of the international working class to the ulti-

mate aims of its class program are evidence of immaturity or deliberate pseudo-Left falsification. Socialism's aid to other revolutionary forces is well enough known, sparing us the need to deny the accusations of slanderers. Fidel Castro gave a fitting reply to those who criticize the Soviet Union for allegedly shirking its anti-imperialist duty. They should ask themselves, he said, where the liberation forces in Africa, Asia and Latin America get all their arms.

Incomprehension of the dialectical substance of international détente sometimes also breeds Right-opportunist tendencies and complacency. This is borne out, among other things, by the survival of the 'convergence' theory, though it should be clear by now that a cocktail of capitalism and socialism is as impossible as hot ice.

There are other wrong interpretations of détente and the normalization of Soviet-American relations. Some short-sighted leaders of developing countries have jumped to the conclusion that the international polarization of class forces is over, that the essential difference between the foreign policy of socialist and capitalist states has been done away with and that it is now safe to abandon oneself to the embraces of an imperialist power.

The facts will dissipate these illusions in due course. In the meantime, they may do considerable damage, especially if invoked to deceive the people.

Recently, there have been all too many reminders that despite the relaxation of international tensions, imperialist policy is as ever fraught with the danger of reaction and aggression. The events in and around Cyprus were yet another such warning. They showed that the Soviet Union could not be more right in working for *the spread of détente to the whole world.*

The fascist putsch in Cyprus, primed by the Greek junta, and the consequent outbreak of hostilities, show how fragile the peace is in certain parts of the world. Once more, they revealed the dangerous role of the aggressive NATO alliance, against which Communists have been warning all these years. It is not only a locus of resistance to international détente, but also an instigator of dangerous politico-military provocations. The independence of Cyprus has always been a thorn in the side of the NATO generals. For them the island is a potential military base. Small wonder that NATO cast its shadow from the outset on the revolt of the fascist rebels against the lawful Cypriot government. But the NATO policy-makers have blundered. Their blunder is possibly, politically irremediable, for it led up to a point where two members of the professedly 'peace-keeping' alliance, came to the brink of war. Never very high, the reputation of the Atlantic bloc has probably touched bottom. The urgent international problems are now augmented by that of restoring the indepen-

dence and democratic order of the Republic of Cyprus, and making good the grave material, political and psychological damage of the fascist revolt. This should give fresh impulse to the struggle of the peoples for peace and the elimination of the aftermaths of the cold war.

Whatever attacks the policy of peaceful coexistence may be exposed to from 'left' and right, Communists are convinced that it conforms best of all to the need of the times and the vital interests of the peoples. This is at the root of the extensive and massive support given to the 'peace offensive' of the socialist countries under the flag of international détente. Which is one of the reasons why the process of détente will be continuous and why the world will not go back to cold war. The crucial thing today is vigilance, readiness to repulse the aggressive forces, and perseverance in the fight for peace, for the preservation of the new climate in international relations.

*Jan Prazsky*

---

## DIARY

*WMR* editorial offices were visited by Comrade Reinaldo Marin, First Secretary of the Paraguayan Communist Party, who spoke on the political situation in his country. Comrade Marin also discussed broader mutual cooperation with *WMR*.

During a recent visit to *WMR* editorial offices Comrade S. Achutha Menon, Chief Minister of Kerala State and member of the CP of India National Council, described the work of the coalition government and the Kerala Communists' efforts to resolve urgent economic and social problems.

Broader cooperation between *WMR* and the CPI was also discussed.

Our editorial offices were visited by Comrade Hector Agosti, prominent literary critic and writer, director of the journal *Cuadernos de Cultura*, and member of the Executive, CC CP of Argentina. He discussed cooperation between the CPA and *WMR*.

books and journals

# The impact of the scientific and technological revolution

*Radovan Richta*,
Director, Institute of
Philosphy and Sociology,
Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences

## A SURVEY OF LITERATURE

The problem of how to use the scientific and technological revolution (STR) for the good of society has been gaining in urgency over the past few years. What social forces will control its achievements – automated systems, new sources of energy, biological processes that can alter man's genetic code and psyche, devices that help change the climate, space-flight techniques, the means of mass destruction? What use will be made of the steadily growing potential of world science, roughly ten times as great now as two decades ago? What use will be made of the technology whose potential in industrial countries is growing at a quickening pace? The clearer the outlines and trends of the STR become, the more relevant is the question of which social system is able to solve its problems and made maximum use of its achievements for the people's good. Worldwide interest in these questions has stimulated the output of books on this subject.

*'The future shock'*

For a long time, bourgeois authors based their notions of the future on the belief that new research techniques, computers, and the like, would help to resolve all the inherent contradictions of capitalism. In the 60s some Western authors believed that class war had been overcome, and primarily thanks to new technology.[1] One still comes across new and more subtle attempts to salvage capitalism with the aid of science and technology by providing a permanent social basis for the 'technotronic era'[2] and an appropriate 'year 2000 ideology.'[3]

Meanwhile it has emerged that the STR aggravates the contradictions of capitaliat society. 'Faith in economic growth has been re-

placed by a feeling of unease in the face of the prospects opened up by it.'[4] The adverse effects of technological progress geared to capitalist profit show that the capitalist system cannot regulate technological development to meet the wide range of human requirements, and that it causes serious apprehensions over the future of man.[5] A case in point is the environment, for the 'waterways become sewage pits and the air fills with poisons.'[6]

Bourgeois society cannot cope with the problems posed by the STR, and more and more bourgeois authors of the 70s propose limiting scientific and technological progress. Many of them consider that the time has come to go over 'from the past dynamics of growth to the future condition of world equilibrium,'[7] because, as they see it, development based on economic, scientific and technological growth will in any case lead to disaster,[8] to the 'future shock.'[9] Some associate with the STR an ominous vision of 'doomsday,' saying that 'technology is the ultimate author of all ills.'[10] More and more authors take anti-technological sentiment to the point of technophobia.[11] They blame science and technology, wittingly or otherwise, for what is the fault of monopoly capitalism. Indeed, it is by no means science and technology but the capitalist form of using them that lays waste the environment and twists human life into a harmful pattern.

*A direct productive force*

General attention today is focussed on the outlook for the socialist system, which strives to use science and technology for the good of man. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, speaking to its 24th Congress, described it as a task of historic importance 'to closely combine the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system.'[12] It is on this basis that the long-range prospects of a developed socialist society are scientifically forecast and the strategy of its scientific and technological progress worked out.

In socialist countries, several hundred new works on theoretical problems of the STR have appeared in the past three or four years. An international symposium of scholars and experts of the CMEA countries and Yugoslavia on 'The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Social Progress' (Moscow, February 1974) found that Marxist-Leninist analyses invariably tie up current political, economic and philosophical problems with the concept 'scientific-technical revolution.' The definition of the nature and social role of the scientific and technological revolution, D.M. Gvishiani, Corresponding Member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said at the symposium, is one of the most important theoretical and political findings of Marxism in the second half of this century.

The intensity of research into problems of the STR is indicative of the fast-growing demands put on the management of social processes in socialist society. The task, P.N. Fedoseyev, Vice-President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said, 'is fully to reveal the place of the scientific and technological revolution in world history, its role in providing the material and technical basis for communism, and its impact on the social, political, ideological and cultural spheres of life and on the development of the individual . . .'[13]

In the late 60s and early 70s, Marxist-Leninist authors evolved a fairly complete concept of the STR. The important aspect of this is the confirmation of the changes in the composition of the productive forces predicted by Marx, Engels and Lenin. These changes are due basically to the development of science into a 'direct productive force' and to the transformation of production, as Marx put it, 'from a simple process of labor into a scientific process.'

It follows that the STR may be defined as a set of fundamental changes in science and technology leading to a universal revolution in the structure and dynamics of the productive forces of society, changing man's place among them due to the overall application of science as a direct productive force.[14]

Study of the nature of the STR required a further elaboration of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the productive forces and their internal structure,[15] especially the problem of the interrelation of the material, technical and social aspects. The fact is that the STR implies 'fundamental qualitative changes in the material and technical basis of production and its management, as well as in man's position and function in the labor process and hence in the character of labor.'[16]

Some authors try to find methods[17] for defining the nature and trend of contemporary history and forecasting the development of socialist society. They see the inherent connection of the STR with the laws governing the epoch of transition from capitalism to communism, and with the construction of a developed socialist society. 'The prime characteristic of the unfolding scientific and technological revolution,' writes S. Trapeznikov, 'is that it is taking place in the epoch of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. A highly important factor revolutionizing the contemporary process of history, the STR ultimately strengthens the positions of socialism and is a condition for its worldwide victory.'[18] The STR is shaping the productive forces and the material and technical basis of communist society.

Experience shows that socialist society can solve the problems posed by the STR. Attempts to find solutions to these problems outside the socialist system and communist movement, on the basis of revisionist notions of a 'democratic,' 'humane,' etc., socialism,[19]

inevitably boil down to attacks on the only realistic approach of these problems.

*Catalyst of social change*

Capitalist science has shown itself incapable of finding points of departure for analyzing the STR. Some Western scholars try to squeeze the progress of the STR into a narrow framework (cf. the patterns of the 'cybernetic,' 'technotronic' or other revolutions); others deny the very advent of the STR, describing the concept itself as an 'eschatological illusion' or a 'myth.' Vacillation between technological determinism ad moralistic or anthropological subjectivism[20] does not allow bourgeois science to evolve a sound approach to studying the character and dynamics of present-day development.[21] The concluding report of Harvard University's eight-year program on technology and society says plainly that it will take many more years of research 'to come to some conclusions about whether, how, and to what extent society is shaped by its technology.'[22]

The Marxist-Leninist method alone is effective in studying the dialectics of the relationship between the transformation of the world and social change. The more man knows and transforms the world, the more he can and must know and transform his society and himself. In socialist countries, scientific and technological progress necessarily becomes a catalyst of social change.[23] On the other hand, changes in the social function of science are necessarily accompanied by general changes in the very character of science. Recent scientific and technological progress has revealed the vast importance of the fact that Marxism-Leninism has laid the foundations and created the structure of 'one science' capable of linking knowledge of nature with knowledge and the revolutionary development of society.[24] Contemporary science is going through a new stage of history differing fundamentally from both the science of antiquity and tranditional science, a product of the Renaissance and the industrial revolution.[25]

The progress of the STR has fully revealed the significance of social sciences and prompted close coordination of research between natural and social sciences.[26] In building socialism, any problem of the STR involves a whole set of sciences, and therefore every natural science program must be accompanied by relevant research in social science. It is not accidental that at this stage the balance between the natural and social sciences in socialist society is changing.[27]

Once the task of transforming nature consisted merely of mastering this or that sphere of it. Today it is becoming ever more evident that we must approach this task as a complex, which can only be done by a society capable of 'regulating its development through interaction with nature.'[28]

This applies particularly to ecology. The conclusion to be drawn is that we must create 'closed cycles' between society and nature, the waste-free technology[29] anticipated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

*Part of the social process*

'Lenin pointed out,' said M.V. Keldysh, President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, 'that science is one of the main levers in building communist society, and the Communist Party has consistently adhered to this postulate . . .'[30] The growing role of science expresses itself, among other things, in the fact that it keeps ahead of technology and production and actively influences both.[31]

Bourgeois and revisionist authors, including Maoists, portray science in socialist countries as a sort of independent growth on the body of socialist society. They believe its rapid development will turn the socialist system (like the capitalist) into 'post-industrial society'[32] managed by a technocratic elite.

Thereby they put the problem on its head. Marxist-Leninist analysis has shown that under socialism only the working class can be the decisive, leading factor in the progress of the STR.[33] The working class gradually changes the character of its life and labor on a mass scale[34] and achieves its historical social goal, which is to provide conditions for the harmonious development of the individual. Ultimately this will remove the essential distinctions between physical and mental labor and between town and country.[35]

Bourgeois authors try in vain to refute these arguments and to prove that the historic role of the working class is on the wane and that the intellectuals and white-collar workers are moving into its place. Some of them, such as Daniel Bell,[36] regard scientists and technologists as the decisive factor in 'post-industrial society,' while authors like Marcuse hope that society will come under the control of the humanists. Both versions are virtually in favor of capitalists retaining power.

Not a single achievement of science or technology can be realized or used outside definite social conditions. The progress of the STR is by no means a purely technical matter but part of the social process.[37] This is the essential reason why a narrow, purely technical interpretation of scientific and technological progress is insufficient. As matters stand, an effective strategy of this progress can be evolved only in direct connection with the development strategy of socialist social relations.[38] This is a basic condition for managing social processes on a comprehensive scientific basis in line with the objective laws of social progress. Authors in socialist countries discuss the important problem of encouraging organizational forms of management that

would meet the requirements of the STR best of all.[39]

*Using the advantages*

A key task facing science is to ascertain and use those advantages of the socialist economic system that at this stage would propel a rapid growth of the productive forces, which, in turn, would promote socialist relations.[40] It is also necessary to ascertain and use those achievements of science and technology that are particularly effectual at this stage in fostering socialist relations, and hence scientific and technological progress.

Analysts single out two basic spheres in which the advantages of socialism with regard to the STR manifest themselves actively. One of them is socialization, the social organization of reproduction of the life of society. Speaking generally, socialization is the starting point in the fruitful use of science. Socially combined labor on the scale of the entire society becomes the basis for the conversion of science into a direct productive force. This is why, under the socialist system, the STR is logically bound up with the maximum expansion of social integration[41] in management, planning and rational use of technology. This is where we will find large and easily activated growth potentialities. Blueprints of nationwide automated date-processing and control systems reveal the vast possibilities of utilizing scientific and technological achievements in socialist society.

Another advantage of socialism is that the new human relations release the working people's energy and help to foster their abilities and activity.[42] Socialism strives to develop science, technology and the productive forces in a way that will raise the working people's standard of life, gradually turn labor into a form of creative endeavor, promote education and culture, and ensure protection of the environment. Hence the fundamental importance of directing scientific and technological progress toward mechanizing monotonous labor which requires no particular mental effort and of providing more facilities for the service industry, education, etc.

The scientific literature of socialist countries shows the connection between the STR and intensified economic development.[43] A search is on for more effective, that is, time-saving, uses of scientific and technological achievement in the economy.[44] Authors rightly stress that the very concept of economic efficiency must by all means be based on a proper relationship between the economic and social aspects.[45]

To be sure, changes in the character of labor may sometimes look like merely a social act, and the educational standard, say, as a measure of job competence only. The result is entirely different, however, when one takes account of the long-term outlook for

socialist society in view of the STR, bearing in mind, among other things, the sources of scientific, technological and social progress acquired by society with the changing content of labor, increasing education of the working people, and so on.[46]

The formation and development of the socialist way of life invariably ensures the overall growth of the productive forces and the working people's abilities and makes possible a mutual stimulation of social and technological changes.[47] The achievements of the STR are thus brought into use by intimately linking them with the advantages of the socialist economic system.

*Deforming element*

In the light of the foregoing, the limitations of capitalism stand out all the more.[48] While capitalism at its monopoly stage 'leads directly to the most comprehensive socialization of production' (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 22, p. 205), and while the state today intervenes in scientific progress[49] much more than before, a system based on private property cannot plan[50] scientific and technological progress throughout society. Revealingly, the Hudson Institute's *Prospects for Mankind* proposes that the idea of planning social and technological processes should be replaced with the slogan of 'planned muddling through.'

Capitalism cannot set in motion the factors that develop the initiatives, abilities and energies of the overwhelming majority of working people. It is a social system ensuring the development of society 'only by dint of the most extravagant waste of individual development.'[51] The bitter and ever more frequent criticisms that have been levelled in the West against technological policy in recent years show that developed capitalist countries disregard the opportunities opened up by scientific and technological progress for improving the productive work of millions of people. On the other hand, the hierarchism of the consumption system in capitalist countries nullifies most of the opportunities available for the development of the working people's energy and initiative.[52]

It appears that scientific and technological progress in developed capitalist countries, especially in the United States, which lays claim to setting the tone in this respect,[53] is neither normal nor optimal. Indeed, in view of the objective potentialities of the STR, this kind of progress is essentially limited, lop-sided and deformed.[54]

Even frank advocates of monopoly capital, such as Herman Kahn, predict that this crisis will become particularly acute by the mid-80s.[55]

Bourgeois theories of growth reduce distinctions in social relations to the difference in the growth degree of the productive forces and attribute every social contradiction to the 'economically backward'

countries' effort to make up for lost time by following the same historical path as has been, or is being, travelled by capitalist countries.

However, analysis of scientific and technological progress in socialist and capitalist countries shows that the higher the level of the productive forces attained by socialist countries, the greater are the advantages of socialism, and the more they differ from capitalist countries in the use of the STR. Socialism makes it possible to draw freely on the resources made available by man's social progress. This enables it both to develop new human relations and to open new paths for scientific and technological progress.

The existence of the Soviet Union and the socialist system imparts a new, unprecedented dynamics to the growth of the productive forces of the world. It spares mankind from the use of modern means of mass destruction. It actively influences the alignment of class forces in a climate of peaceful economic competition, acts as a curb on misuse of the achievements of science and technology for the selfish ends of imperialism[56] and encourages peaceful uses of science and technology.[57] Under socialism, the beneficial impact of the social system grows as the achievements of the STR are put to use. It is understandable why scientific and technological progress in today's world is accompanied by a growing ideological struggle.

The pressing task of science today and the honorable mission of the scientists of socialist countries is to carry out comprehensive theoretical research with a view to ascertaining the lines on which the achievements of the STR can be best combined with the advantages of the socialist economic system.


1. P. Drucker. *The Age of Discontinuity*. New York, 2nd ed., 1971, p. 152.
2. Z. Brzezinski. *Between Two Ages. America's Role in the Technotronic Era*. New York, 1970.
3. 'The Prospects for Mankind.' Hudson Institute, 1972.
4. 'Science, Growth and Society, a New Perspective.' OECD. Paris, 1971, p. 26.
5. 'Technology, Processes of Assessment and Choice' (Report of the National Academy of Sciences). Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 1.
6. W. Kuhns, *The Post-industrial Prophets*. New York, 1971, p. 2.
7. J.W. Forrester, *World Dynamics*. Cambridge, 1971, p. 2.
8. See D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, W.W. Behrens, *The Limits to Growth*. New York, 1972.
9. A. Toffler, *The Future Shock*. New York, 1970.
10. G.R. Taylor, *Rethink: A Paraprimitive Solution*. London, 1972, p. 129; *The Doomsday Book*. London, 1970.
11. See Th. Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Post-industrial Society*. New York, 1972.
12. L.I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972. Vol. 3, p. 257.
13. P.N. Fedoseyev, 'Twenty-Fourth Congress of the CPSU and the Main Trend of the Social Sciences' (Russ.). *Kommunist*, 1972, No. 1, p. 59.

14. See *Man-Science-Technology*. Experience of Marxist Analysis of the Scientific and Technological Revolution (Russ.) (a joint Soviet-Czechoslovak work). Moscow, 1973, p. 352.

15. See V.G. Marakhov, *The Structure and Development of Productive Forces in Socialist Society* (Russ.). Moscow, 1970.

16. Kurt Hager, *Sozialismus und wissenschaftlich-technische Revolution*. Berlin, 1972, p. 23.

17. See Y.S. Meleshchenko, *Technology and the Laws of Its Development*. Leningrad, 1970.

18. S. Trapeznikov's article in the collection, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Social Progress* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972, p. 13

19. See Roger Garaudy, *L'Alternative*. Paris, 1972; E. Fischer, *Die Revolution ist anders*. Hamburg, 1971.

20. See A. Touraine, *Production de la Societé*. Paris, 1973.

21. See Walt Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth*. Cambridge, 1960; *Politics and the Stages of Growth*. Cambridge, 1971.

22. 'Harvard University Program on Technology and Society 1964-1972.' Cambridge, 1972, p. 7.

23. See T. Trendafilov, *Scientific-Technological and Social Revolution*. Sofia, 1973.

24. See P.V. Kopnin, *Dialectics –Logic – Science* (Russ.). Moscow, 1973, p. 27.

25. See G. Volkov, *The Beginnings of Science*. Moscow, 1971; *Man and Scientific and Technological Revolution* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972.

26. See *Synthesis of Present-day Scientific Knowledge* (Russ.). Moscow, 1973.

27. In the Soviet Union the proportion of scientific workers grew by more than 150 per cent in the 60s. However, the growth rate was higher in economics (341 per cent) and philosophy (260 per cent), then came physics, mathematics and technological sciences. (See D.M. Gvishiani, S.R. Mikulinsky, S.A. Kugel, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Changes in the Structure of Scientific Personnel in the USSR* (Russ. Moscow, 1973, p. 69.)

28. Y.K. Fyodorov, *Interaction of Society and Nature* (Russ.). Leningrad, 1972, p. 85.

29. B. Commoner, *The Closing Circle. Nature, Man and Technology*. New York, 1971, p. 280.

30. See *Lenin and Modern Science* (Russ.). Moscow, 1970, Part I.

31. '... In the last resort,' B.M. Kedrov writes, 'science is brought into being, now as always, by the requirements of technology and production, but it increasingly reveals its active role and its ability to *react* on the practice which gives rise to it.' (See *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Socialism*, a joint Soviet-Czechoslovak work Moscow, 1973).

32. D. Bell, *The Coming of Post-industrial Society*. New York, 1973.

33. See, e.g., *The Working Class –the Main Revolutionary Force* (Russ.). Moscow, 1973.

34. V.V. Krevnevich, *The Influence of Scientific and Technological Progress on Changes in the Working-Class Structure in the USSR* (Russ.). Moscow, 1971.

35. See *Urbanization, Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Working Class* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972.

36. It is noteworthy that D. Bell, an ideologist of monopoly capital, deliberately takes his cue from I.V. Makhaisky's anarchist concept (see D. Bell, *The End of Ideology*. New York-London, 1967, p. 355) and interprets the socialist revolution as a result of a revolt of intellectuals using the working class in their interests. This done, he has no difficulty in calling Marx, Engels and Lenin 'technocrats.' He construes the effort of socialist countries to combine the achievements of the STR with the advantages of socialism as a sign of the 'technocratization' of socialist society. He is out to offset the impression which the rapid scientific and technological progress of the socialist system produces, first of all the fact that the socialist countries' productive

forces have by now attained a level of development at which the imperialists' hopes of forcing socialism to its knees through technological superiority have been dashed.

37. G. Kröber, H. Laitko, *Sozialismus und Wissenschaft*. Berlin, 1972.

38. See F. Kutta and M. Soukup, *Management at the Stage of the Scientific and Technological Revolution* (Czech). Prague, 1973; N. Stefanov, N. Yakhiel, S. Kachaunov, *Management, Modelling, Prognostication* (Bulg.). Sofia, 1970.

39. 'Large-scale modern socialist production and the scientific and technical revolution provide the material and technical basis of democratic centralism' (V.H. Afanasyev, *Scientific Management of Society*, Russ. Moscow, 1973, p. 254).

40. V.A. Zhamin, I.M. Vladimirova, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Advantages of the Socialist Economic System* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972.

41. See D.A. Lebin, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Socialist Integration* (Russ.). Moscow, 1973.

42. The development of the individual during the STR is studied by T. Jaroszewski, a Polish philosopher.

43. See V.D. Kamayev, *Present-Day Scientific and Technological Revolution: Economic Forms and Laws* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972.

44. '... The scientific and technological revolution and the management of social processes today are highly important means ... of saving time' (V.G. Afanasyev, *Scientific and Technological Revolution, Management, Education* Russ. Moscow, 1972, p. 25).

45. See A. Dronov, *Scientific and Technological Progress and Economic Problems* (Russ.). Minsk, 1973.

46. 'With the scientific and technological revolution going on, education can and should be both a requisite and an active cause ... a factor speeding up scientific and technological progress and production growth' (V.N. Turchenko, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Revolution in Education*, Russ. Moscow, 1973, p. 11).

47. See J. Filipec, R. Richta, *Scientific and Technological Revolution and Socialism* (Czech). Prague, 1972.

48. See *Present-Day Scientific and Technological Revolution in Developed Capitalist Countries: Economic Problems* (Russ.). Moscow, 1971.

49. See Y.A. Lebedeva, *USA: State Influence on Scientific and Technological Progress* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972; Z.P. Ivanova, *Scientific and Technological Revolution in the USA* (Russ.). Moscow, 1971.

50. 'Centralization of Federal Science Activities.' Report to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Developments. Washington, D.C., 1969.

51. Karl Marx, *Capital*. Vol. III. Moscow, 1959, p. 88.

52. These facts are admitted even by proponents of the concept 'industrial society' (J. Fourastie, *Lettre ouverte a quatre milliard d'hommes*. Paris, 1970).

53. Bourgeois ideologists insist to this day that the United States has become a prototype of technological society (J. Douglas, *Freedom and Tyranny: Social Problems in a Technological Society*. New York, 1970).

54. N. Gauzner, *Social Effects of the Scientific and Technological Revolution Under Capitalism*. Moscow, 1973; see N.N. Inozemtsev, *Present-Day Capitalism: New Phenomena and Contradictions* (Russ.). Moscow, 1972.

55. Herman Kahn, B. Bruce-Briggs, *Things to Come: Thinking About the 70s and 80s*. New York, p. 205.

56. *Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Developing Countries* (Russ.). Moscow, 1973.

57. The views of a number of Western scientists are typical in this respect. See, e.g., G.T. Seaborg, W.R. Corliss, *Man and Atom: Building a New World Through Nuclear Technology*. New York, 1971.

## Books in brief

*V.I. Lenin i KPSS o proletarskom internatsionalizme* (Lenin and the CPSU on Proletarian Internationalism). Collection of documents. Moscow, Politizdat, 1974. 2 vols.

This collection comprises writings and extracts from writings by Lenin and important documents of the Party relating to the development of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of proletarian internationalism and the Party's struggle for the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement, against every variety of nationalism.

*Georgi Dimitrov i obedinyavaneto na revolyutsionnite i demokratichnite sili za mir, demokratsia i sotsializm*. Mezhdunarodna konferentsia po sluchai 90-godishninata ot rozhdenieto na Georgi Dimitrov (Georgi Dimitrov and Unification of the Revolutionary and Democratic Forces for Peace, Democracy and Socialism: International Conference on the 90th Anniversary of Dimitrov's Birth). Sofia-Press, 1974. 734 pp.

The book contains the records of a conference attended by 115 delegations from Communist and Worders' parties, Socialist and Democratic parties, national liberation movements, national professional and international democratic organizations, and representatives of research centers. It fully reproduces the papers delivered by the participants and the messages of greetings received by the conference.

T. Caraciuc, C. Florea, I. Iuga, C. Niri, *Clasa muncitoare contemporana*. Consideratii asupra locului si rolului clasei muncitoare in viata social-politica a lumii actuale (The Working Class Today). Bucharest, 1974.

The authors look into the present-day situation and role of the working class in socialist, developed capitalist, and Asian, African and Latin American countries. A chapter is devoted to the world Communist movement, the most influential political force of today, and to the political and trade union organizations of the working class. An ample bibliography is added.

B. Köpeczi, *Az 'uj baloldal' ideologiaja* (The Ideology of the 'New Left'). Budapest, Kossuth könyvkiado, 1974. 257 pp.

Academician Köpeczi examines the ideological and political views of the 'New Left' among the students and intellectuals of Western Europe and the United States, and reveals the influence of Trotskyism, Maoism and anarchism on their concepts. He rejects the 'New Left's' claim to being the real heirs of Marx as indefensible and shows thier views to be incompatible with Marxism.

L. Valev, A. Manusevich, L. Nezhinsky, G. Slavin et al. *V.I. Lenin i obrazovanie kommunisticheskikh partiy v stranakh Tsentral 'noi i Yugo-Vostochnoi Yevropy* (Lenin and the Rise of Communist Parties in Central and Southeast Europe). Moscow, Nauka, 1973. 469 pp.

Lenin demonstrated from the theoretical and political point of view the need to found revolutionary, Communist parties everywhere. The authors concern themselves with Lenin's influence on the ideological, political and organizational development of the Communist parties of Central and Southeast Europe in the early years of their activity.

*Polityczne i ideologiczne problemy wspolczesnej chrzescijanskiej demokracji* (Political and Ideological Problems of Christian Democracy Today). Warsaw, Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1974, 320 pp.

The book comprises the records of a seminar held in Warsaw. It analyzes the ideological foundations of the policy of Christian Democratic parties and the philosophical genealogy and structure of Christian Democracy. It examines the political circumstances of its development after World War II and relations between the CD parties of Western Europe and NATO and devotes special attention to the economic, ideological and political concepts of West Germany's CDU and CSU.

A. Ribas, P. Castro, C. Messer, A. Santos, F. Oro, ed. al cuidado de J. Norman, *Tecnologia e independencia economica* (Technology and Economic Independence). Buenos Aires, Ediciones Silaba, 1974. 134 pp.

Science and technology in the hands of multinational monopolies lead to new forms of dependence and help to colonize the country economically. Looking into the present state of the Argentine economy and its use of scientific and technological achievements, the authors come to the conclusion that only by ending dependence on foreign and domestic capital can the nation put its resources to rational use and harmonize industry.

Editions of the journal

# 'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM' 1974

**EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:**

**(World Marxist Review):**
Central Books Ltd., 37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C. 1, England.

Progress Subscription Service, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V1T4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi, India.

**FRENCH EDITIONS:**
**(Ls Nouvelle Revue Internationale):**
Société d'Edition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens, Paris (2e), France.

Librairie Rousseau, 36 rue J. J. Rousseau, Genève, Suisse.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Librairie du Monde, Entier 162, Rue du Midi, Bruxelles, Belgique.

**ARABIC EDITIONS:**
Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

Dar Hilal, 16 Mohamed Iz Al-Arab Street, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.

ETH-Thagafa el-Jadida, Al-Tahrir Square, 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 smeckách 30, CSSR.

**DANISH EDITION:** Förlaget Tiden, Dr. Tvaergade 3, 1302, Kobenhavn K., Denmark.

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

**GERMAN EDITIONS:**
Deutscher Buch-Export und-Import GmbH, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, GDR.

"Globus," Vertrieb susländischer Zeitschriften, 1200 Wien, Höchstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldtstrasse 46, Switzerland.

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

**GREEK EDITION:** Thakurova 3, 16616 Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

**HUNGARIAN EDITION:** Kultura, Konyv-és Hirlap külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1., Fö u 32, Hungary.

**ITALIAN EDITION:** Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4, Roma, Italy.

**JAPANESE EDITION:** Nauka Ltd. 2, Kanda-Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

**MONGOLIAN EDITION:**
Ulan-Bator. Sukhebaataryn talbay 2. Mongol ardyn Khusgalt namyn tov namyn Khoroo "Enkh tajvan, socialismyn asuudal" setguuliyn mongol khevlelijn gazar.

**NORWEGIAN EDITION:** Boks 3715, Oslo, Norway.

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

**POLISH EDITION:** RSW, "Prasa-ksiazka-ruch" BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

**RUMANIAN EDITION:** I.C.E. "Libri," Calea Victoriei 126, Bucuresti, Rumania.

**RUSSIAN EDITION:** Mezhdunarodnaya kniga, Moscow C-200, USSR.

**EDITIONS IN SPANISH:**
Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Nacional 1253, Bogota, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular, San Juan de Letran, 37 — 4° piso Mexico 1, D.F.

Ideologia y Politica, jr. Moquegua 718-203, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracas, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial "Anteo," Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

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

**VIETNAMESE EDITION:** S'o' xuât nhap khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bá Tru'ng, Hà-nôi.