WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

July 1975, Vol. 18, No. 7 50¢

Victory in Vietnam / 3

American Revolution / 97

Struggle for democratic unity / 41

Changes in the Philippines / 116

First Russian Revolution / 77

Status of women / 108

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

July 1975, Vol. 18, No. 7

Features

3 The victory in Vietnam and its international significance

8 Decisive factor of stability and progress in Europe
J. Korcak

16 The class role of the army in socialist society
W. Jaruzelski

The Party

26 A constructive national alliance program
A. Yata

33 The traditional and the new in cadre policy
S. Jakab

Theory

41 Communists in the struggle for democratic unity
International theoretical symposium

67 The working class and its allies
International Marxist discussion

77 Lessons of the First Russian Revolution
G. Cogniot

Political panorama

87 The masses in motion
G. Vieira

97 From cradle of bourgeois freedoms to state-monopoly capitalism
J. Pittman

(Continued next page)

(Cont'd)

100 The class character of the American Revolution
H. Aptheker

108 The status of women — a criterian of social progress
Y. Lagadinova

114 Another battle won. Letter from Uruguay
J.G.

116 Trends of change in the Philippines
F. Balagtas

123 Diary

The press

124 New prescriptions, old maladies. Some new trends in bourgeois political economy
A. Mileikovsky

132 Books and the press

140 Brief information about Communist and Workers' Parties

143 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

The victory in Vietnam and its international significance

The people of Vietnam have won an historic victory. Behind it are long years of privation and sacrifice, behind it are 30 years of heroic struggle against imperialism, French then U.S., against their puppets and accomplices.

Communists, progressives, anti-imperialist forces the world over, share the joy of victory with the brave patriots of South Vietnam, with the entire Vietnamese people. They see it as a triumph of socialism, national independence, democracy and peace.

The international communist and working-class movement always regarded help to the fighters of Vietnam as its vital duty. 'A prime objective of united action is to give *all-round support to the heroic Vietnamese people*,' declares the document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties addressed to all Communists of the world, to all opponents of imperialism. The meeting unreservedly supported the program for settling the South Vietnam problem put forward at the time by the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front, and adopted an appeal, 'Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam!' The fraternal parties foresaw the Vietnamese patriots' ultimate victory, emphasizing that it would be 'of fundamental importance for strengthening the positions of the peoples in the struggle against imperialist *diktat* and arbitrary rule.'

Life has confirmed the fraternal parties' analysis of the events in Vietnam and of the prospects of the popular struggle there. There is truly a historic logic in all that happened in Vietnam in the spring of 1975. The collapse of the moribund anti-popular regime propped by foreign arms and political terror, which had so flagrantly violated the Paris accords, was inexorable. But there is immeasurably more in the victory. Vietnam is one of the series of staggering defeats of the imperialist system in the global confrontation between the two worlds. It is one of a series of historically inevitable failures of neo-colonialist strategies directed against the national-liberation movement.

Imperialism hoped with armed intervention to eliminate a socialist outpost in Asia, bar the road of the Vietnamese and all Indochinese people to peace, freedom and progress, deal a blow against the revolutionary movement for national liberation, and test the solidarity of the socialist countries and all anti-imperialist forces.

Underlying the U.S. aggression were also economic motivations which became more and more apparent in the last few years. The prospects of offshore oil and a large and cheap labor market provided ample 'justification' for the stepped-up activity of U.S. monopolies in South Vietnam aimed at turning the country into a preserve of neo-colonialist exploitation.

Those plans failed. Neither the long war of French colonialism striving to restore its erstwhile rule over Vietnam nor the direct intervention of the United States and its accomplices from other countries, nor the notorious 'Vietnamization' of the war – that racist strategy of pitting Asians against Asians – could salvage the fortunes of imperialism.

U.S. imperialism brought the whole might of its military machine down on Vietnam. According to official data, direct U.S. expenditures on the war exceeded $141,000 million. U.S. aircraft dropped more than seven million tons of bombs on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, 3.5 times more than the total unloaded by the Western allies over all World War II theatres, plus 100,000 tons of defoliants and other noxious substances. Toward the end of 1968 there were 585,000 U.S. servicemen in Vietnam; the aggressors lost more than 56,000 dead, 300,000 wounded, and 8,000 planes and helicopters.

The victory is a triumph of the heroism, courage and devotion of the Vietnamese people who, inspired by the behests of the great Ho Chi Minh, waged the struggle on three fronts: the military, political and diplomatic. Even people remote from Marxism admit that armed struggle alone would have been insufficient had not Vietnam's revolutionaries enjoyed wide mass support, had their cause not been seen by their compatriots as an embodiment of the national will. The final liberation of South Vietnam was accelerated by the fact that the liberation army's advance merged with the rising of the local population against the puppet regime of Thieu and his U.S. masters. On the international scene, the patriots' success was facilitated by an unprecedented recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government by more than 40 countries even before the victory, and by many other forms of diplomatic activity by both the PRG and the government of the DRV.

A tremendous factor of victory was the firm unity of North and South, the support of the South Vietnamese patriots' liberation struggle by the socialist Vietnamese state in the North. Build socialism in

the North and help the patriots in the South – that was the motto of the entire DRV population. 'Everything for the South, everything for victory' – that appeal inspired every citizen. The cost of that effort is well known. But the people of the DRV led by the glorious Working People's Party, shouldered it willingly; thus the socialist system provided the basis for the victory.

All of which confirms the great truth that nowadays it is socialism, not imperialism, that decisively influences the course of history, and that the attempts of imperialist and reactionary forces to suppress the peoples' movement for national liberation and social progress can never succeed.

The victory in Vietnam was a triumph of effective, militant socialist solidarity. The powerful support the embattled Vietnamese people received from the socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, is universally known and recognized, the peoples will never forget it. As stressed in the messages of greeting to the Soviet leaders on the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism from the leaders of the DRV and WPPV, the NLF and PRG of South Vietnam, the Vietnamese people know that the victory of their revolution is inseparable from the tremendous effective, all-round assistance and support of the Soviet Union, all fraternal socialist countries, all progressive mankind. In expressing their gratitude for that valuable assistance and support, the Vietnamese people and their leaders see it as an expression of class solidarity that breeds inspiration in the struggle for a better future. Ho Chi Minh repeatedly pointed out that all the victories and achievements of the Vietnamese people trace back to the October 1917 Revolution in Russia and the Soviet people's victory in the Second World War. He highly appreciated the role of the world socialist system, the formation and strengthening of which was made possible by the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism.

The victory in Vietnam has confirmed the power, effectiveness and great politico-moral impact of the worldwide solidarity of all progressives with its embattled people. The names of Raymonde Dien and Henri Martin are symbols of the French people's resistance to the 'dirty war' in Vietnam. Unforgettable is the scope of the anti-war movement in the United States, in many ways responsible for the shift to more realistic attitudes on the part of some of that nation's ruling circles. The impressive world Vietnam solidarity assemblies in Stockholm, Berlin and Paris, as well as many other actions in support of the patriots of Vietnam, make up a chapter of history. Support for the Vietnamese people's heroic struggle developed into the biggest mass movement of our time, reaching out to all countries and corners of the globe, becoming an important factor of political life.

Thus did the 1969 appeal of brother parties find embodiment in

concrete action. And everywhere Communists were the moving spirit of those actions. Once again it was demonstrated that no public movement inspired by the ideals of peace and progress is possible without Communists or against Communists. And as the 1969 International Meeting pointed out, 'the more resolutely the Communist and Workers' Parties uphold the freedom of peoples and head the struggle against the imperialist policy of aggression, the broader and more effective the anti-imperialist movement of the peoples.'

Successful completion of the Vietnamese people's armed struggle is thus a reflection of the fundamental change in the world correlation of forces in favor of socialism, democracy, national liberation and social progress and itself contributes to continued advances in the same direction. This more than anything else determines the international significance of the victory of the patriots of Vietnam. What are its worldwide implications?

Development of the world revolutionary process asserts the inalienable right of all peoples to chart their own destinies, a right unswervingly supported and championed by Communists. That demand lay at the root of the Vietnamese people's struggle, of the struggle of the peoples of Cambodia and Laos, just as it lies at the root of the diversified, persistent fight against imperialism waged by the peoples of more than a hundred countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Vietnamese patriots' victory in the face of intervention by the most powerful imperialist country is a tremendous practical contribution toward the assertion of that right, which embodies the Leninist principles of self-determination of nations.

The complete liberation of Vietnam is, furthermore, of enormous significance for the social progress of countries of the national-liberation zone, Southeast Asia in the first place. Through the 30 years of war the revolutionary process, as Vietnamese leaders repeatedly emphasized, never halted; two revolutions unfolded side by side: the national-liberation and socialist in the North and the national-liberation and democratic in the South. This made for the genuinely popular, mass character of the struggle, a thing which U.S. imperialist strategists failed to foresee or understand when they tried artificially to implant capitalist relations in South Vietnam, establishing a parasitic stratum that aped the 'American way of life' and was utterly divorced from the people.

The outcome of the battle in Vietnam is a weighty contribution to those processes of the national-liberation movement that characterize its current transition to a new stage, a transition from national to social liberation.

No less important, finally, is that the Vietnamese people's victory was achieved in conditions of international détente and is closely

associated with the successes of the peace offensive of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. It confirms that the socio-political climate based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, and united, mass popular action for peace are conducive to success in the struggle for independence, in the national assertion of countries bent on charting a future of their own choice.

The liquidation of the military hotbed in Indochina creates favorable conditions for the further improvement of the international climate. The liberation of Saigon is a triumph of the policy of peaceful coexistence and strengthens the forces striving for détente and peace. The historic changes in Indochina provide new opportunities for Asian security on a continental scale, and are a major contribution to the drive for it.

One of the lessons of Vietnam is that imperialist policy based on military pressure can be defeated. That lesson has been grasped by people all over the world. It is coming to be understood among ruling circles in imperialist countries, though there are still 'incorrigibles' inclined to base political options on military force. Regretting that the military involvement in Vietnam was 'inadequate,' they would like to make use of the slightest pretext to resort to force again, here or in other areas of the globe. That these are not mere threats, that the trigger-happy men are well in evidence, was demonstrated by the mid-May U.S. show of force against liberated Cambodia.

Evidence accumulates, however, that, slowly but surely, realism is gaining in international affairs. This will be substantially facilitated by the new situation in Indochina.

The Vietnamese patriots' victory was not an easy one. More than two million killed, millions more crippled, orphans and refugees, destroyed towns, ravaged fields and defoliated forests, a mutilated land – that is the price paid by the Vietnamese people for victory. Their fortitude, heroism and unswerving faith will forever serve as an example and stimulus in the struggle against imperialism, for the preservation of peace, for the liberation of peoples from exploitation and oppression.

A new chapter has been opened in the life of the Vietnamese people. As the DRV and PRG leaders emphasized at rallies held on May 15 in Hanoi and Saigon, which now bears the name of Ho Chi Minh, to celebrate the country's complete liberation, the people of Vietnam are faced with equally impressive, but now peaceful and all the more inspiring tasks. 'The new situation and the new tasks,' DRV Prime Minister Pham Van Dong pointed out, 'demand the very rapid development of our part of the country in order to contribute worthily to socialist construction in the North, strengthen the DRV in every respect and continue to perform our sacred duty with regard to the

heroic people of South Vietnam, to be worthy of being known as the revolutionary base of the whole country.' In South Vietnam, the newspaper *Liberated Saigon* wrote in May, 'the policy of the PRG . . . is aimed at building a new life, at setting up and strengthening a popular government serving the people.' Work is under way to create the prerequisites for carrying out the great dream of President Ho Chi Minh – of building a peaceful, united, independent, democratic and prosperous Vietnam.

The Communist and Workers' parties, all progressive forces of the world, wish the Vietnamese people success. These wishes are enthusiastically shared by the representatives of European, American, African and Asian Communist and Workers' parties on the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review*. The triumph of the Vietnamese people's just cause fills us with pride and happiness. We wish the patriots of South Vietnam the restoration of their country on new, democratic lines. We wish the whole Vietnamese people successful advance along the road of national unity, peace and social progress. We know that, as before, in years of war, so now, in time of peace, the Vietnamese people can rely on the unswerving support and effective fraternal assistance of the socialist countries, the international communist and workers' movement, the national-liberation movement, all progressive anti-imperialist forces of the world.

Decisive factor of stability and progress in Europe

Josef Korcak
Member of Presidium, CC CPC,
Deputy Chairman of the
Czechoslovak Government and
Chairman of the Government of
the Czech Socialist Republic

The situation on the European continent has changed substantially in these postwar 30 years. There had been a phase of extreme tension, followed by a turn to normalization between states of opposite social systems. Now, we may safely speak of tangible improvements in Europe's political atmosphere and, much more, also of realistic opportunities to consolidate the successes and make them irreversible.

It is no chance coincidence that these same 30 years saw the emergence, development and consolidation of the community of socialist states. In Europe, as indeed in the rest of the world, peace and socialism are indivisible. The peace in Europe, the continent's progress toward collective security and cooperation, are a direct result of socialism's steadily growing influence in the political, economic and social domains.

The foreign policy of the countries of the socialist community takes full account of the dynamism of the present-day world and of the intricate dialectical connection between the struggle for peace and revolutionary transformations. Its dual objective in Europe is to assure international stability and social progress. So, let us examine some of its main aspects.

It was Europe, where the socialist world system came into being. This had a strong bearing on the entire international situation on the continent, which became the operational field for a historically new type of foreign policy – the coordinated policy of the group of states headed by Marxist-Leninist parties.

The socialist countries' mechanism of cooperation took shape many years ago and is continuously being improved. It has its own time-tested forms, its own structure, reposing on the Warsaw Treaty Organization and, notably, that organization's Political Consultative Committee. There are the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance with its regular high-level sessions, and the systematic high-level bilateral and multilateral consultations of the fraternal parties and states.

The international weight of the community of socialist countries is not simply the sum of their national and defensive potentials. Likewise, their agreed international policy is not simply the sum of the foreign-policy efforts of each of them. The pooling of their resources and coordination of their policy yield incalculably greater results than if they had each acted on their own. Czechoslovakia's experience shows that the closer the unity of the socialist community and the broader the cooperation between Marxist-Leninist parties, the more plentiful are the opportunities for us to influence the international situation.

It was unity which made our community's initiatives for lasting peace in Europe so highly effective.

Let us recapitulate some of the joint actions of the past 10 years. In 1966 the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries advanced the idea of an all-European conference in its Declaration on Strengthening Peace and Security in Europe. In 1969 the signatories to that Declaration proposed that preparations for the all-European Conference should enter the practical stage without

further delay. In 1969 and 1970 the Warsaw Treaty countries' foreign ministers formulated proposals concerning its agenda, time and place. In 1972 the Political Consultative Committee set forth the basic principles for relations between European states in its Declaration on Peace, Security and Cooperation, and in 1974 it outlined a program of further efforts for détente.

Latterly, the central place in the foreign policy of socialist countries is occupied by the Peace Program of the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And what has so far been accomplished in implementing that program has truly changed Europe's political face.

The system of treaties concluded in Central Europe is a big achievement of the socialist countries' coordinated policy based on the Peace Program. The significance of their single-minded, mutually-coordinated policy was clearly evident in the period preceding conclusion of the treaty between Czechoslovakia and the FRG. Ending the 'cold war' between the two countries and formalizing the elimination of the aftermaths of the Munich *diktat,* this treaty is a big success for Czechoslovakia's foreign policy. But it would never have been signed if the ground had not been laid for it by the agreed political actions of the fraternal countries.

For the first time in Europe's history, tangible steps have been taken to shape a dependable system of collective security and equitable cooperation. The results achieved so far at the European Security and Cooperation Conference raise hopes for its successful conclusion at summit level. The socialist countries are advocating a permanent European consultative mechanism and periodical all-European conferences.

They are coordinating efforts to secure constructive discussion in the talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, which would complement political with military détente.

The Soviet Union is socialism's decisive force. This is due to objective factors – the political prestige of the world's first socialist country led by the CPSU, its experience in building socialism and communism, its vast material resources, its invincible defensive potential, and its unfailing aid to peoples fighting for freedom and peace. We in Czechoslovakia are convinced that friendship, alliance and cooperation with the USSR are imperative for the effectiveness of the foreign policy cf each socialist country.

The Soviet efforts to repattern the world system of international relations and, in particular, to extend its peace dialogue with the United States, are of tremendous importance for European peace. Chiming in with the Maoists, some West-European politicians and ideologists portray the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations as

'super-power collusion' behind the backs of the European peoples. These inventions, saturated with crude slander of the USSR, originate from people who are not interested in European peace, because it is clear that stability on the continent would be a pipe dream until the principles of peaceful coexistence become standard practice in the world's political affairs and, first and foremost, in the relations between such large states as the Soviet Union and the USA. The countries of our community do not see the efforts to improve the situation in Europe as a local, purely 'Europeocentrist,' concern. We consider them a means of strengthening peace on the global scale. A Europe adhering to the principles of collective security can be an example for other regions.

The economic achievements of the socialist community have always been an important instrument, and the material basis, of influencing the situation in Europe. The CMEA countries, whose share in the world population is barely 10 per cent, produce one-quarter of the world total of national incomes and one-third of the world's industrial output. They substantially surpass Western Europe (and likewise the USA) in volume of industrial production. They have no inflation or monetary upheavals, whereas in the capitalist world this economic malaise has long since become incurable. The high growth rates of the socialist economy are stable. The CMEA countries are the only economic zone in the world with no recessions and no unemployment.

Of course, the growing specific weight of the CMEA countries in the European economy cannot by itself assure international stability. But nonetheless definite opportunities are shaping for the socialist economy to become a stabilizing influence on the continent. Whether or not these opportunities are used depends on the dimensions of East-West economic cooperation.

The fact that this cooperation has begun yielding its first fruit speaks of the growing importance of the socialist economy as an influence on present-day international relations. It was socialism's economic successes that facilitated the change in the world balance of forces. Also, they laid the objective foundation for the capitalist countries' interest in business ties with the socialist states. The old imperialist policy of commercial and economic blockade of our countries, has collapsed. And though there are still advocates of discrimination, creating difficulties for cooperation among states with different social systems, a general positive swing is under way. V.I. Lenin's prediction that capitalism will be compelled to relent, has come true. 'There is a force more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments or classes that are hostile

to us,' he said. 'That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 33, p. 155).

The socialist countries, too, including Czechoslovakia, have a stake in equitable cooperation with the capitalist states. The bourgeois press has come forward with all kinds of speculation concerning this fact, not short of alleging that in the absence of extensive economic and technical contacts with the capitalist world socialism may slide to the brink of bankruptcy. This is utter nonsense, totally denied by the fact that the socialist economy made rapid and steady progress for many decades despite the virtually complete absence of ties with the capitalist economy. The motivations are of an entirely different kind.

To begin with, cooperation contains potentialities that may benefit the economic development of our countries. This derives, among other things, from the opportunity to shorten the time of access to the achievements of world science and technology, and new production techniques. Active international exchanges stimulate the economic organisms of the socialist countries to raise the quality and extend the range of commodities, and so on.

Second, apart from the purely economic factors, there are important political motives for large-scale and long-term business deals with bourgeois states and firms. They provide political détente with a dependable foundation in the realm of economic cooperation between countries with opposite social systems, with what some people call the material infrastructure of peaceful coexistence.

Some ultra-left demagogues claim East-West cooperation is, of all things, 'a policy of saving capitalism,' helping it overcome its crisis. Greater cooperation may, in fact, mean orders for some capitalist enterprises that might otherwise have folded up, and jobs for people who might otherwise have been dismissed. We Communists of the socialist countries can only rejoice if our foreign-policy efforts yield such results. But, clearly, socialism has no intention of being capitalism's healer. Economic cooperation between countries with different social systems does not abolish any of the main factors behind the crisis of the capitalist system.

Though it enters into business relations with socialism, the bourgeoisie does not neglect its class interests. And there is much more to this than just winning new markets and increasing profits, which are a natural element of mutually beneficial economic relations. Certain imperialist circles expect to use East-West cooperation as a lever for a 'convergence' of the two systems or, to put it more simply, as a means of undermining socialism, of 'eroding it from within.' We are aware of this. However, these designs are no more realistic than the old-time policy of blockade. Public ownership of the means of pro-

duction, the socialist monopoly of foreign trade and economic planning are dependable guarantees against any possible incursions on the socialist character of our economy. But the fact that imperialism has not given up hope is a reminder that economic ties and cooperation between the states of the two systems is also a form of struggle between them.

The political discussions on our continent give ever greater prominence to questions of cultural cooperation, exchanges of ideas and information. This is perfectly natural. The relaxation of the military of political confrontation has objectively enhanced the role of non-military spheres in the relations between states with opposite social systems. Besides, expanded contacts between peoples, knowledge of the values of different national cultures, customs, traditions and of scientific accomplishments can contribute substantially to the further deepening of European détente.

We may legitimately claim that if international exchanges of ideas and information have gained greater significance, this is chiefly our own achievement, because the foreign policy of the socialist community is centered precisely on disburdening the contention between the two world systems of any dangerous elements of tension and on directing it wholly along the channels of peaceful economic competition, political dialogue, comparison and struggle of ideas. We see this as a gain because, among other things, it provides additional opportunities to spread the truth about socialism, about our communist outlook, in Western Europe.

Clearly, the present and prospective successes in this field stimulate the socialist countries' participation in the international efforts to expand communications between peoples. But we constantly remember that ideology has always been a domain of acute and relentless class struggle. So, though the socialist countries regard cultural cooperation and exchanges of information between European peoples as necessary elements of détente, they will never abandon any of their ideological positions. We know perfectly well that the imperialists, too, have no intention of laying down their arms on the ideological front.

The facts show that Lenin was absolutely right to stress that the bourgeoisie's resistance to the offensive of the progressive forces is the most deep-seated and strongest in the ideological field (See *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 370). Today we are witnessing imperialism's irascible and touchy reaction to the social and political changes in Europe resulting from the consolidation of the socialist community and its increased influence on the continent. The gigantic and extravagant propaganda machine that imperialism created in the cold-war years has not cut back its operations. On the contrary, it is

trying to extend the range of its ideological subversion against socialism. In particular, the bourgeoisie is resorting to the services of all types of revisionists and renegades, including Czechoslovak emigrés.

And against this background certain Western politicians demand concessions that would, in substance, facilitate further imperialist ideological efforts against the socialist countries. What is more, certain bourgeois political groups portray such concessions as the price socialism must pay for détente. This posture is clearly meant to torpedo the consolidation of peace in Europe.

The socialist countries are for an honest and open debate of the two outlooks, conducted in accordance with the norms of peaceful coexistence and the principle of non-interference in each other's internal affairs. We are working for such forms of information exchanges and ideological polemics that would not impede our continent's advance to an enduring peace. The irreconcilability of the ideologies of the socialist and bourgeois societies should not be allowed to obstruct the European détente. This is what the states of the socialist community regard as one of the most responsible objectives of their foreign policy.

Working for the repatterning of international relations in Europe, the socialist countries stand in close unity with the continent's progressive forces. This is natural. For the positive changes on the political scene go hand in hand with the successes of the working class and other democratic forces in the struggle for peace and progress, against monopoly oppression and the designs of reaction.

Supported by the countries of the socialist community, the working masses in the European capitalist states are putting up a fight against those who try to reverse the course of events. More, they are advancing the cause of détente. Their greater activity for peace and democracy weakens imperialism's political and social base and undermines the position of the more reactionary, militaristic elements. Public opinion is playing an ever greater part in improving the international climate. This was convincingly confirmed by last April's Second Assembly of Public Forces for Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which representatives from Czechoslovakia also took part.

Socialism's peace offensive is backing up the political and ideological positions of those forces in Europe's bourgeois countries that have always stood in the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security – the working class and the Marxist-Leninist parties. Socialism's greater influence on the entire European situation is helping to restrict reaction's freedom to maneuver in home affairs as well. There are more promising opportunities to isolate the extreme right wing of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which includes cold-warriors and advocates

of extreme anti-democratic action in home politics. This is creating new and favorable conditions for further successes by the proletariat, all working people, in the struggle for their rights, for democracy and against monopoly power.

As a result, the successes of the socialist world, its international activity, help to accelerate social progress in the capitalist part of our continent.

In sum, the foreign policy of the countries of the socialist community is a policy of peace and at the same time a class policy. The socialist countries are doing their utmost to make the final quarter of this century the beginning of a new era in Europe, an era of sound inter-state relations, constructive cooperation, and steadfast social progress. The new European conference of Communist and Workers' parties will surely play an important role in the search for the way to this goal. 'Its preparations,' said Comrade Gustav Husak, 'show that the unity, capability and weight of the Communist and workers' movement in Europe are growing. And we shall continue to do our part for the successful completion of the preparations for the conference, and for its success.'*

The broad and massive support enjoyed by the peace offensive of the countries of the socialist community is clear evidence of the growing prestige of Marxist-Leninist parties, and confirms the Communists' view that their struggle for a peaceful Europe is in complete conformance with the peoples' aspirations to a dependable system of international security, and with the class interests of the working people.

**Rude Pravo,* January 24, 1975.

The class role of the army in socialist society

General of the Army,
Wojciech Jaruzelski Member of
CC PUWP Political Bureau,
Minister of National Defense
of the Polish People's Republic

The striving to exclude wars from international relations is implicit in the class essence of socialism, whose first state document was the Soviet government's Decree on Peace. It has been the invariable goal of the foreign policy of initially the world's first and only socialist state, and then the community of fraternal socialist countries. But this is not an easy goal to achieve as long as capitalism, especially its aggressive imperialist form, still reigns over vast territories. Maintaining that socialist revolution can, for a start, triumph in just one or several countries, V.I. Lenin anticipated that it may entail civil wars provoked by domestic counter-revolutionary forces and that there may be 'a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 23, p. 79).

History, as we know, has confirmed this, necessitating defense of the gains of the revolution and the existence of an armed force – an army of the new, socialist type. By following Lenin's tenets, the Soviet Union was able to crush the counter-revolution and the foreign intervention in the Civil War, and later also to repulse the imperialist, fascist aggression.

The victory of 1945, whose 30th anniversary the fraternal countries of the socialist community and all progressive forces celebrated recently, produced a new relation of forces in Europe and the rest of the world. It was a political and moral defeat for imperialism, whose strategy of many years, directed against the world's first socialist state, had completely collapsed. The crushing defeat of fascism, in which the Soviet Army played the decisive role, ended the isolation of the USSR. In many countries of Europe and other continents the situation became favorable for revolutionary changes. The sphere of capitalist rule was reduced. A community of socialist states appeared, and the material foundation for peaceful coexistence became more solid.

For the socialist states the 30 years since the victory have been 30 years of struggle for peace. To hinder the progressive social processes, imperialism mounted a new offensive. Intent on 'rolling back' communism, it launched a cold war, including atomic blackmail, incited crises that took the world to the brink of war, and involved itself in all kinds of interventions against socialist countries, against national-liberation revolutions and social movements. This made the struggle for peace extremely difficult, the brunt of the burden falling to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They were compelled to increase their defensive capacity, and to establish a politico-military alliance of European socialist states, the basis for joint elaboration and consistent implementation of their peace-loving policy.*

This policy has been wholly effective. With the support of the international working class and all progressives, socialism has given people – not only in socialist countries but in all Europe – what they cherish most: peace has reigned on our continent for all of 30 years. Hopeful processes have begun and are making headway. There is a good chance to make the détente dependable and irreversible. But this will not come about automatically. To establish lasting and just peace is not easy. Among other things, it requires constant efforts to augment the defensive potential of the socialist community. That this is necessary has been confirmed by the turbulent, sometimes dramatic, events of the postwar 30 years.

There is a close link between the policy of peace and the defense policy of the socialist countries. The latter is of a comprehensive nature. It is essentially centered on assuring the basis of our defensive capability: the politico-social awareness of the people, the economic potential, the state and, first and foremost, the socialist armed forces, that crucial specialized link in our defenses which in essence and purpose differs as drastically from the armies of exploiting states as socialist states differ from states of the exploiting system.

The Soviet Army is the first army in history serving the interests of the working masses, an army of liberated workers and peasants. And all the armies of the new type formed later enjoy its aid and draw on its combat experience, its tremendous doctrinal, organizational, technical, educational and ideological achievements.

These achievements are the basic model for the Polish People's

*This was done 20 years ago, May 14, 1955, at a peace and security conference of European states, which created the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The organization was essential because the leading capitalist countries had formed an aggressive politico-military bloc, NATO, in 1949, later joined by the renascent German militarism of the FRG.

Army, one of Europe's first regular armies of the new type after the Soviet Armed Forces. The Polish Communists drew on the Soviet experience, adapting it to the concrete conditions in their country, which is also true of the other socialist armies.

Three main factors set the pattern for the formation of the Polish Army, and also determined its subsequent development. First, ardent patriotism, love of freedom, and progressive traditions. The Polish armed forces came into being as an army of a people which made tremendous sacrifices but did not falter in its fight for independence. Upon its banners is inscribed the patriotic and internationalist slogan, 'For Your Freedom and Ours.' The liberative spirit and aspirations that imbued it were lauded by Marx and Engels, and Lenin, too, backed them in one of the earliest Soviet decrees annulling the treaties on Poland's partition.

Patriotic and progressive traditions helped the men in their dual mission: that of national liberation and of revolution, fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet ally against fascists, liberating the country, taking part in the assault on Berlin and, at the same time, supporting the new people's power, helping to tear down the old social order, and fighting the class struggle for Poland's new, socialist identity.

Second, the Polish Army was created by the Polish Communists, who gave it their thought and organizational ability. The Party's Marxist-Leninist analysis helped elaborate a concrete program of liberation and reconstruction, linking the national-liberation factor with the internationalist factor in home and foreign policy.

Third, the formation and development of the people's army reposed on the ideological, organizational, material and human aid provided by our Soviet ally. Soviet officers played an important part in activating our divisions and armies. They fought and shed their blood side by side with Polish officers. Soviet socialist industry gave us modern weapons. The atmosphere in the Soviet Army, the experience and example of the Soviet Communists, too, influenced the formation of our armed forces as an army of the new type.

The fraternity of the Polish and Soviet soldiers, their common wartime exploit, have produced a lofty form of internationalism and, at the same time, express the essence of the Polish-Soviet friendship. Based on Marxist-Leninist ideology, our fraternity is continuously reinforced through various forms of bilateral and multilateral cooperation, and is a great historic gain for our armed forces and the entire nation. The experience gained is used to good effect in strengthening friendship and cooperation with the armies of our other allies.

The class essence of the people's army as an arm of the socialist state is reflected in its functions. These are determined both by the

scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism and the social-historical realities: the concrete international relations and the intrinsic objective laws governing the development of the socialist state. The functions of the socialist army are, in a way, a reflection of the functions of the socialist state. There are two main and comprehensive functions: the external, which depends on the state of international relations, and the internal, distinctly contemporary and tied in with the life of socialist society.

The external function primarily implies defense of the socialist system and the revolutionary gains of the masses against any external class enemy. Lenin laid a special accent on this at the historic hour when the first socialist state was born, showing that the revolution cannot defend itself without a strong and organized army, that the army is necessary to assure the full victory of the revolution.

Defense of the country's independence is another element of the external function. It is as intimately linked with the first as the national aims of the working people are linked with their class aims. This is why any attack on a socialist country is at once an attack on its system, and vice versa. This unity of national and revolutionary goals follows from the fact that every socialist country identifies the program of its own development with the general development of socialism, and its own security with the security of the entire socialist world. The theory and practice of defense is based on the unity of the national and the revolutionary internationalist aims. This determines the role of the socialist army as the armed force of the people. Aggressiveness is contrary to the nature of the socialist state. So are intentions of violating the sovereignty of other peoples. Striving for universal peace, the socialist countries maintain their armed forces, train and arm their armies, exclusively to defend their frontiers and the socialist system.

The third element of the external function is relevant for people of the entire world. It has its roots in history and is especially distinct at present: assurance of world peace. The strength of the socialist armies, especially the might of the Soviet Army, frustrates the aggressive designs of imperialist groups. Coupled with the general foreign-political activity of the socialist states, their peace initiatives and actions in international affairs, this is a crucial factor of world peace. In the Second World War this humanitarian aspect of the external function underlay the great liberative mission of the Soviet Army, its liberation of many European peoples, including the Polish, from fascist slavery, delivering the world from a deadly peril. The people's army of Poland performed a liberative task, too. Its participation in the final defeat of fascism helped liberate our own country, but was also an internationalist contribution to the liberation of fraternal

Czechoslovakia and the German people from the fascist yoke. Nor shall we ever forget that Czechoslovak units fought in some parts of southern Poland, and that anti-fascists of different nationalities participated in the Polish Resistance.

Nowadays, the armies of the socialist states perform their external mission in pursuance of common goals and in the name of fraternity in the political and organizational framework of the Warsaw Treaty, which is open to any country desiring peace and European security.

Participation in international missions for peace and freedom is a new facet of the external function. For many years, Polish soldiers have served on the neutral armistice-keeping body in Korea, and performed a similar mission in Indochina. A Polish Army unit is also part of the UN armed force in the Middle East. Abroad, our soldiers have won worldwide respect and praise.

The internal function of the socialist army is of a special nature. It also has many facets and is also subject to change. In the earlier period it amounted chiefly to protecting people's power from the class enemy at home. The need for this disappeared as the new system grew stronger, as the socialist society took shape and became politically, morally and ideologically integrated. In fact, the army was a substantial factor of this integration, and of the worker-peasant alliance: its ties with the people and its educational activity were and are an important aspect in the consolidation of the progressive, patriotic forces of our society.

The forms in which the army of the new type participates in the life of the people, in building socialism, depend on the political situation at home and abroad, and on the army's own internal development. Before the war was over and during the first several postwar years the Polish Army defended the new, socialist power from domestic reaction, contributed politically to the creation and development of the new, democratic state, and participated in the early revolutionary actions, such as the agrarian reform and the nationalization of industry. It helped mould society's political consciousness and was an active and loyal promoter of the socialist cause. There was also the formidable assignment of defusing mines left all over the country by the retreating nazis, opening up communications, helping restore and restart industrial enterprises, repair war damage and develop abandoned and virgin land.

Due to the laws of socialist development, the center of gravity has now shifted to primarily educational, ideological, organizational, technical, scientific and economic tasks. The army's participation in the country's main areas of economic and social development, including major and complex technical projects, is increasingly active and versatile.

Army technicians and specialists in organization, medicine, and the like, contribute continuously to the country's development. The army's social scientists help in elaborating and disseminating the theoretical principles of educational practice, in moulding the political-ideological public consciousness required for socialist construction, patriotic and civic thinking, culture, ethics and morality.

Each year thousands of reservists, for whom military service is a school of civic duty, leave the army to enter production and other fields. These ideologically mature and disciplined people with a high degree of professional training and organizational skill, devote the knowledge they acquired in the army to the development of society. Consequently, the people's army is not only a consumer, but one of the producers of socialist social values.

The army's socialist character is accentuated by the socialist development of the country. The soldiers' participation in political life and in the life of society, the fact that they perform assignments for the economy, the variety of their contacts with the masses in towns and villages, with the youth, with veterans of the revolutionary and liberative struggles – all this helps servicemen to learn the conditions and needs of the country, and shapes their socialist motivations.

The external and internal functions of the socialist army are not isolated from each other. They intertwine, are interdependent, and develop dynamically as a unity. The army's sources of strength, the laws of its existence and development, are closely linked with these funcitions.

The Party is the political leader of the socialist army. 'Our people's army is the product of the Party,' said Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the CC PUWP. 'The Party's people gave it life. The Party's ideas gave it its identity. The Party's policy determines the trend and also provides the material and social preconditions of its development.' As the people's leading force, it is one of the Party's principal objectives to assure the security and defensive capacity of the country in the ideological, political, economic, technical and military domains. Its concern for the socialist armed forces is deep and constant. The PUWP leadership and Comrade Edward Gierek devote much attention to the people's army and maintain close contacts with it.

The commanders, political officers and all army Communists are the direct conductors of the Party's decisions. Party organizations and branches, patterned in keeping with the Party Rules, are active at all levels of the army. They encompass more than 60 per cent of the professional servicemen, including some 85 per cent of the officers and 100 per cent of all commanders at regimental level and higher. The Communists in the army take guidance in the Party Rules and bear responsibility to the Party for their behavior and work.

There is a specially trained political apparatus in the armed forces with a definite frame of reference, forming a unity with the army's Party organizations. There is also the Socialist League of Army Youth, a democratic organization embracing young people doing their military service and the younger members of the army's professional core.

The personnel policy, its ideological and organizational principles, is an instrument of the Party's leading role in the armed forces. The Party shows a deep interest in the selection of command and political personnel for the Polish Army, for their numerical growth and improvement. This is natural, because the combat preparedness of the armed forces, their role in the state's defensive system, depend on personnel, their ideological and moral qualities and training.

The socialist army's class structure mirrors the rapid social, professional and cultural progress in the army and the society as a whole. The influx of young workers and peasants has enhanced Poland's defense potential, forged deep links between the armed forces and the people, and helped mould the new type of army. They trained, acquired experience and progressed together with the whole army. Many of them are now ranking officers, scientists, specialists. The continued development of the military educational system has produced an officers corps that occupies a leading place among the people's intelligentsia. A substantial percentage of the officers corps are people with a higher education, and this percentage is rapidly increasing.* They are people of high integrity and extensive knowledge enabling them to achieve much in science to the benefit of national defense and development.

In the new type of army joining the officers corps is more than a choice of profession; it is, perhaps primarily, a political declaration, a conscious choice of ideological and ethical stance, a purpose of life and work. In such an army a career officer is not just an educated specialist; he is also a fighter for socialism loyal to the Party and the people. He is not a member of an elite isolated from the rank and file, but the socialist state's representative among the soldiers and, at the same time, a spokesman for their civil rights.

Exponents of the so-called convergence theory, promoted in the ideological struggle by some bourgeois circles, declare that the scientific and technological revolution will lead to a decline in ideological motivations of human behavior and, notably, to the gradual transformation of the officers of socialist armies into non-political techno-

*More than 50 per cent of the army officers and 70 per cent of navy and air force officers have a higher education.

crats. Such theories, however, collapse when confronted with our reality, with the politically motivated soldier of socialist armies.

The Party's leading role finds expression, among other things, in the fact that Marxism-Leninism provides the theoretical basis of all army activity, the basis of the socialist defense doctrine and of army educational work. Concern for high standards of Marxist-Leninist knowledge among career personnel is expressed in the universal endorsement of the requirement: 'Every officer must be an educated Marxist.' It is met by an extensive system of education and self-education, schools, courses, seminars, and evening Marxist-Leninist universities, which are very popular in the Armed Forces.

Socialism's greatest asset is people, their socialist consciousness, activity and motivations. As Communists see it, the basis of combat readiness is the political state of the army, the soldier's ideological and moral outlook, which is decisive in the success of any undertaking. The socialist soldier's mentality, his ideological, political, ethical and social views are objectively rooted in the origins, class character and objectives of the socialist army, and are their subjective expression. The Polish Army's educational system fosters a profound sense of patriotism in the soldiers, invoking the undying progressive, revolutionary values of national history, especially the traditions of the struggle against fascism, as well as the contemporary and long-term problems of socialist construction. Patriotic education is inseparable from internationalist education. Of special importance here are the ideals of friendship with the Soviet Union, the comradeship-in-arms with its army and the other socialist armies, as well as solidarity with the peoples fighting for independence, with the toiling masses of the whole world.

Discipline is a manifestation and consequence of the moulding of the socialist character of officers and men. Rooted in political consciousness, it assures the most efficient fulfillment of the tasks facing the armed forces of a socialist state.

A characteristic feature of the new type of army is its democracy, which is based on extensive opportunities for advance to the highest ranks and positions in the armed forces and the active encouragement young workers and peasants receive along that road. It also finds expression in the internal army mechanism, which includes collective bodies, meetings, conferences and consultations on basic issues involving virtually the whole army structure. Extensive consultations are held, for example, on drafts of certain basic statutes and norms, especially those laying down principles of behavior in the socialist army. As a consequence their observance becomes more than a serviceman's obligation: it becomes a part of his general moral duty.

Democracy and public activity provide the basis on which the

movement of innovators and rationalizers thrives. Concern for the rational, thrifty use of the defense facilities produced by the people is also a general distinctive trait of the fighting man of a socialist army. Ideological conviction, creative thinking and initiative characterize him as a socially mature and active citizen. These are the ideological prerequisites on which the voluntary socialist emulation movement, embracing all military units, reposes.

They are also manifestations of socialist culture, the importance of which should be emphasized, especially bearing in mind the present high standards of the armed forces. Socialist culture implies, among other things, solid education, intellectual activity, respect for ethical and moral norms, a developed need for aesthetic impressions. Such an integrated approach to the meaning of culture becomes a factor influencing the character and development of socialist armed forces.

But in a socialist army the question of culture is first and foremost one of human relations. Their new quality finds expression in, on the one hand, the atmosphere of mutual respect, friendship and good will, comradeship and solidarity, the commanders' concern for their subordinates and their needs; on the other hand, these relations imply exemplary, conscious discipline, a sense of responsibility, conscientiousness and strict performance of orders. The fostering and maintenance of such relations is the lofty privilege and humanitarian duty of every commanding officer as a leader of men.

In a socialist army a commander exercises his prerogatives on the principle of unity of command, which implies great military and moral prestige and his deep confidence in his subordinates, and vice versa. A prerequisite of public confidence in a commanding officer is his high ideological and professional standards, conscientious performance of his duties and concern for his men. Another prerequisite is a ready ear for collective opinion in army and Party affairs, a combination of high integrity and tact and principled exactingness toward oneself and one's subordinates. Fundamental to the socialist army's way of life is that discipline combines with respect in the attitudes of subordinates toward their superiors, in short, a congenial atmosphere of Party loyalty, mutual trust and sincerity. The Party organization, using methods in keeping with army conditions, is the inspirer and keeper of such relations.

Imperialist forces have difficulty accepting the irreversibility of socialist and progressive change in the world. The confrontation between the two systems is, today, not so much in the arms race fueled by military-monopoly circles as in the ideological sphere. Even realistically thinking bourgeois politicians build their long-term strategic plans on the softening and weakening of socialism and the emasculation of its Marxist-Leninist content.

The armed forces of the socialist states, especially their internationalist unity, and their friendship and comradeship-in-arms with the Soviet Army, are one of the targets of imperialist propaganda. We fully realize this and rebuff such attacks. The political awareness of officers and men, their confidence in the Marxist-Leninist, class policies of the Party, patriotism and internationalism are the most effective weapon capable of foiling all attempts of ideological subversion against the socialist armies.

The Communist and Workers' parties are consistently fighting for lasting peace and security. The programs of the Marxist-Leninist parties combine the cause of peace with the struggle for the peoples' freedom and progressive development.

A special, historically important role belongs to the Peace Program adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU and dynamically and consistently put into effect by the Soviet Union with the dedicated personal participation of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev. Its implementation is facilitated by the economic and defense achievements of socialism and the correlation of world forces associated with them. This creates new opportunities for détente and consolidating peace. Together with the other socialist states, Poland is actively contributing its share. 'Together and in close cooperation with the Land of Soviets, with our neighbors – fraternal Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, with our other allies and friends, we shall continue consistently along the road of détente,' said Edward Gierek, First Secretary, CC PUWP, at the Victory Day session of the Sejm on May 9, 1975. '. . . Our purpose is to prolong the period of peace, which has already lasted 30 years in Europe, for the whole foreseeable future. We shall do everything in our power to make that prospect a reality.'

This objective is well served, and will be served, by the all-round, dynamic socialist development of Poland and its socio-economic and defense potential. The tasks of this development for the coming five years will be formulated by the forthcoming Seventh PUWP Congress. And as always, the fighting men of the people's army will take an active part in implementing them alongside the working class and the whole people, demonstrating their loyalty to the people, the Party and socialism, as well as their international solidarity with their comrades-in-arms in other socialist armies, the working masses and progressive forces of the whole world.

A constructive national alliance program

Ali Yata
General Secretary, Party
of Progress and
Socialism (Morocco)

A new political situation is shaping in Morocco, with an immediate bearing on the Party of Progress and Socialism (PPS).

Ever since it was founded in 1943 and up to 1974 our Party was juridically and in effect denied the right of legal activity. At the time of the French protectorate (until its collapse in 1956) it was an underground party. After independence, it went over to semi-legal activity, which, for various reasons, was sometimes almost underground and sometimes legal. It was not until August 1974 that the Party was at last legalized and came into the open as the Party of Progress and Socialism. This was a big political victory for the revolutionaries, the working class, and the popular movement.

The victory is not to be traced to any changes of the Party's principles or program, or any departure from previous aims – which it consistently observes. It is due to the specific conditions of the Moroccan liberation movement and the relation of forces. The Party's success derives from its resolve to work to the limit of its strength and resources.

At all times, it was our rule to keep the leadership in the country, to work in the country, to have close contacts with the people, and to work with the masses. Regardless of the situation – during the protectorate or after independence – the Party press (leaflets as well as periodicals) was invariably published at home. This yielded positive results and helped in framing the correct political line.

The conditions after independence were not easy. The 19 years since 1956 abounded in bitter struggle against imperialism, its old and new forms of colonialism, and in clashes with Moroccan reaction, which encompasses feudal elements and segments of the bourgeoisie closely associated with foreign capital. Unfortunately, at most times the patriotic forces were divided. In the early years of independence the national bourgeoisie tried first to monopolize, then share, power with the reactionary circles. The progressive and democratic forces were kept out of the government.

But an end to this state of affairs is near. This is best evidenced by the legalization of the PPS, which coincided in time with a new uplift of the anti-imperialist movement or, more precisely, was one of its first results, and will doubtlessly give new impulse to its struggle against enemies, will add to its strength, and enrich it with advanced ideas.

The national congress of the PPS, convened legally for the first time in Casablanca on February 21-23, was, in the opinion of progressives, an event of historical proportions for Morocco.

This was not simply another congress. It stood for a new and big step forward. First of all, it confirmed the Party's political course and practical activity. Second, it was the beginning of work in a new situation.

Our enemies, too, were aware of its political significance. Reactionaries and various opportunist groups tried to torpedo it. But all they managed to achieve was a postponement of its opening day: instead of the 7th, as originally scheduled, it began on the 21st of February. The congress showed the Party's strength, and its influence on the country's political affairs.

Highlighted by a sense of uplift and enthusiasm, it yielded fruitful results. It showed the Party's maturity and sense of responsibility for crucial national and international, political and ideological matters. It showed that the Party's international ties are expanding. Representatives of 16 Communist and a number of revolutionary-democratic parties, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) attended it. This underscored the Party's growing prestige and recognition of its services to the country and people. It was also attended by delegations from Morocco's major political parties and trade unions, including the Socialist Union of Popular Forces and the Istiqlal (Independence Party), represented by their general secretaries, and the Moroccan Union of Labor.

The items of the agenda were formulated and analyzed by the Central Committee, and circulated beforehand for discussion by Party branches. The entire Party took part in the discussion, which yielded splendid results and spoke of the sense of involvement and responsibility of Party members. On the basis of the discussion, Party branches drew up instructions for their delegates to the congress.*

The congress unanimously approved the Central Committee's political report, adopted the rules and the new program, and elected the leadership, which, apart from professional revolutionaries, now

*Delegates numbered 338. Their social background: workers and employees 43 per cent, poor peasants 16, intelligentsia 41. Among them were more than 20 women. Ages: 43 per cent up to 30 years, 40 per cent 30-40 years, 17 per cent over 40.

includes many manual and mental workers, and – what is important for Morocco – women. All PPS organizations must now step up work among workers and peasants, dealing more closely with the problems of the youth and women, and participating in the elaboration of ideological questions.

To understand the new political situation in Morocco, it would be useful to recall the past.

Independence was a blow to imperialism and Moroccan reaction. But the reactionaries took advantage of the insufficient consistency of the national bourgeoisie and with imperialist and foreign reactionary support soon returned to the political scene and mounted a counter-offensive. At first, they paraded in democratic garb, then threw it off and attacked the revolutionary and progressive forces.*

Reaction got its chance mainly due to the policy of the right wing of the national bourgeoisie, which tried to seize control of the working masses and use them for its class interests. There was also the support from the 'left,' consisting of certain adventurist petty-bourgeois elements. The policy of the right wing generated resistance by patriotic and revolutionary forces. But it has had a negative effect all the same: undermining the national bourgeoisie itself, and causing a rift in the anti-imperialist movement forged during the years of the protectorate. This played into the hands of imperialism. In 1963 representatives of the national bourgeoisie were removed from the government. A dangerous political vacuum ensued, which reaction tried hastily to fill. The progressive and democratic gains were in jeopardy. That this was so is evidenced by the abortive reactionary coups in July 1971 and August 1972.

But political events in 1972-74 show that slowly but surely the country is going back to constitutional standards. There is evidence of a tendency toward liberalization in home policy, the economy, and social relations. The dialogue between the royal court and the main opposition parties is being resumed.

But reaction is by no means crushed. The forces of progress and democracy are still divided. The equilibrium on the home political scene is precarious.

In the past, successive governments tried their hand at unfortunate experiments. Suffice it to recall the policy of 'economic liberalization' that proved so harmful. Our Party had warned time and again against the inevitable negative results of these various measures.

*The Moroccan Communist Party was officially banned in 1959. In 1963 reaction rigged up a trial of functionaries of the radical National Union of Popular Forces. The state of emergency imposed during the student unrest, which was suppressed in the spring of 1965, was not lifted until 1970. – *Ed.*

In the present situation, too, the Party advocates a program of consistent anti-imperialist struggle, constructive action and restoration of national unity as an alternative to the present bankrupt policy. It is going over to legal activity and is asserting itself as the vanguard of Morocco's working class oriented on the theory of scientific socialism and firmly determined to fight for the consummation of the national-democratic revolution. The PPS declares that, like the other major national parties, it will continue to promote on the international scene the demand for the liberation of Spanish-occupied Moroccan territories in the Sahara. The world's political history has few parallels of this. In Morocco's case it speaks of change in the methods of government.

Having become legal, our Party is able to participate more actively in the country's political life. The PPS congress was an important event in this context. By making a profound study of the situation in Morocco, defining the methods and means of achieving its aims and tasks, it has given the Party and the working people a clear perspective of the struggle.

The congress devoted special attention to such questions as the tasks of the national-democratic revolution, completing the national-liberation process, the struggle against extreme leftist trends, and the international situation.

The first stage of the national-democratic revolution ended with the winning of independence in 1956. The prime objective of the new stage is full liberation which, the Party says, must precede the transition to socialism. Insofar as restoration of Moroccan sovereignty over lands occupied by Spain and overcoming economic dependence are concerned our struggle is basically anti-imperialist and as such is international in character.

Since 1956 our Party has been telling the people that despite the achievement of political independence the main contradiction remains that between the liberation movement and imperialism. Hence the need for a broad and firm anti-imperialist alliance based not on emotions, not on likes or dislikes, but on objective assessments of the demands of life. We hold that only such an alliance can assure a radical solution of the existing contradiction, win full independence and guarantee the success of the second stage of the national-democratic revolution.

Morocco's experience shows that full liberation cannot be achieved by one class, much less by one social group. It requires the joint efforts of all patriotic forces. But an alliance of those forces cannot be achieved solely by propaganda means, however powerful. All revolutionary social strata must be directly involved in the preparation and implementation of liberation actions. The need for this was amply

demonstrated by the failure of the efforts of those circles who hoped to overcome imperialism and backwardness with the sole support of their own class, stratum or clan. There is, as we see it, a close dialectic link between final liberation, on the one hand, and the democratization of state institutions and participation on the masses in national decision-making, on the other. When all these conditions are met it will become possible to accelerate the second stage of the national-democratic revolution.

In all of this it is absolutely essential for the working class and other sections of the masses to occupy a place within the national alliance matching their socio-economic weight and political dynamism, as constantly reasserted by their high fighting potential. The second stage of the national-democratic revolution, it should be remembered, is characterized by a special strategy of class struggle which envisages the patriotic sections of the middle and small bourgeoisie occupying a place alongside the working class, poor peasants and progressive intellectuals. But the main organizational and ideological role in the national alliance falls to the working class.

The successful diplomatic moves in the autumn of 1974 in support of demands for the restoration of Morocco's territorial integrity convincingly showed that the unification of the patriotic forces in the common national interest is correct and effective.

We can point with satisfaction to Morocco's achievements in other spheres. The new upsurge in the anti-imperialist struggle (especially against Franco colonialism) fueled a number of moves aimed at completely removing foreign private capital from the agricultural sector of the economy and the further restriction of its operations in industry, trade and finance.*

The working people's stubborn struggles for better conditions have also yielded important results, notably, pay rises, with a higher national guaranteed minimum and rates for some categories of wage and salary earners. These successes inspire the workers to continue the fight for their rights.

But the tasks ahead are even more imposing. First of all, we must step up the struggle for the return of territories under foreign rule – not limiting it to diplomatic activity. It is also necessary to enhance state sovereignty over the economy, in which foreign capital still holds strong positions (especially in the financial sphere).

In this connection I should like specifically to point out the present more realistic approach of Moroccan political circles to the problems

*The nationalization and 'Morocconization' of foreign enterprises. The latest move was the nationalization of a number of foreign companies marketing oil products.

of the national-liberation movement. It is being generally accepted that national sovereignty can be assured by simultaneously waging the struggle for the restoration of territorial integrity, economic liberation and national construction on a progressive and democratic basis.

Official statements contain, alongside calls for the liberation of occupied territories, suggestions for the formation of a government to prepare elections to legislative bodies, for the introduction of an effective parliamentary regime.

In principle our Party, which has long been advocating the development of Moroccan political life in that direction, supports these proposals. However, we are against hasty elections, holding that the patriotic parties must have sufficient time to prepare and organize. Only then can their potentialities be fully brought into play.

Our Party demands the formation of a government of national unity including representatives of all patriotic forces, all parties subscribing to a common program. In particular, we insist that the key ministries – economic affairs, finance, agriculture and foreign affairs – be given to the four parties currently in opposition.

Our program also includes a demand for a new constitution, democratic in content and democratically drawn up and adopted. It should recognize the sovereignty of the people, be in keeping with their aspirations, and correspond to the historic, political and socio-economic requirements of our time.

The PPS is fully aware that the reactionaries have not laid down their arms and are mobilizing their forces. They are stubbornly resisting the progressive changes, both current and anticipated, in political, economic and public life. They see the main threat in the unity of all patriotic forces. However, it should also be remembered that the reactionaries are not the only opponents of unity. Of great harm to the interests of the nation and the people are opportunist movements, especially ultra-leftist.

The ultra-leftists, who often and easily slip into right-wing opportunism, lay claim to leadership of the working masses. With their anarchist, Trotskyite and other leftist slogans, they would like to confuse progressive political organizations and trade unions, breed distrust and despair among the masses, sow the seeds of hostility toward the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. By their adventurist actions they provoke divisions and in effect betray national interests, playing into the imperialists' hands.

The ultra-leftists have made our Party the target of their attacks. They openly regret its legalization, denounce its struggle for patriotic unity against imperialism, and denounce its loyalty to proletarian internationalism. However, the handful of former members of our Party seek supporters in vain. They will never find them among the

fighters taking part in the political struggle, who understand their responsibilities and have an adequate ideological background. That is why the ultra-leftists have completely failed in their overtures to the working class and the trade union movement. The workers quickly discerned their petty-bourgeois character and turned away from them.

However, the ultra-leftists have greatly harmed the youth movement. They took the National Students Union along the road of adventures, with the result that it was banned. They are also to blame for major mistakes in the movement of lycée students. Our Party sees its duty in waging an implacable struggle against the pernicious influence of ultra-leftist adventurists on politically immature young people who, in Moroccan conditions, are so easily demoralized and led astray from the genuine revolutionary road.

The Moroccan people's achievments in the struggle against imperialism and reaction depend in large measure on the world situation which the PPS congress concluded, is characterized by a steady shift in the correlation of forces in favor of peace, socialism, the Communist and working-class movement in capitalist countries, and the national-liberation movement. The countries of the socialist community have advanced tremendously in building socialism, moulding the new man and ensuring universal peace and security. The national-liberation movement has inflicted heavy defeats on imperialism in Indochina and Africa (the winning of independence by the peoples of the former Portuguese colonies). The imperialists are losing one position after another. Suffice it to recall international recognition of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and the gains of the developing countries in their efforts to assume control of their national resources and win economic independence. In a number of countries national development programs have a pronounced socialist orientation. Together with other revolutionary forces, workers are actively participating in the consolidation of the progressive regimes in Syria, Iraq and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. In Morocco the working class has also scored unquestionable gains. Major successes have been won by the labor movement in capitalist countries. The working class made great contributions to the overthrow of the fascist dictatorships in Portugal and Greece.

The changes in the world balance of forces would have been ever greater and faster if not for the harm caused by Maoists, Trotskyites, extremists and other opponents of the world revolutionary process. For imperialism exploits every opportunity to counter-attack, to strike at the revolutionary forces, win back lost positions, strengthen reaction and support opportunist movements.

In the national-liberation zone imperialism strives to prevent, or at

least slow down, the process of forging closer ties with the socialist world. But such attempts are rarely successful. We in Morocco also have grounds to be proud of the successes of political and economic cooperation between our country and socialist countries. Many speakers at the congress mentioned this with satisfaction.

Our Party holds that positive changes on the world scene will continue to be associated with the greater unity of the international anti-imperialist front.

The congress set clear and concrete tasks for the coming period and charted a broad historical perspective. This will undoubtedly help further strengthen the Party's influence. Cohesion, loyalty to the people, loyalty to the principles of scientific socialism and a profound faith in the ultimate triumph of socialist ideals are the earnest that the Party will cope with the tasks facing it.

The traditional and the new in cadre policy

Sandor Jakab
CC Member and Department Head, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

Improving Party work with cadres to meet the new requirements is an imperative necessity. For with dynamic economic development in this age of the scientific and technological revolution, wider independence and increased responsibility of all elements of the Party and state apparatus, and the more exacting judgment of administrators by the masses, it is necessary to use our accumulated experience to improve the performance of our cadres. The 11th Party Congress held earlier this year declared: 'Strengthening the Party's leading role and correctly implementing its policy requires more effective and consistent application of our fundamental principles in cadre work.'

But how to combine the traditional with the new? The Party has a fund of experience and on the basis of it has worked out clear-cut criteria to judge a man's political and professional ability.

The Party is working on the premise that every cadre, at whatever level and at whatever job, must have these three-in-one qualities: political maturity, professional competence, leadership ability. Nor

can they be treated separately or counterposed to each other. They should be seen as a whole, though in concrete situations one of the three may prove more important than the other two. At present the emphasis is on political maturity, political suitability. What does this imply? First, complete political commitment, a high educational standard and a profound interest in social and political problems. Political loyalty is not enough; a person appointed to a leading post must have a conscious and active share in Party work, must always be ready to stand up for his principles.

Why has the question of political suitability come to the fore precisely now? The answer is, because of international and national developments. Broader international economic, political and diplomatic contacts in the peaceful coexistence climate, closer ties with the capitalist world, are, one might say, a test of maturity for our cadres, a test of their political and professional qualities. For only politically mature executives, with a solid knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, can effectively carry out Party policy in the interests of the working class and all working people in this process of expanding international contacts. On the home front there is wider independence of local administrative and economic agencies. This, too, requires a better political grounding, for wider jurisdiction lays a greater responsibility on our middle-level cadres.

By and large, our cadres are doing a good job. They have the necessary professional training and experience, can analyze and assess major social processes and channel them in the desired direction. They see every problem and its political implications, are always guided by the interests of the economy, and are concerned for the full and explicit execution of directives. Only a small minority of our cadres are not up to the work assigned them: they usually lack adequate political education or are apolitical, take an egoistic, overbearing attitude, lead a petty-bourgeois way of life. They also lack political acumen, are prone to laxity and indiscipline, show little concern for fulfillment of decisions and take little notice of the damage this does to the economy. There are not many such cadres, but they do a good deal of damage. People are apt to judge all cadres by these men, and this damages the Party's prestige and influence.

The accent on political maturity is attributable also to the fact that a new generation has grown up which has never had contact with capitalist reality and was not involved in the class struggles of the early liberation days. Educated in keeping with our world outlook, some of them have become highly skilled organizers whose professional competence is complemented by high cultural standards. They are always striving for higher achievement, for more efficient ways of doing things and have a good record of performance. But they

will become real leaders only by going through the 'school of life' and reaching the political level required of a top-rank executive of our time. They have the conviction, dedication and ability needed to achieve that level.

A Central Committee study of the political education and knowledge of 32,000 cadres shows that much has been accomplished in this respect. Political education has been varied and consistent: there is the regular and correspondence-course Higher Party School, one-year schools in various parts of the country, evening Marxism-Leninism universities, which together are attended by many thousands. No less than 80 per cent of the Party apparatus have finished political schools; the figure for the state apparatus and the cooperatives is 42 per cent, and 51 per cent for cadres in the national economy. Besides, many went through political courses in higher educational establishments. And yet things are not entirely as they should be. For only 14.5 per cent of executive personnel in the ministries and similar agencies have a higher political education, with the percentage still lower, 9.7, among economic executives, factory directors and their deputies, and only another 28 per cent have an intermediate political education. Many officials of the local councils, cooperatives and various administrative and other agencies lack proper educational training.

To correctly understand the situation we must take into account that the Party demanded political training above all from Party functionaries and senior government officials. That was only natural, but it adversely affected political education of cadres engaged in other fields. The present situation was influenced also by the fact that in the mid-60s we concentrated on professional rather than political training. That is why the Party Central Committee decided to help heads of central government agencies to acquire a higher political education. The CC decision emphasized the importance of political training and provided better facilities for it.

Another important measure is the organization of refresher courses. Most of our cadres received their political training over the past 20-25 years and many have, more or less successfully, continued their studies independently or through various seminars or evening courses. But a considerable number did not do that and are to some degree lagging behind. Then there is the need for political training of our young specialists, the men and women graduated by our institutes and universities. Most of them are drawn into the life of the factory collective and find that they need more political knowledge. Their numbers and role in the economy are gradually increasing and we must see to it that they are given adequate political retraining. Much

has been done in this respect, but we have to deal with growing requirements.

Every year about 400 Party cadres go through our own and the Soviet Higher Party School. Besides there is a new center offering refresher courses for cadres in the administrative and economic fields. Local Party bodies run their own re-training courses. We are working on new forms of political education. For one thing there will be more facilities for independent study, better curricula, etc. But even now, I think, while professional training is getting due attention, political training is not getting enough. Nor are we making enough use of pedagogies and psychology in political education.

The question is sometimes put: Is there some way of measuring the political maturity and political suitability of a leading cadre? Some are inclined to the view that this can only be done in an acute revolutionary or military situation. But that leaves out of account the fact that peacetime constructive labor is a test for our cadres, for at times they have to prove their political suitability in complex conditions. I refer not to the kind of decisions or actions that get a lot of publicity, but to the day-to-day activities that contribute to our cause, the building of socialism. Lenin, it will be recalled, attached immense importance to the ability to organize communist *subbotniks* or volunteer labor days, and this form of assessing leadership ability has lost none of its validity. Much the same applies to the socialist emulation movement and particularly the socialist work teams.

Our Central Committee has set out concrete criteria of political suitability: 'Political suitability is identical with political commitment. It implies a high degree of professional competence, interest in social and political problems. Leading posts can be held only by persons whose devotion to popular rule, the interests of the people and the policy of the Party has been tested;

'who have the theoretical and political education necessary for the job they are assigned, and who systematically add to their knowledge;

'who fully understand the policy of the Party and government and carry it out in their particular field of work;

'who, in making decisions or issuing instructions, take into account their political implications, and in all their activities are guided by the interests of society and the political aims of the Party;

'who have an active part in public affairs, are morally beyond reproach, and whose way of life and behavior conform with the standards of socialist morality, whose words match their deeds;

'who apply the principles of socialist democracy in all their work;

'who correctly employ the authority delegated to them and always safeguard the ethics of public life.'

Concern for political maturity does not mean less concern for

professional competence or managerial ability. However, the basis, the guarantee of competence and effective leadership lies in the political training of our cadres.

In recent years the Party has devoted much attention to democratizing its cadre work. What does this imply? First, more responsibility and a bigger role of elective bodies in all cadre matters. Many functions of central departments have been delegated to local bodies. The trade unions, too, now have a bigger say in cadre matters. We have introduced a system of appointment competitions, especially in professions that have a long tradition of such competition. This applies to culture, science and the medical profession. All this has had a positive influence on our cadre work.

However, there are still certain negative phenomena.

One of them is formalism. Sometimes an illusion of decisions being carried out is created, though practical actions are at variance with their substance. Or draft decisions are forwarded to the Party body concerned at short notice, with the result that it has no time to study them and make suggestions, and they are simply rubber-stamped. Subjectivism in work with cadres still persists. Notably, in filling vacancies executives consider only those they personally know, 'tested' workers, so to say; some executives moving to new jobs take some of their former staff with them; there are cases when premiums are awarded to those most vocal in praising their superiors, etc. There is a view that the 'number one' executive is also the 'number one personnel officer' and therefore no one can influence his decision-making. Nepotism and favoritism are especially harmful. Subjectivism is the most deep-rooted and persistent evil, which the Party combats stubbornly and consistently.

In the past the masses participated in appointing personnel indirectly, through their mass organizations. For a long time that practice justified itself and contributed to our advance. Thanks to it many thousands of capable men and women were assigned to executive positions and acquitted themselves well. By exercising their powers of control the mass organizations helped foster and consolidate socialist patterns of executive work and behavior.

Today, however, the need is for direct rather than indirect participation in cadre policy and handling of specific problems. The experience to date shows that more immediate involvement of rank-and-file workers is bound to yield positive results. For example, election of deputies to parliament and local councils from specific election districts makes it possible to promote capable people enjoying mass confidence to positions of leadership and at the same time spurs the political activity of the masses. Direct election of team leaders and chairmen on cooperative farms tends to increase their

sense of responsibility. In the next few years it is planned gradually to provide greater opportunities for workers to participate directly in personnel matters. A coordinated and balanced effort should also be made to enhance the role of public bodies, especially the trade unions, and improve their organizational and educational work.

Democratization of cadre work also means that we must promote thousands and tens of thousands of the most capable working people to managerial posts. We strive to organize our work so as not to overlook a single capable worker, farmer or intellectual. It is necessary to select people with leadership abilities carefully, attentively and thoroughly, weeding out loudmouths, bunglers and careerists. Our selection system is capable of ensuring that executive positions are occupied by competent leaders and reducing to the minimum the number of those who aspire to leadership but lack the ability.

Democratization of cadre work is impossible without broad publicity. Important changes have taken place in this respect. Gone is the mystique and secretiveness that shrouded cadre work. Now personnel departments seek to establish and maintain good relations, based on mutual trust, with the whole collective, with all workers. Periodical re-certification of executives has also helped make cadre work open and more democratic. But much still remains to be done. For example, sometimes the written testimonial is at variance with the person's real worth. Some executive may be in favor of democracy – not at his own enterprise, but his neighbor's. The Party is working to overcome these shortcomings. It wants members of every collective to be regularly informed of personnel matters, thus involving them in control and management.

The correct balancing of democratism and centralism in cadre work is an important political matter. With the promotion of democratic principles it has been necessary to provide central agencies with information and registration services needed to assure guidance of cadre policy. But most essential, of course, are day-to-day contacts with people, both executives and their subordinates.

One of the most pressing problems is cadre replacements which has a direct bearing on the executive standards of the future. It calls for consistent, purposeful efforts to train and select personnel with due consideration of present and future requirements.

Obviously, newly appointed executives should be at least as good as those whom they replace. Special emphasis should be placed on promoting shop-floor workers and cooperative farmers to positions of leadership. Those who overrate the results of the process of the convergence of classes think it unnecessary to seek adequate numerical representation of the working class in management and administration. This view is wrong today and doubly so in the future, since the

convergence of social classes adds to the importance of the leading role of the working class.

The conditions for the working class to perform that role are there. Its educational and cultural standards are high. This is due to scientific and technological progress, which adds to the importance of mental activity in an expanding range of labor processes. More and more members of the working class are highly skilled workers with full secondary education. Their public activities, their work for the benefit of society, alongside their professional experience, is proof of the possibility of, and need for, increasing the number of workers in positions of leadership.

Naturally, workers should be promoted to executive positions after due preparation, careful selection, and as conditions appear. Participation in the trade-union movement and public organizations, work in junior executive positions in the state apparatus and economic management, education, various forms of retraining – all this can help achieve the set objective. The forms of preparation are diverse. They can be found if each executive and each personnel manager is constantly guided by the rule to keep tabs on the workers and farmers displaying administrative and managerial aptitude and to follow their progress in mastering executive skills. It is most important that this be treated not as a passing campaign but as a constant, organic part of our work.

The problem of cadres replacements raises the question of the principles and scale of the turnover of executives. Stability is a principle that has proved its worth; it gives an executive the sense of confidence needed for long-term planning. However, where individuals are concerned the principle is applicable only as long as they work creatively, as long as they do not block advance. It must be said that not everywhere has this been understood correctly. If an executive does not meet the requirements, if he causes more harm than good, if he gets in the way of, say, cadre policy, he must be replaced.

We do not advocate obligatory, systematic rotation which produces uncertainty and a feeling of temporariness. There are other ways of controlling the work of executives and preventing professional blindness or political errors. Our experience indicates that the replacement rate of executives in a four-year cycle is 20 to 30 per cent. This takes care of the necessary cadre changes. As said before, while opting for stability we also have a system of competitions for appointments for a specified period to carry out a specific assignment. As far as can be judged, this system has been working smoothly, ensuring effective leadership in science, education and the health service.

In addition to working-class involvement in management and administration, we also consider it necessary to enlist more women and

young people. Women hold only one or two per cent, and young people seven per cent, of the positions directly subordinated to the Party Central Committee. And this despite the CC's repeated underscoring of the problem. Considerable changes in ensuring women's legal, political and economic equality have taken place since the Central Committee passed a special decision on the position of women. The percentage of women joining the Party has increased substantially, and more and more are given posts of leadership; advanced training courses have been organized; in 20 years more than a million women have become industrial workers. These changes are of historical significance. Now the task is to promote class-conscious working women to leading bodies and executive positions. It is necessary to finally overcome the prejudice against women's leadership abilities. It is important that men should not obstruct this and that women more readily consent to assume public functions. It is also very important to raise the number of kindergartens and nurseries, to expand the services at lower prices, and relieve women of some of the household chores. The involvement of women in management and administration is a long-term task.

The same can be said of young people. Our Party membership includes representatives of three generations. The experience and restraint of the elder combines with the energy and drive of the younger. There have always been many young people in the Party leadership and trade union movement, even in the most difficult and responsible periods. Today these fine traditions must be continued. Lenin said that it was necessary to entrust leading positions to young people more boldly, that this helped combat bureaucracy, and also reveal youthful talent. The experience of the old combined with the energy of the young can only benefit our advance and the Party's prestige.

The Party Central Committee has defined the long-term tasks of cadre work. Party organizations can help carry them out more effectively if they foster a creative atmosphere in which our cadres can reveal their abilities, if all capable people are given responsible assignments. Party organizations should not forget that executive personnel are people burdened with many concerns and that their main joy is in good results at work.

theory

Communists in the struggle for democratic unity

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL SYMPOSIUM

As reported in the June 1975 issue of *World Marxist Review*, last April the journal organized an international theoretical symposium in Prague on 'Communists in the Struggle for the Unity of Democratic and Anti-Imperialist Forces,' to mark the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. It was attended by representatives of Communist and Workers' parties and scholars from 49 socialist, developed capitalist and developing countries.

The symposium was opened by *Konstantin Zarodov*, Editor-in-Chief of *World Marxist Review*. The Seventh Comintern Congress, he stressed, was an outstanding historic event, the significance of which has not been eroded by time. The years roll by, new generations enter the arena of class battles, new socio-political forces come to the fore, but the Congress documents remain a great book of Marxism-Leninism. From it Communists learn how to improve the methods and content of their work and struggle for the noble cause of the working class, against imperialism, reaction and war, for democracy and socialism.

Today, when the world is celebrating the 30th anniversary of the defeat of fascism, it is appropriate to emphasize that that victory was a triumph of socialism, of the broad alliance of democratic forces. It advanced the Communists' revolutionary cause and paved the way for the formation of the socialist world system. It also enabled the working people of many capitalist countries to win important political and social gains.

Nowadays, when the struggle has entered a new and higher stage, there is a direct link, both historically and ideologically, between the ideas and lessons of the Congress and the policy of joint action against

the peoples' main enemy, imperialism. It is this subject, of such prime political and theoretical relevance to the present, that has been put up for discussion at this symposium.

As at the time of the Seventh Congress, so today, problems of the struggle against the threat of war and for the preservation of peace, of the connection between the struggle for democracy and national liberation and the struggle for socialism, lie at the very core of revolutionary strategy.

As at the time of the Congress, so today the road to the solution of these problems lies through working-class unity and joint democratic action against the common enemy – imperialism.

As at the time of the Congress, so today the decisive political force capable of leading the masses in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism are the Communist and Workers' parties, the international Communist movement.

But the world of the 70s is a far cry from the world of the 30s, and this has to be taken into account. Today there is the mighty community of socialist states, the international working class is much stronger, and the peoples of former colonies and semi-colonies are independently making their own history. The objective possibilities of uniting anti-imperialist forces have grown, and the conditions of struggle have become more favorable. Contrary to the assertions of our opponents, the waves of revolution do not spread in all directions, they have one direction, and their mighty surge is rising. Nowadays there are no remote, sleepy backwoods: the whole world is in a state of revolutionary ferment.

All this combines to make it easier now than at the time of the Congress for Communists to tackle many of the issues of the struggle for democratic unity. But the dialectics of the class struggle is such that there are also new problems and difficulties. That is why today, as at the time of the Congress, the question is that of further creative development and application of the Leninist strategy of alliances in the conditions of the class struggle now prevailing in individual countries and on the world scene.

Topical theoretical and political problems of the fraternal parties' struggle for democratic unity, for the cohesion of all anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces have been submitted for this discussion. As we see it, problems of the Marxist-Leninist policy of alliances should be examined in close connection with the experience accumulated by brother parties, with the tasks facing the movement as a whole and the parties operating in the specified conditions of their respective countries. Topical significance attaches to such questions as, how the policy of peaceful coexistence provides more favorable conditions for cementing anti-imperialist forces; the importance of the policy of

alliances in resolving problems of social progress in both developed capitalist and developing countries. I expect that the symposium will devote some attention to the Communist-supported principles of political cooperation with various progressive, patriotic and anti-imperialist movements and organizations, the correlation between cooperation and ideological struggle of groups with different political and philosophical views. It is our firm conviction that an analysis of the ways of establishing anti-imperialist and democratic unity both nationally and internationally will make possible a broader and more comprehensive assessment of the historic role of the decisions of the Seventh Comintern Congress and the present-day relevance of its ideas.

K.I. Zarodov announced that messages of greeting to the symposium had been received.

MESSAGES OF GREETING

Please accept fraternal greetings from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba on the occasion of the opening of the international symposium devoted to the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. Your symposium is of special significance as it is taking place at a time when progressive mankind is celebrating the 30th anniversary of victory over fascism, the decisive contribution to which was made by the gallant and heroic Soviet people.

The decisions and conclusions about the united anti-fascist front adopted at that historic Congress, in which Georgi Dimitrov, an outstanding leader of the international working-class movement, took an active part, serve to this day as a banner in the struggle of the working class and all democratic and progressive forces.

Today all left, anti-imperialist, progressive forces are gathering under the flag of unity. Coupled with the might of the socialist camp, that unity is a decisive factor in the consolidation of international détente, a factor making it irreversible. It assures increasingly effective support for the struggle of the working class of capitalist countries, and of national-liberation movements, which are gaining in scope in the conditions of the acute crisis of capitalism.

We are confident that your symposium will contribute to the campaign of international solidarity with the people of Chile, with all other peoples, whether in Indochina, the Middle East or other parts of the globe, fighting against fascist-type regimes serving U.S. imperialism. We are confident in their victory.

We wish the best of success to the symposium.

Central Committee
Communist Party of Cuba

In marking the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Comintern Congress, which was of decisive revolutionary and political significance not only for the international Communist movement, but also for the working class and democratic forces in all countries, I recall with deep emotion Georgi Dimitrov, that great revolutionary fighter who, at the Leipzig tribunal, delivered Hitlerism its first political defeat. At the Seventh Congress, Comrade Dimitrov, a true Leninist with tremendous prestige, expressing and elaborating the revolutionary policy of the CPSU, gave the international communist movement a powerful impulse, breaking with the sectarian narrowness that characterized Communist parties at the time, helping to turn them into large revolutionary parties capable of leading the victorious struggle of the working class and popular forces for democracy and socialism.

As a Communist I can take pride that our country was the first to reveal the tremendous progressive and revolutionary significance of the policy worked out by the Seventh Comintern Congress. In Spain, after the creation of the Popular Front in 1936, a group of Communists was elected to the parliament; more important, it became possible to organize our people's armed resistance to the revolt of Spanish fascists and reactionaries supported by the two fascist powers of the time – Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy – a resistance that continued for almost three years.

It is this instructive line of democratic unity formulated by the Seventh Comintern Congress that we are successfully continuing in our country today, promoting a broad national, democratic and revolutionary policy of unity with all progressive and anti-Franco forces.

I wish the comrades attending this important and significant symposium great success in their militant revolutionary activity based on the great lessons of the Seventh Comintern Congress, which today retain their significance for all those fighting for their countries' national independence, for democracy and socialism.

Dolores Ibarruri
Chairman
Communist Party of Spain

Warm fraternal greetings on the 40th anniversary of the historic meeting of Communist parties which rallied the forces of popular

unity against fascism and war and for the defense and extension of democracy.

John Gollan
Peter Kerrigan
Participants in the
Seventh Comintern Congress

A VICTORY EQUIVALENT TO A GIANT REVOLUTION

Rodney Arismendi
First Secretary,
Communist Party of Uruguay

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International presaged the great victory over German fascism, the most significant event of contemporary history since the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The decisive role of the USSR in the Second World War, in the liberation of many peoples, as well as the vanguard role of Communist parties, made a special imprint on that terrible war. German fascism, which was defined by the Seventh Congress as an openly terrorist dictatorship of the most aggressive circles of world imperialism aspiring to establish their rule over the peoples, wipe out democracy and drown the working class and popular forces in blood, embarked on a path of unprecedented crimes. The spearhead of that main strike force of international imperialism was directed against the USSR.

The Seventh Comintern Congress must be credited with formulating a correct strategy and tactics of struggle at an historical turning point and analyzing the class character and place in history of German fascism, exposing it in all its manifestations. On this basis it drew conclusions concerning potential international working-class alliances in extreme situations and the need to bar the road to fascism by forging the broadest possible mass alliances within each country. It set the prime task of restoring the unity of the working class disrupted by the Social Democrats' opportunist policies.

The Congress called on all states and peoples to pool their efforts in defense of peace to hold back and defeat the fascist aggressors, to establish united popular anti-fascist fronts, and broad anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, democratic fronts in colonies and dependent countries.

The Comintern deserves even greater credit for facilitating the theoretical, political and organizational building of Communist parties, the training and steeling of Party cadres who played a prominent

role in the struggle against fascism in Europe, in the war in Spain, on the liberation battlefields of Asia, in the development of the liberation movement in Latin America and certain parts of Africa. They also guided the processes that led to the emergence of the socialist world system. It must also be credited with the emergence of powerful Communist parties in the major European countries. The Comintern's mistakes, apparent at certain periods and pointed out by the Communist movement itself, do not detract from the great historical significance of the Congress.

The war, which culminated in the defeat of national-fascism, was equivalent to a vast revolution in its consequences. Contrary to imperialist intentions, the first socialist state, far from being destroyed, became a point of attraction for the peoples fighting for liberation. Socialism crossed the boundaries of one country and became a system. Western Europe received a powerful democratic charge. The collapse of imperialism's colonial system began. New independent states appeared in Asia and Africa. In many of them democratic regimes came to power, others proclaimed socialist goals and took to the non-capitalist road. Latin America launched the struggle for its 'second independence,' and the Cuban revolution heralded the beginning of the triumph of socialism on the continent.

The crisis of the capitalist system is deepening and entering new phases, and now, 30 years after the victory over nazism, it is exacerbated by new qualitative changes.

But it would be naive to underestimate the urge for war and fascism latent in capitalism, notably in U.S. imperialist circles, and fed by the new crisis developments.

The statements of the Seventh Congress had a decisive impact on the policies and development of Communist parties, the working-class and popular movements. Viewing them as a body of integrated experience, we continue today to use them as a source of knowledge and fruitful ideas in promoting Latin America's revolutionary movement.

After the war, North American imperialism launched an offensive with the purpose of enslaving the peoples of Latin America. It unleashed a frenzied anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign accompanied in many countries by the installation of reactionary dictatorships, the banning of Communist parties, the formation of the Panamerican system (with such agencies of imperialist domination as the OAS and others).

However, early in the 1950s, the revolutionary process in Latin America began to gain momentum. The revolutions in Bolivia and Guatemala, the stubborn struggles of the working class, student demonstrations, etc., showed that new times had set in. That period

ended with the downfall of many dictatorships and the victory of the Cuban revolution, which heralded a qualitative change in the situation in Latin America. Together with the Cuban revolution, the Latin American revolutionary process is a part of the world socialist revolution, an expression of the fundamental democratic and anti-imperialist changes sought by all our peoples. The 1960s were marked by a further upsurge of the liberation movement. It was a period when different forms of struggle were tested. The 1964 coup in Brazil could not stem the revolutionary tide. The events in Peru and Bolivia, the stubborn struggle of the working class in Uruguay, Argentina and other countries, the growing unity and formation of various liberation fronts in a number of countries culminated in the Popular Unity victory in Chile, which joined Cuba in the front ranks of the Latin American revolutionary process. The strategically planned blow against the Latin American revolution in 1973 was in grim contrast with the preceding events. The fascist military overthrew the Popular Unity government of Chile. To underestimate the gravity of that development would mean to fall into unwarranted optimism. But does it mean that the situation has changed fundamentally and Latin America has entered on evil days of fascism?

We think not, but we have always said that Latin American revolutionaries, who have traversed difficult roads, many of them soaked with blood, must expect trying times.

We are witnesses of a grim popular struggle against Yankee imperialism and its lackeys, the oligarchies, of a confrontation between revolution and counter-revolution. But the revolution in Latin America will forge ahead. For example, after the coup in Brazil, the anti-imperialist democratic revolution made headway in various forms in Peru, Bolivia, Chile and even Ecuador. Both trends must be kept in mind. On the one hand, the counter-offensive of Yankee imperialism and reaction; on the other, the expansion of the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle and its new manifestations. Among the latter we should note the growing role of Cuba in Latin American relations, the final breaking of the blockade, the collapse of the OAS, and the emergence of various forms of resistance of countries aspiring to independence and control over their national wealth. Note should also be taken of the deepening national-revolutionary process in Peru, strengthening of the anti-imperialist position of Panama, and participation of countries where parties of the national-reformist or national bourgeoisie are in power in joint action against brutal North American policies. This refers to Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica and, to a certain degree, Ecuador and Honduras. Even in the complex and difficult process taking place in Argentina we see not only an imperialist and fascist plot, but also the

radicalization of the broad masses that creates conditions for the unity of the majority of the people. Organized resistance in Uruguay, the regrouping of forces in Chile, miners' strikes in Bolivia and the peoples' struggle in other countries show that imperialism has not been able to consolidate the reactionary regimes, to say nothing of liquidating Communist parties or the working-class and popular movements. The failure of the so-called Brazilian economic miracle and the voting of almost two-thirds of the electorate against the dictatorship are harbingers of major changes.

Consequently, after Chile we must give greater scope to our strategic and tactical views, deriving inspiration from the positions set forth by the Seventh Congress. The need is to unite all anti-fascist forces, all those who in one way or another, to a greater or lesser extent, find themselves at odds with imperialism and join the great movement of peoples and governments. The fundamental objectives of this unity should be an independent foreign policy, a policy of defense of natural wealth, the socio-economic development of our people, agrarian reforms, democracy and anti-fascism. Such a movement will lead to the isolation of fascist dictatorships, as is already taking place in Chile and, in a certain sense, in Uruguay. It will promote solidarity with organizations, parties and fronts fighting for the freedom of their countries. Objectively this movement is already manifest in the coinciding positions taken by Cuba and other progressive countries, it acquires concrete form in joint action of Communists and socialist, democratic, Christian democrat, national-reformist, revolutionary-democratic and other parties. If this movement expands to the fullest it will halt the counter-offensive of Yankee imperialism and raise the anti-imperialist, democratic and anti-fascist process to a new level, create opportunities for going over to higher forms of revolutionary struggle and promote broad anti-dictatorship unity with the prospect of establishing democracy in a number of countries.

This way of posing the problem sets the sights on developing broad anti-fascist and anti-imperialist movements. But this should not keep us from clearly seeing the class character of the governments, parties or personalities taking part in the political process. Consequently, in the framework of broadly coinciding interests, we must forge the unity of the most progressive currents, i.e., of all those who speak for the socio-political interests of the motive forces of the democratic and national-liberation revolution: the socio-political category which embraces the working class, in alliance with the peasantry and the broad masses of the middle strata, students and intellectuals. In the course of the struggle it may be joined by some sections of the national bourgeoisie.

The unity problem is determined by such new continental de-

velopments as involvement of the military in the contradictory processes of struggle, participation of the Catholic church and other institutions. Without a profound and consistent policy of differentiation within the armed forces it will be impossible or very difficult to crush fascism.

The diversified realities of our continent include such acute issues as the correlation of democracy and socialism, differentiated approach to various forms of the bourgeois state, search of ways of approaching the national-democratic revolution, and its stages.

At present two prime tasks can be singled out: the labor unity of the working class and all wage and salary earners, and the unity and development of Communist parties. We emphasize the role of Latin America's proletariat, because it represents a tremendous social force, numbering 40 million industrial workers (out of 50 million wage and salary earners). The conditions of the general democratic struggle create new opportunities for achieving organizational unity of trade union centers and organizations. The now banned glorious Uruguayan NLC, some other Latin American trade union centers and the WFTU are active along these lines.

The hour of new trials has struck for the Communist parties of Latin America. But despite the difficulty and complexities of the struggle, the tremendous sacrifices and frequently unexpected twists of the revolutionary process, our parties are growing stronger, most of them have been and remain the protagonists in the current events, and they are gearing themselves to respond to the challenge of history with distinction. The main thing is that the opportunities for greater Communist unity have grown immeasurably.

Our cohesion will not only facilitate the peoples' liberation struggle, it will also be a contribution to the unity of the international communist and working-class movement, the convening of an international meeting which, in the view of Uruguayan Communists, is necessary. This meeting will creatively advance the ideas of the Seventh Comintern Congress. It will be a demonstration of contemporary forms of proletarian internationalism, that eternal beacon lit by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the Manifesto of the Communist Party, which Lenin made the guiding star of our epoch.

OUR AIM: UNITY

Khaled Bagdash
General Secretary,
CC Syrian Communist Party

Our symposium has a twofold task. First, to recall the history of the world Communist movement, particularly of such an important event

as the Seventh Comintern Congress. This is highly important, especially for the new generation of Communists. Second, to exchange views and experience as a means of promoting solidarity and cooperation.

I had the honor of attending the Seventh Congress and of being elected, under the name of Ramzi, to its Presidium as a representative of the Arab countries. Forty years have passed since then, but my impressions of the Congress are as fresh as ever.

The confidence it inspired in all of us proved a decisive factor in overcoming the formidable difficulties in the years that followed. The Congress strengthened the unity of the world communist movement: each country had its own particular problems and each Communist party shaped its policy and tactics to suit national conditions, but this did not prevent a consensus on the strategy and tactics of the world movement.

In the complicated situation of those days, the Congress solved a problem that confronts us today too, how to combine the tactics of a proletariat in power with those of a proletariat fighting for power in order to strengthen unity of the communist movement. The Congress unanimously decided that this does not preclude the obligation of each Communist party to support not only the Soviet Union's foreign policy as a whole, its general line, but also every concrete act, every concrete step of Soviet policy in the political, military and all other fields.

Has that proposition become obsolete? Certainly not. For the socialist system, headed by the USSR and acting in alliance with the world revolutionary movement and the world national-liberation movement, is steadily and rapidly becoming the decisive factor in shaping the international situation and the future of mankind. We Syrian Communists see this as our principal task, for there can be no contradiction between the overall interests of the world's first socialist state and the supreme, vital interests of every people in whatever part of the world. That was forcefully emphasized by Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International.

We say to all progressives that they must expose and reject all imperialist, reactionary and chauvinist stratagems, and especially Maoist propaganda.

The Soviet Union's global strategy is based on anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, support for national-liberation movements, the worldwide fight against aggression, for independence and socialism. The peaceful coexistence policy and détente are part of that strategy, not contrary to it, nor a departure from it. Soviet policy fully accords with the interests of all the peoples, all the Arab peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine.

In emphasizing that the fundamental, long-range interests in the fight for national and social liberation coincide with those of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, we say that firm friendship can rest only on these interests. And workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals display an increasing understanding of this basic truth, which is gaining ground also among progressive-minded patriots.

Ten years ago, when we observed the 30th anniversary of the Seventh Congress, we had to reply to the opinion expressed by some that the Communist parties did not fit into the conditions in the newly-liberated countries because some progressive national circles were inclining toward revolutionary democracy and carrying out major socio-economic measures to wipe out the remnants of feudalism and big capital. In particular, they had started agrarian reforms, nationalization of the big capitalist companies, etc. All this, it was argued, opened a straight and smooth road to socialism without leadership by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard.

The problem was settled by the realities of the situation. The sharpening struggle between the progressive countries and imperialism, the very development of these countries, their growth requirements, and the need to mobilize the people to safeguard the social and economic reforms – all this became the starting point for cooperation between Communists and revolutionary democrats in many of the newly-independent countries, and this cooperation led to the formation of progressive national fronts. Experience made it clear that we must strengthen the Communist parties in these countries and help form Marxist-Leninist parties where they do not yet exist.

Our cooperation with the Baath Socialist Party, both in and outside the government, goes back to 1966. In the nine years since then we have extended cooperation in the government – there are two Communist ministers – the People's Council, the trade unions, the student movement and in public and political activities. This led to the organization of the Progressive National Front which, besides our two parties, includes other patriotic and progressive forces and parties. Important initiatives have been taken in the three years since its foundation. There were many difficulties obstructing our cooperation, but our Party showed patience and by its practical work sought to create an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding. It has not been easy, but has led to ever broader positive results, making the Front a more effective force.

The guiding principles of our policy toward the progressive forces were drawn up at the Third Party Congress in 1969 and reaffirmed by the Fourth Congress in September 1974. These principles are: first, cooperation with all patriotic forces within and outside the govern-

ment; second, upholding the independence of our Party on all fundamental questions and pressing political issues; third, all-out support for the demands and interests of the masses.

The Progressive National Front played an important political role during the patriotic liberation war of October 1973. The Front's charter is directed primarily against imperialism, feudalism and big capital. It calls for expansion of the state sector of the economy, efforts to promote social progress, and proclaims socialism its ultimate goal. It calls for Arab unity on a progressive and anti-imperialist basis. The immediate aim of the national struggle, the charter expressly states, is liberation of occupied Arab territory and assurance of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. One of the charter's main clauses stresses friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union as a long-term strategic aim. The charter gives the Progressive National Front wide powers, including the right to decide the question of war and peace. This and other clauses make it an important political and moral factor.

On behalf of all Syrian progressives, our Party expresses sincere gratitude to all fraternal Communist and Workers' parties for their support and solidarity in our struggle against zionist and imperialist aggression.

A few remarks on the character of economic and social development in our and similar countries.

Our Fourth Party Congress noted that the growing over – as Lenin foresaw – of the national-democratic revolution into an anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist revolution led by revolutionary democrats and supported by the Communist Party, does not signify that it has become a socialist revolution. For it is accomplishing the tasks of the national-democratic revolution, though carrying out significant socialist-oriented progressive measures.

Consequently, the stage in which leadership is in the hands of revolutionary democrats cannot be considered a transition stage to socialism in the meaning we usually give that term in relation to countries where socialist revolution has triumphed. We cannot use the term 'transition stage' here because the revolutionary-democratic regime represents the interests of the urban middle strata, even of some sections of the national bourgeoisie, and does not rely in sufficient measure on support from the working class and the peasant masses.

Though a progressive national policy is followed, on the whole, in all progressive Arab countries, there has been a sharp aggravation of the class struggle over their future and their long-term foreign and home policies. But the forces exist to counter this right danger and cut short all reactionary intrigues. For that to become a reality, however,

there must be closer cooperation of the progressive forces in each country and also closer cooperation between all the Arab countries and the socialist community.

We take pleasure in reporting that the recent conference of Arab Communist parties called for preparations to start for an international meeting of Communist and Workers' parties. We feel that the conditions for such a meeting are ripe and that it will benefit the entire world communist movement.

MOUNTING ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE

Rodolfo Ghioldi
CC Executive Member,
Communist Party of Argentina

Held at a time when the danger of fascism and war was especially keenly felt, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International was one of the most important events in the history of the international revolutionary movement. It noted the growth of the revolutionary forces, called for a united proletarian front and broad anti-fascist unity, emphasized the inevitable defeat of fascism. Its resolutions infused faith, hope and a fighting spirit, helped to counteract sectarian tendencies and right opportunism. Today, on the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism, we recall with a feeling of gratitude the valor of the Soviet people and their glorious Armed Forces who made the decisive contribution to the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition.

A national-liberation alliance was organized in Brazil in 1935. It was a broad anti-imperialist movement led by Comrade Luis Carlos Prestes. Comrade Wang Ming spoke of this at the Seventh Congress. The movement culminated in a heroic revolution which, however, was crushed. There followed savage reprisals, with thousands of anti-imperialist fighters arrested and thrown into prison and tried by military tribunals. The fascist prosecutor falsified the decisions of the Seventh Congress and slandered the Soviet Union. I was one of the accused and to me fell the honorable mission of defending the ideas of communism, the Soviet Union, the Seventh Congress and Comrade Wang Ming. Actually, the Brazilian reactionaries wanted to put the Seventh Congress on trial, but they only stressed its importance as a blow at the class enemy, as a forum imperialism feared.

The position in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and the tasks of the Communists following therefrom was one of the questions on the Congress agenda. Its resolution singled out organization of anti-imperialist popular fronts as the key task of Communists in these countries. Earlier, in the 1928 Comintern theses, note was made

of the rise of the national revolutionary movement in South American semi-colonial countries.

That movement has become a historic reality. In Cuba, the revolutionary masses led by Fidel Castro have raised aloft the banner of socialism. The socialist world system is thus represented in Latin America, too, and this is a powerful stimulus for our anti-imperialist struggle.

Throughout the continent there is a widening intensive socialist-oriented struggle for liberation and democracy. Everywhere the people want change, freedom from the domination of imperialism, the landed oligarchies and the reactionaries. And while not underestimating imperialism's ability to impose reactionary policies, we should take into account such major setbacks for imperialism as the failure of the Alliance for Progress and the Organization of American States. Some commanders-in-chief of Latin-American armies question the need for the regular military conferences. The blockade of Cuba is collapsing. One after another, Latin American countries are establishing diplomatic relations with Cuba, whose prestige continues to grow. The aid given Cuba by the Soviet Union and other socialist states reassures the Latin American countries that any liberation movement can count on the socialist world system's support and effective assistance. Anti-imperialist trends are gaining strength in Peru and Panama.

Our Party is advancing to a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, which it regards as a stage on the road to socialism. The character of the revolution is determined by objective national conditions. Even during World War I, light industry showed some progress in our country, as well as in many other semi-colonial and dependent countries. Some branches of heavy industry came into being during World War II. They were financed by foreign capital. An agricultural, stock-farming country, Argentina became an agrarian-industrial country, which increased the leverage of the industrial, commercial and financial bourgeoisie in government.

But the development of capitalist relations of production in town and country did not in the least affect the interests of the big local and foreign monopoly landowners. Indeed, landed estates tended to expand, with both the industrial bourgeoisie and major imperialist companies investing part of their huge profits in grain-growing and livestock farms.

On the other hand, imperialism uses new methods of plunder, taking advantage of the technological dependence of national enterprises on monopolies. Nine out of Argentina's 20 biggest enterprises are owned by foreign capital, nine belong partly to the state and only two are the property of domestic capitalists (although it is hard to say

whether they are really independent of imperialist monopolies). The share of imperialist monopolies in industrial production is 40 per cent, and the fact that they are active in the most dynamic industries adds still more importance to the qualitative side of this figure.

The country's progress is handicapped by twofold oppression – on the part of the imperialists and the landed oligarchy. The democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution will sweep away all these obstacles and pave the way for socialism. If this revolution takes place in a country like ours, there is reason to assume in view of the international situation, and first of all the existence, support and aid of the socialist world system, that the transition from the first stage to the socialist stage will take a relatively short time. The process will benefit from the fact that 73 per cent of the gainfully employed population are wage and salary workers and that the potential allies of the workers – the middle strata and small and medium employers – constitute an impressive force. The poor and small peasants and agricultural workers, too, have considerable revolutionary potentialities.

More than ever before, Latin America's Communists need active mutual solidarity. The campaign for the release of Luis Corvalan and other Chilean political prisoners, against the persecution and torturing of Brazilian, Paraguayan, Bolivian, Uruguayan and Guatemalan patriots and for the release of 2,000 Argentine political prisoners is the duty of all revolutionaries.

Reaction is aided by Trotskyist and Maoist groups, which are at one in their hatred for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Maoism is making common cause with Strauss and Pinochet – what an alliance! The Maoists sow anti-Sovietism in Latin America by alleging that Soviet aid poses a 'threat.' The imperialists could hardly have dreamed of a more helpful accomplice. This makes our ideological struggle all the more important.

Big changes have occurred in the world since the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. The alignment of forces has changed. The heroic people of Vietnam have defeated imperialism. The treaties signed by the Soviet Union, Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia with the FRG have appreciably improved the diplomatic climate of Europe. The Soviet-U.S. talks on economic matters and, above all, on measures to avert nuclear war, the overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal and the intensification of the fight of the working class and struggles for national and social emancipation predicate new tasks for the world communist movement. An international meeting of Communist and Workers' parties is becoming an urgent necessity. Its participants will be inspired by the theoretical and political legacy of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, a

legacy whose worth has been proved by history. The new meeting will answer questions of concern for the whole revolutionary movement.

RELEVANCE OF THE IDEAS OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

Tsola Dragoicheva
Political Bureau member,
CC Bulgarian Communist Party

Creative enrichment of the theory of scientific socialism is logically and dialectically connected with the world revolutionary process. This gives our struggle for communism tremendous power, singleness of purpose and strategic precision.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern holds a special place in the creative elaboration of our theory. The trend which it imparted to revolutionary practice is valid to this day.

The Congress helped us Bulgarian Communists to understand our Party's experience – whether of the greatest revolutionary achievements or of failures with tragic consequences. Bulgaria was an early victim of fascism. The military fascist coup on June 9, 1923, imposed a fascist dictatorship which ruled the country almost uninterruptedly until the victory of the socialist revolution in 1944.

In 1923 the Bulgarian Communist Party organized and led the September rising, the world's first anti-fascist revolt. After the Seventh Congress we gained a clearer idea of the nature of fascism in our country, where it lacked a mass base comparable to that in Germany or Italy. Today, 40 years after the Congress and 30 years after the victory over fascism, we marvel at the correctness and accuracy of the Congress definition of the class substance, social forms and characteristics of fascism, and the vast importance which that definition had for evolving a correct program and slogans against fascism.

The Seventh Congress also played a tremendous role in our Party becoming a genuinely Leninist party. Lenin's call for work among the masses was reaffirmed by Dimitrov at the Leipzig trial. '*Mass work, mass struggle, mass resistance, a united front and no reckless ventures* – these are the alpha and omega of Communist tactics,' he said. Dimitrov put Lenin's slogan in still more precise terms at the Seventh Congress. 'We want to find *common language,*' he said, 'with the broadest masses in order to fight against the class enemy, want to find ways and means of ending for good the *isolation of the revolutionary*

vanguard from the mass of the proletariat and other working people . . .' By elaborating Lenin's idea of class alliances in a new situation, the Congress also gave new strength to our Party.

The Congress sharply criticized Social-Democratic theories of fascism and rejected the false definition of Social-Democratic parties as social fascist parties. It proved the possibility of united action with them, warning, however, that the struggle for the broadest possible unity of working-class forces did not imply a truce with reformism. The decisions of the Congress creatively carried forward Lenin's idea of linking the fight for democracy with the fight for socialism.

In 1936 the BCP set about establishing a Popular Front by starting talks with almost all bourgeois democratic parties and even a section of the military. The Popular Front's first political act was participation in the 1937 communal elections under the slogan of restoring the Turnovo Constitution. In the 1938 general election, the Front put forward a common program and a joint list.

The Party's long work among the masses and its patient effort in rallying all anti-fascist forces paid off after nazi Germany's treacherous attack on the Soviet Union. Immediately after the German invasion, on June 24, 1941, the Political Bureau of the CC BCP set out to organize an armed anti-fascist struggle against the nazi invaders and their Bulgarian underlings. The Party operated in a most complicated situation. The fascists' nationalist propaganda held out to the masses the illusory prospect of vindicating Bulgarian national ideals under the aegis of nazi Germany. Bulgaria was not an occupied country and the anti-fascist struggle there began as a class struggle of the workers and their Communist vanguard against a government of traitors and against Hitlerism.

Our Party cadres showed exemplary staunchness and perseverance in working for the establishment of a united anti-fascist front. Unification came to be based on the idea of the Fatherland Front, which carried forward the tactic of a broad anti-fascist front of the people evolved by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. The Fatherland Front program included primarily general national-liberation tasks. From the autumn of 1943 it operated as the center of the anti-fascist struggle.

The Front program did not include the objectives of the Communist Party's maximum program. This is not to say, however, that the working class, the chief motive power of the Front, did not strive for its ultimate goal, socialism. Our Party's approach to this issue was free from sectarian oversimplification, for we realized the dialectical unity of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism. The Party knew that the democratic platform put forward by the Front would facilitate the transition to the socialist revolution.

The defeat of fascism marked the beginning of the transition to socialism in Bulgaria. 'The September 9 Revolution, which triumphed with the decisive aid of the Soviet Army,' said Todor Zhivkov in his definition of our revolution, 'was a socialist revolution from the first, a repetition of the Great October Revolution in its fundamental, key aspects. Needless to say, the September Revolution also accomplished general democratic and anti-fascist tasks. This was its distinctive feature as a socialist revolution.'

Immediately after the overthrow of fascist rule, the Party took steps to strengthen its organizations and increase their numbers. The BCP became a factor rallying all progressives who favored Bulgaria's development as a people's democracy. Fatherland Front committees became government bodies organizing economic, political and cultural activity. The BCP exercised a leading role in society, leaning primarily on Front committees.

It convinced Front parties of the need to have a single youth organization. Furthermore, 30 trade unions were formed which joined the General Trade Union of Workers. The Bulgarian Popular Women's League came into being. Societies for Friendship with the Soviet Union became major cultural propaganda centers.

The people's democratic state proceeded at once to abolish the bourgeois-fascist state machinery. Elections to the People's Assembly were announced to consolidate people's rule. They were opposed by the British and American members of the International Control Commission, who alleged that there was no freedom or democracy in Bulgaria. We had to postpone the elections. The opposition succeeded for a while in misleading part of the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie. But the attempts at restoration made by reactionary army officers failed and their clandestine organizations were destroyed with support from the whole people.

The economic base of the bourgeoisie was shrinking. The People's Assembly passed laws assuring the implementation of the Fatherland Front program. One of them provided for the confiscation of property acquired through speculation. It dealt a blow to big capitalist property. The agrarian reform law was spearheaded against the kulaks. Nationalization played a key role in consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Soviet Union's all-round fraternal aid, and cooperation with other people's democracies proved decisive in establishing and furthering people's democratic rule. We succeeded in avoiding a civil war.

Changes in the economic and class structures of our society also had a political effect. In 1948 the Fatherland Front resolved to transform itself into a united social and political organization. The Social-Democratic Party, having taken the road of Marxism-Leninism,

merged with the BCP. The Zveno Popular Union and the Radical Party voluntarily discontinued their autonomous existence and their members continued to work in the Fatherland Front. In addition to the BCP, the Front included as an autonomous political organization the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union, which retained its influence among a section of the working peasantry.

The experience of Bulgaria's development after the September 1944 rising, as well as the experience of other people's democracies, confirmed the viability of people's democracy as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the 40 years that have passed since the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, the international Communist and working-class movement has become the most influential political force for peace, progress and socialism. Success will depend, in the future as in the past, on the cohesion of our movement, on its ability collectively to discuss pressing problems and make maximum use of the practical and theoretical experience. The Bulgarian Communist Party considers that the situation requires the convening of a new meeting of Communist and Workers' parties.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern is associated with the names of many prominent leaders of the international communist movement and Dimitrov was one of them. His ideas and all that he left to the Party and people commit us to the cause of international solidarity and to fighting for peace, for the victory of socialism and communism throughout the world.

MILESTONE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR WORKING-CLASS AND POPULAR UNITY

Friedl Fürnberg
Political Bureau member,
CC Communist Party of Austria

The struggle to foster the class consciousness of the working class and ensure that the workers should understand their position and tasks has always been linked with the struggle for working-class unity. This was the case at the dawn of the Marxist working-class movement in Germany and elsewhere. It was also the case in Russia, where Lenin constantly linked resolute dissociation from the reformists with the effort to achieve the broadest possible unity of the working class.

Thus the struggle for working-class unity has also always been a struggle against the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie among the

working class, in its organizations. This struggle has had its ups and downs, but it is safe to say that the end result is colossal and this not only in comparison with the initial situation. Hundreds of millions of people are engaged in united action on an international scale today. The solid unity of the working class as the core of the unity of all working people has long existed in a number of countries. The unity of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties is becoming ever more manifest internationally as well. Difficulties arising from the complexity of the international struggle are overcome one after another.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern was a milestone in the struggle to unite the working class and rally the people around it. It was said at the Congress that when the Comintern was still led by Lenin, it had called on all Communist parties to fight for a united front of the working class. Communists know this, but our adversaries allege that the Comintern and its member parties banked on a split in the working class. In his speeches to the Second and Third congresses of the Comintern and his famous work, *'Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder,* Lenin devoted special attention to united front problems. I will give just one example to stress the importance Lenin attached to the struggle for a united front. In 1922, after studying a draft resolution on the Comintern's participation in a planned conference of all the workers' parties of the world, he wrote: 'My chief amendment (to the draft – *F.F.*) is aimed at deleting the passage which calls the leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals accomplices of the world bourgeoisie' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 42, p. 400). Lenin added that 'it is absolutely unreasonable to risk wrecking an affair of tremendous practical importance' on that account (Ibid., pp. 400-401).

Looking back on the history of the struggle that has been going on since 1919 for a united front and class unity of the workers, one is struck, first of all, by the fact that this struggle has not been following a straight line but has had ups and downs corresponding in most cases to changed conditions. And if one heeds only the overall picture, noting the alternation of gains and setbacks, one may get the impression of continuous repetition. This is, in fact, the conclusion drawn sometimes, but it is entirely wrong. In recent decades, development has continued and led to big gains. This has been due in decisive measure to the Communist parties being ever more aware of the meaning, content and forms of the struggle for the unity of the working class and the people, as well as of the leading role they must play in this struggle. The experience of the working class, too, has been highly important.

After the revolutionary vanguard of the working class had or-

ganized in Communist parties, Lenin said that the next task was to ensure that the majority of the class accomplishes its historic mission by winning socialism. This purpose could be served by forging closer links and, in a sense, merging with the mass of workers, by carrying on a common fight for the small and big interests of the working class, a fight closely linked with ideological activity intended to enhance the social awareness of the working class and help it in realizing its role in society. It was no easy matter to convince newly founded Communist parties of the absolute necessity of this. According to ultra-leftist views current at the time, the revolutionary vanguard could achieve victory without first winning the support of the majority of the working class. The Communist parties would hardly have come out of the impasse of would-be revolutionariness and sectarianism so soon but for the great help given by Lenin and the Comintern. Enjoying world prestige and proceeding from the experience of the Russian working class and the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin and the Comintern showed the Communist parties the right way.

'The purpose and sense of the tactics of the united front,' Lenin wrote, 'consist in drawing more and more masses of the workers into the struggle against capital, even if it means making repeated offers to the leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals to wage this struggle together' (Vol. 42, p. 411).

The working class has always sought unity. Reformists have used this for their own ends and continue to do so. They have been alleging for many decades that the Communists' united front tactics are merely a maneuver. They often pounce on the word 'tactics' because *their* tactics have always been maneuvers designed to conceal their real political intentions. For the Communists, however, tactics are definite forms and methods of class struggle against capital within the framework of the strategic goal. United front policy is aimed at uniting the working class. It has never been directed against working-class organizations which uphold the workers' interests in one way or another.

Experience shows that the forms of united front policy cannot be established once and for all, for they depend on the political situation. This is why the policy of unity varies in form from country to country. It has always to be framed anew because no ready-made pattern serves the purpose. This means that we must apply – with due regard to the actual situation – the principles evolved by Lenin.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern accomplished a historic task by showing the anti-fascist masses all over the world the Communists' readiness to fight in common with all democratic forces against fascism and the war menace. It was a milestone in the Comintern's activity for the good of the world Communist movement. Now

that the task is to make détente irreversible, curtail monopoly power and take the road of progress leading to socialism, there are new opportunities to bring about the unity of the working class and people. However, these opportunities are not the same in all countries. It is obvious that, say, the French Communist Party can carry on this struggle in a way different from that of our Party, which is faced with a powerful reformist Social-Democratic Party. But Lenin's advice and the experience of the Comintern are of tremendous importance to us all. We must know them, bear them in mind, and use them.

LESSONS OF THE POLICY OF ALLIANCES

Helena Berg
CC member, Socialist
Unity Party of Germany

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern, which set an example of consistent and creative application of Marxism-Leninism, opened a new stage in the history of the world communist movement. It pointed out that socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the peace offensive of the first worker-peasant state had a decisive effect on the alignment of world forces and the world revolutionary process. Now that neo-fascists are stepping up their activity in some countries, the conclusions of the Congress are as valid as ever.

The Congress revealed the forces that were equal to fighting against fascism and war. It realistically assessed the opportunities for this fight and outlined its methods. The strategy and tactics worked out by the Congress creatively carried forward Lenin's scientific conclusions about the united front of the working class and the policy of alliances.

The Congress stressed the close interconnection of democratic and social tasks in the struggle against fascism and imperialism. Consistent implementation of the anti-fascist policy of the united working-class and popular front helped the working people to advance to the socialist revolution.

The victory over fascism gave rise to a broad offensive of the revolutionary forces. In Central and Southeast Europe, imperialism was unable to halt the progress of the revolution. This was due primarily to the fact that the peoples of these countries, supported by the Soviet Union, held their ground against home reaction and foiled imperialist interference. With the balance of forces in these countries changing steadily in favor of socialism due to the application of the strategy and tactics provided by the Seventh Congress, the theory of transition from the bourgeois democratic to the socialist revolution

advanced by Lenin was put into practice. Drawing on the Soviet experience of building socialism and on their own experience, the Communist parties of these countries achieved working-class unity of action and on this basis gave the working-class policy of alliances unprecedented scope.

The working people of the German Democratic Republic have been following this path ever since 1945. At illegal conferences in Brussels (1935) and Berne (1939), the Communist Party of Germany aided by the Comintern creatively applied the decisions of the Seventh Congress in the anti-fascist struggle going on in Germany. The CPG strove to overthrow Hitler in common with the Social Democrats, Christians and other democratic forces and to establish a new democratic republic based on a broad popular front. To save the nation, the Berne conference stressed, it was necessary to overthrow the fascist dictatorship. The joint struggle of the Communists, Social Democrats and other democrats against fascism, a struggle waged both in Germany and in exile, and the movement of the Free Germany national committee during World War II were cases of translating the ideas of the Seventh Congress into reality.

The liberation mission accomplished by the Soviet Army afforded the German people decisive opportunities to eliminate fascism and militarism for all time. In solving this problem, the German working class was effectively backed by its Soviet class brothers.

The historic appeal launched by the CPG on June 11, 1945, followed the general line of the Seventh Congress with due regard to the new situation and past experience. It continued the elaboration of the tasks set by the Brussels and Berne Party conferences. The CPG demanded the complete abolition of militarism and fascism, an end to monopoly power and junker landownership, the transfer of key posts in government and economy to the working people and the establishment of an anti-fascist democratic system. These were demands put forward by the masses. The CPG saw its primary task in uniting the working class and achieving united action by its parties on revolutionary lines, which was a most important prerequisite of winning other classes and strata for the construction of a new, democratic Germany.

These tasks were carried out in the course of a resolute fight against forces which after the defeat of German fascism tried to rescue the imperialist system in Germany, with support from the Western occupation authorities, which did their utmost to stop democratic anti-fascist development.

The struggle for working-class unity of action, and above all for the cohesion of the CPG and SDPG, was a difficult political and ideological struggle during which debates took place on fundamental problems of the working-class movement. Cooperation among the work-

ers in the course of anti-fascist and democratic changes helped to clarify these problems. United action cleared the way for the organizational merger of the two working-class parties into the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in 1946. Thus, our experience proved the Seventh Congress, which visualized this possibility, to have been correct.

Working-class unity played a decisive part in uniting all other anti-fascist democratic forces. This unification went on in step with far-reaching social changes.

Speaking of the policy of alliances, our Party has always conceived it as patient political and ideological work among the masses and a means of bringing them more fully into the process of social change. At the same time our Party has fought unrelentingly against forces seeking a return to the past, against their anti-Communist and anti-Soviet concepts. Active in the GDR were considerable forces inspired and supported by West German monopoly capital, which had revived. They tried to stop the construction of an anti-fascist democratic system and even to reverse the trend of development. Our Party's resolute fight against these forces contributed to a differentiation in petty-bourgeois parties.

In the light of the experience of the socialist community, we believe the following universally valid characteristics of the policy of alliances may be listed: steadily growing role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party in every public field; increasing engagement of the parties to the alliance in the process of social change by perfecting the socialist state and extending socialist democracy and, as a result, an increasing sense of responsibility on the part of the classes and strata cooperating with us; close connection between government measures to improve the standard of living and continuous ideological work to bring the scientific, Marxist-Leninist world outlook home to large social strata; and, as an effect, of the revolutionary transformation of society and of the influence of the working class, a change in the political and moral outlook of our allies, and their greater closeness to the working class.

Our experience indicates that the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern are perfectly valid also in this period of building the new society. 'Good relations with friendly parties,' said Erich Honecker at the 13th Plenum of the CC SUPG, 'are very important to our people's increased political and moral unity. These parties are engaged in a vast effort which makes the strata influenced by them ever more aware of their responsibility to our socialist state. Friendly parties have about 350,000 members today. As it advances to communism our Party will abide by the tested principle of consulta-

tion with and endorsement by the Democratic Bloc of all fundamental matters.'

Four decades after the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, we have reason to affirm that its decisions have passed the test of time, that the guidelines for struggle put forward by the Congress have contributed to a radical transformation of the political character of the world and that the lessons of this struggle continue to help us in solving the problems of mankind.

EXTENDING THE DEMOCRATIC GAINS OF THE MASSES

Idris Cox
Veteran member of the
Communist Party
of Great Britain

In the 30 years that have passed since the victory over fascism, the socialist world has made great progress and brought about a change in the alignment of forces in its favor. Even so, the basic ideas put forward by Georgi Dimitrov in 1935 are relevant today. But there are also greater prospects of making peaceful coexistence a reality of weakening and undermining imperialism, of uniting the democratic forces in the capitalist world, and of forging a closer link with the liberation struggle of peoples. As a participant in the Seventh Congress I should like to share with you recollections.

There was deep silence in the Congress hall, punctuated with loud bursts of applause and standing ovations, when Dimitrov delivered his report on the united front against fascism. His courageous onslaught against fascism at the Leipzig trial had made him a living symbol of the worldwide struggle against this menace.

Dimitrov was a convincing speaker, taking time to emphasize the most important sentences in clear and simple language. He had not completely recovered from his term in the fascist prison, and there were rest periods during his report. After each of them he was back at the rostrum, more vigorous than ever. When he spoke of fascist repression and war plans his normal melodious voice became a roaring challenge similar to that made against Goering at the Leipzig trial.

During the discussion of his report Dimitrov listened with keen attention to every speaker. In his reply to the discussion and his final statement at the end of the Congress, he made many important

conclusions which are equally valid even today for the international Communist movement.

There were hundreds of Communist delegates present from all parts of the world. Dimitrov had a unique record of Communist leadership in his own country, but his arrest and trial by the German fascists in 1933, and his courageous defiance, had made him world famous. Far from being conceited, he remained a warm-hearted human being, a man of the masses. He was interested in the struggle for unity in every country. I satisfied myself of this as a member of the 20-strong British delegation which had a long exchange of views with Dimitrov before leaving Moscow. It was obvious he had made a serious study of the political situation in Britain (as also in other capitalist countries) and understood the special situation in Britain.

Britain is the birthplace of capitalism, and still the center of a vast imperialist system. Its ruling class is perhaps the most experienced and resourceful in the capitalist world. But then Britain is also the birthplace of the modern trade unions, and the imperialist tribute from overseas exploitation has long been used to corrupt the more highly-paid workers, and has provided fruitful soil for the seeds of opportunism.

However, there are also factors of a positive character. There is only one trade union center, and it is committed to strive for international trade union unity. The British workers have a proud record of militant struggle for their economic demands. As Lenin emphasized, the Labour Party is not strictly a political party based on individual membership, but a political federation of the trade unions and working people. The British TUC embraces over 10 million organized workers, and about six million of them are in trade unions which are affiliated to the Labour Party, in contrast to 700,000 individual members.

There are 650,000 students organized within the National Union of Students. As well as fighting for its own demands, the declared policy of the NUS is to assist strikers, to organize campaigns against the apartheid system in South Africa, and to support all liberation struggles.

In almost every aspect of human problems there are active movements, both of a national and local character, engaged in the struggle for improved conditions. Indeed, the rising mass movement in Britain, both organized and unorganized, is engaged in what can be described as a process of 'operative democracy.' This extends also into the sphere of international solidarity. There are solidarity movements in support of the struggle in Portugal, Spain, Chile, Indonesia, Vietnam, Northern Ireland, and elsewhere. In all these movements Communists cooperate in the struggle shoulder to shoulder with

non-Communists. Outstanding also is the growing movement against racial discrimination.

Why do I present all these particular aspects of the situation in Britain? Precisely because the growth of unity between Communists and democratic forces must depend on taking into account the specific national features and the different conditions in each country. The essential need for this approach was strongly emphasized by Lenin in *'Left-wing' Communism,* and by Georgi Dimitrov at the Seventh Congress. The forms and methods of unity between the Communists and democratic forces in the non-socialist world do not have a single pattern.

There are still tendencies to belittle the big democratic gains won in many developed capitalist countries. Yet these gains were *not* freely given by the ruling class, but are the fruits of growing mass struggle against it.

We British Communists have carefully worked out our concept and program for the road to socialism in Britain. It does *not* mean that socialism is an immediate perspective. We are striving to build a popular alliance around the leadership of the working class to change the political situation in Britain and to transform the existing Parliament. And in this alliance we will not stress the 'leading role' of the Communist Party. We will strive for 'equal partnership' of all those committed to achieve this aim. In our program, *The British Road to Socialism,* we have outlined the close and inseparable relation between the immediate struggle for greater democratic advances and the basic aim of socialism.

A review of the contributions of other participants in the symposium will appear in our next issue.

The working class and its allies

INTERNATIONAL MARXIST DISCUSSION

The following set of theses is to open a Marxist discussion of present-day allies of the working class. The question is central for Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics. It concerns all Communist

parties irrespective of the concrete conditions, assuming specific forms in socialist, developed capitalist, and developing countries, depending on their political, social and economic level.

The theses, drawn up by the International Working-Class Movement Institute (USSR Academy of Sciences), examine the subject in relation to the anti-monopoly stage of the struggle in the developed capitalist countries.

The Editors invite readers to join in the discussion. They may deal with the problems raised in the theses or examine questions related to the situation of the working class and its allies in socialist and developing countries.

In defining the place of the problem of working-class allies in Marxist-Leninist theory, Lenin pointed out that the working class can fulfill its historic mission 'only ... by the most thorough, careful, attentive, skillful and *obligatory* use of any, even the smallest ... opportunity of winning a mass ally.... Those who do not understand this reveal a failure to understand even the smallest grain of Marxism, of modern scientific socialism *in general*' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 70-71).

The Marxist-Leninist presentation and solution of the problem of allies provide the theoretical and methodological basis for further analysis of the problem in present-day conditions. It assumes specific forms, depending on the type and level of economic and social-political development, the position and interests of the working class and the non-proletarian classes and social groups, the nature of the proletariat's tasks at various stages of the class struggle and revolution, and also the distinctive features of the situation in the country concerned. Hence the problem of working class allies must always be seen in its concrete historical setting, and accordingly requires a concrete historical, socially differentiated approach to the question of allies, taking into account the stage of the revolutionary struggle and its motive forces.

The sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism in the 70s is clear evidence that the exploiting system is historically untenable. As the leading force of social progress, the working class must therefore chart the ways of overcoming the profound economic, social and political crisis, and assuring that the achievement of this objective works in the interest of the working people.

Hence the relevance of a grounded scientific assessment of the social and political forces that may participate in the struggle for a deep-going reconstruction of society. Most important in this context is to determine the social preconditions for extending the class and

political alliances that take, or may take, shape under the leadership of the working class.

Methodologically it is extremely important to take careful account of the position and revolutionary potential of the traditional and new allies. They should be assessed in the light of the processes taking place within the working class, which is the center around which all revolutionary and democratic forces unite.

Developments have confirmed the Marxist-Leninist proposition of the steadily growing role of the working class. In the process of influencing society, the working class itself changes too. No longer is it differences in the nature of the job, the training or proficiency of its various segments and detachments that are decisive, but the general characteristics common to hired workers as a social entity, a class – namely, their place in a historically definite system of social production, their relation to the means of production, their role in the social organization of labor and, consequently, the manner of obtaining, and the size of, their share of the public wealth.

With the scientific and technological revolution, such factors as the structural changes in the economy, changes in production techniques and expansion of service industries are acquiring special importance for the formation of new contingents of the working class, and play a visible part in increasing the numbers of the workers. The share of the working class in the gainfully employed population continues to grow.*

'The ranks of the international working class, the most advanced revolutionary class of our time, and its role as the chief productive and social-political force throughout the world, will continue to grow,' said L.I. Brezhnev in a speech at the 15th Congress of the Soviet trade unions. 'Despite the fashionable anti-Marxist theories that the scientific-technical revolution is tending to reduce the boundaries of the working class and is even leading to its elimination, the facts speak of the very opposite: scientific-technical progress is generating growth of the working class everywhere, and, among other things, by virtue of the new trades appearing in modern production.'

The social boundaries of the working class in this age of the scientific and technological revolution has been the subject of discussion among Marxists. The most general conclusion is that, far from diminishing, the role of the working class as, to use Lenin's words, the 'intellectual and moral motive force and the physical executor'

*Statistics on the structure and share of the working class in the total number of wage-earners and the entire gainfully employed population will be found in *The Working Class, the Leading Force of the World Revolutionary Process*, prepared by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement and edited by V.V. Zagladin, A.A. Galkin and T.T. Timofeyev, (in Russian), Moscow, 1973, pp. 51-67.

(Vol. 21, p. 71) of the transition from capitalism to socialism, is increasing visibly. There is also an increase in the professional and educational level of the working class, and its understanding of Marxism-Leninism as the reflection and expression of its interests. The working class today is incomparably better organized and is employing more effective forms of economic, political and ideological struggle. Its main interests and socio-political aims coincide with the vital interests and aims of all working people. No other class in society is as strong and as well organized.

All this identifies the working class as the main adversary of monopoly power, the coordinator of the aspirations of the many different currents of the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist struggle. The working class expresses their general urge for social progress. It perfects its leading role in the struggle for this progress even before coming to power, and also its ability to determine, assess and uphold the just interests of other social groups and classes, and unite its allies. This creates additional objective and subjective prerequisites for effective unity round the proletariat of the forces fighting for peace, democracy and social progress.

However, the labor movement in many capitalist countries remains divided. This, too, should be taken into account in discussing the allies of the working class.

The next group of problems requiring scrutiny concerns the social milieu in which the working class of the developed capitalist countries finds its allies at the present stage of the anti-monopoly struggle, their objective position and revolutionary potential. These questions, we feel, deserve special attention.

From the class standpoint, as we see it, this applies primarily to the sum-total of classes and social groups occupying an intermediate position between the workers and the capitalists, the two basic classes of capitalist society. This milieu, known as the middle strata, is extremely heterogeneous. In our opinion it includes the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie and those wage- and salary-earners who make up the medium-level personnel in production and the administrative apparatus of capitalist society. These middle strata are continuously reproduced due to the development of state-monopoly capitalism, although their economic basis is not all of one type.

The tendency toward the erosion of these middle or intermediate strata noted by Marx as characteristic of capitalist production relations has been borne out in the past several decades by the drastic decline of the old-type peasant population. In countries with medium or relatively low levels of capitalist development the peasants still make up a large and influential social group, but in industrial capitalist countries their share in the gainfully employed population is only

between one (Britain) and 19 (Japan) per cent.

The development of capitalist relations tends to wipe out the small peasant farm and in some cases also the medium-sized farm. For the farmers monopoly domination in agriculture means loss of their traditional independence. To stand up to sharper competition the small and medium farmer must reduce production costs by working more and lowering his living standard.

Industrialization of agriculture has greatly accelerated the class differentiation of the peasantry. It continues to lose the features of an integral social group formed in the days of feudal relations. In the developed capitalist countries this has led to the emergence of three distinct groups: the big capitalist landowners, small and medium independent farmers much like the small urban producers in way of life and place in production, and, lastly, the farm laborers, whose work tends to come closer to that of the industrial worker with the growth of the rural productive forces. Differentiation of the peasantry can be observed also in some countries at a medium level of capitalist development. The problem of allies among the rural population is, in our view, primarily a problem of cooperating with the small and middle farmers, who represent the middle strata in agriculture.

The sharp reduction in the number and influence of the peasantry in developed capitalist countries poses this question: does the reduction mean that the importance of the peasantry as an ally of the working class has declined?

The correct answer, we think, can be formulated only after considering the complex interconnection of qualitative and quantitative factors characteristic of the peasantry's objective position. Marx and Lenin convincingly demonstrated that it would be wrong to assess the revolutionary potential of any class or social group merely on the basis of its numerical strength in one or another country. Their first criterion was its place in the system of social production, its role in the country's economy, the degree of its organization, consciousness, ability to win over other sections of the working people, etc. Assessing the peasantry from this standpoint, from its position in the system of state-monopoly capitalism, it is clear that, first, it will continue for the foreseeable future to be one of the large contingents of the working people; second, it will continue to play a vital part in the capitalist economy because along with the working class it is the creator of society's material wealth; third, its consciousness, unity and militancy are increasing – the incessant battles of poor, small and middle peasants against the tyranny of monopoly capital have become an important factor in the political life of many capitalist countries. That is why today, too, we believe, Lenin's thesis of the worker-

peasant alliance as a condition of successful struggle against monopoly power retains all its validity.

Countering the policy of the monopolies, which is ruining and driving millions of farmers off the land, while artificially perpetuating some archaic forms of farming, the working class backs the farmers' demands for land ('land to the tiller!') and radical agrarian reform, and supports actions against crying injustices against farmers in the distribution of incomes, social maintenance, pensioning, and general conditions.

If we took stock of the overall tendencies of capitalism, we should be able to pinpoint not only the needs of the peasants in the present economic situation, but also the perspective of cardinal changes in the system of production relations. It is important, therefore, to produce an effective democratic and anti-monopoly alternative, envisaging a radical reconstruction and modernization of farming to assure its stability and progress and make the small producer an equal participant in the future advance to socialism.

The urban middle strata are numerically more stable. State-monopoly capitalism is depriving hundreds of thousands of small proprietors of what has always been the very basis of their existence, breaking up their way of life, causing serious material losses, compelling them to look for new occupations. Even those who manage to remain independent find the going extremely hard. The widespread system of contracts between big concerns and small firms usually makes the latter mere appendages of the former. This is true of the service industries and retail trade. For all that, however, even in countries where the process of class polarization has gone much father, the actual numerical strength of this group has, despite the general downward trend of the group's specific weight, remained relatively stable (in some countries it has even increased) over the past several decades. This is attributable, in particular, to the fact that reduction of small enterprises in industry and retail trade has been compensated by rapid expansion in the service industries where the share of small enterprises is relatively high.

But the further changes in the social structure of the urban middle strata are a more substantial reason. These strata grew through the influx of private and government employees, and the intelligentsia all through the recent decades. Meanwhile, the social distance between different groups of employees increased. Their upper bracket is integrating with the ruling class. The lower with the greatest numbers, is drawing closer in social background to the industrial workers. And the bracket in the middle has formed a kind of nucleus for new middle strata. With many non-manual trades becoming mass professions, medium supervisory personnel are losing their traditional social pres-

tige. The administrative functions are more sophisticated, and such personnel have a smaller share in decision-making, their work is more routine and unemployment has become for them a more real danger.

The differentiation among salary-earners is part of a more general class stratification of the intelligentsia – a social stratum unified by similar and specific labor. During the rise of monopoly capitalism the intelligentsia was a numerically small group closely associated with the ruling class which it served and on which it depended. But even in those conditions it was not class homogeneous (See V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 44-45). And when the intelligentsia grew into one of the most massive social groups of capitalist society, its heterogeneity became increasingly apparent.

The social evolution of the group of 'intellectual professions' is a graphic illustration. Commercialization led to the loss of their former social position by the bulk of intellectuals – lawyers, doctors, teachers, journalists. They became hired workers, some part of the new middle strata and some forming a marginal group alongside the working class. The new middle strata include specialists with a private practice and small proprietors active in the cultural field and the services, the medical field and education.

The bulk of intellectuals suffer still more acutely than middle-echelon salary-earners from the social devaluation of intellectual labor and the consequent loss of material advantages and prestige. Members of the intelligentsia are subjected to the willfulness, red tape and incompetent interference of the state-monopoly apparatus, and fall into humiliating dependence on capitalist magnates.

The rupture between the intelligentsia and bourgeoisie has outgrown isolated protests motivated by ethics or knowledge of the laws of history. It extends more frequently to substantial segments of people engaged in mental work and is generated by their mounting appreciation of their essential interests and social function, which come into collision with the demands of the state-monopoly oligarchy. As a result a considerable section of the intelligentsia becomes an ally of the working class.

The significance of the urban and rural middle strata is not affected by the structural changes. On the whole, they were and remain a massive social group. But the growing numbers, the specific weight and role of the intellectual groups within the middle strata, are a valid reason to seek cooperation with them.

The attitude of the middle strata to the state-monopoly system is contradictory. The visible clash of middle strata interests with the policy of monopoly capital and the state-monopoly system is giving rise to an increasingly negative attitude to the capitalist system and its institutions. But illusions about state-monopoly 'regulation' and

'favorable prospects' for small businesses are still alive. Combining with the mistrust of (even outright hostility to) the working class and revolutionary working-class movement by a part of the petty bourgeoisie, these illusions breed a craving for 'strong government' and 'protection' from workers' pressure. In some countries influential intellectual groups are as conservative as ever due to residual social and social-psychological ties with the dominant class, their relative isolation, and comparative prosperity. Coupled with ingrained individualism, hostility toward state-monopoly capitalism prompts other groups of intellectuals and students to take anarchistic and ultra-revolutionary postures.

In certain conditions, non-proletarian groups which are not part of the middle strata but whose interests clash with those of the monopoly bourgeoisie (middle bourgeoisie, etc.) can also become allies of the proletariat. However, their objective basis for joint action with the working class is, as a rule, much more narrow.

Apart from class interests, large sections of the people are drawn to the working class by interests and aims of a general democratic nature: their stake in democratization of the political system, in racial and national equality, overthrow of tyrannical, fascist and militarist regimes, prevention of war and consolidation of peace.

Democratic movements encompassing different political and social forces joined by similarity of interests and oriented against imperialism and various aspects of imperialist oppression, represent the practical form of joint action by the working class and other social strata. In some cases the proletariat participates in these movements as a class (general-democratic, anti-fascist, and anti-war struggles), and in others is represented by some of its groups (youth, women) or renders them support. Seeing the resistance of religious groups to oppression and abuses, for example, Lenin wrote: 'We socialists must lend this movement our support, carrying the demands of honest and sincere members of the clergy to their conclusion' (Vol. 10, p. 85). In all countries, the working class is the initiator of constructive proposals for uniting the youth, women, believers, etc., and opening the door for active participation of all social strata in the anti-monopoly struggle.

It would be useful to see how the social and political changes in society affect the attitude and behavior of different groups in the armed forces. In the hands of the ruling class the army is a repressive organ. But at the same time the armed forces, especially in the case of a professional rather than a mercenary army, are a specifically organized social category reflecting – albeit not quite adequately – the country's political orientation and social structure. This applies not only to the alternating element, to those drafted for military service,

but also to the permanent element, including the numerically large commissioned categories. Wherever commissioned officers of certain ranks comprise a massive group, they gradually lose their former largely elitist character, and are recruited chiefly from the middle strata. Accordingly, the attitudes of the middle strata make an ever more distinct impression on the views and behavior of the officers' corps. Its closer ties with the middle strata adds to the opportunities for extending the alliance to encompass a significant section of the armed forces. Conversely, cooperation with this section of the armed forces is likely to promote broader and closer relations between the working class and the middle strata.

A study of the composition and status of the allies of the working class should take stock not only of the general and typical features of the entire general-democratic, anti-monopoly stage of the struggle, but also the concrete features of the economic and political situation in the country, as well as the international conditions at every given moment. It would be useful, among other things, to discuss the impact of international détente and the present aggravation of crisis phenomena in capitalist countries on the political positions of the middle strata.

On the whole, détente helps broaden the social base of, and activise, the anti-monopoly struggle. For a long time, the petty-bourgeoisie was highly vulnerable to militarist and chauvinist propaganda. At the height of the cold war it was an important element of the mass support for the imperialist strategy of military-political confrontation with the socialist states. Also, it served as a nutritive medium for the spread of anti-Soviet and anti-communist prejudices, which hindered workers' cooperation with it.

The successes of the Peace Program of the 24th CPSU Congress removed some of the barriers to cooperation. True, reversing the mass psychology is a long and intricate process. The nationalist and great-power ideology that prevailed among the petty bourgeoisie in the leading capitalist countries is anything but dead. The effect of international détente is more visible among strata with a clearer view of the probably consequences of any sharper politico-military confrontation of states with different social systems and of the promising perspectives of peaceful coexistence.

The proliferation of anti-monopoly action is also spurred by the crisis in the capitalist world. Crisis has caused a deterioration in the condition of the bulk of working people, and also created new difficulties for the middle strata. The decline in sales and orders (which has also hit fairly large firms), has driven many a small-scale enterprise into bankruptcy. The small businessman is in serious trouble in the service fields, car maintenance, transportation, hotels, restaurants,

etc. – where small-scale private enterprise is still relatively prominent. Emergency measures to offset the effects of the crisis are in many cases accompanied by dismissals of government and municipal employees (at medium, as well as low, level). For the first time since the war mass unemployment has spread to certain groups of specialists and managers in industrial fields. The reduction of state allocations for social and cultural needs has created additional difficulties for members of a range of intellectual professions in the non-productive fields.

As a result of this turmoil, discontent over the policy of the ruling circles has spread to broader sections of the middle strata than before. What forms does this discontent assume? Wherever bourgeois-reformist governments are in power, economic difficulties may generate an evolution to the right, in some cases even direct support of reactionary ultra-right forces. But by and large the changes in the political mood of the middle strata depend on the strength and influence of the democratic and progressive forces. If they are strong enough, the rightward evolution of the middle strata can be arrested and, more, they can be rallied for more active participation in the anti-monopoly struggle.

Apart from the above objective social, economic and political factors, subjective factors, too, are highly significant in assessing the revolutionary potential of the allies of the working class. The degree of their political consciousness, organization and militancy is another area that, we hold, requires close scrutiny.

There are many facts testifying to the political maturity of many segments of the middle strata. Large groups of white-collar employees are resorting ever more to proletarian methods of struggle and formulating typically workers' demands: for a sliding salary scale, guaranteed minimum salaries, a greater constant portion in the structure of their earnings and elimination of pay components aimed at intensifying labor, an end to discrimination of politically active employees, and the like. The struggle for these demands creates subjective, as well as objective, bonds between its participants and the working class.

Like the industrial workers, the employees are fighting more actively for the right to have their own unions, for recognition of their professional associations and the right to political and trade-union activity at their jobs, to control working conditions, etc. They use forms and methods tested in industrial enterprises: strikes, picketing, boycotts, different types of manifestations, and the like. They also use leaflets, public address systems and 'open assemblies' to contact and win the support and solidarity of the public. All this works for closer ties with the organized working-class movement.

The working class actively supports the conversion of new sections of the middle strata to proletarian forms of struggle. It defends their specific needs and also the demands they share with other working groups (concerning unemployment, tax pressures, declining living standards).

The content of the question of allies, as we have said, depends on the nature of the tasks facing the proletariat at different stages of its struggle and is objectively determined by the interests of the working class and the non-proletarian social groups. Naturally, the passage from the general-democratic, anti-monopoly phase to the phase of socialist transformations will considerably alter the alignment of class forces, and therefore also in some ways the problem of allies. Past experience shows that in the stage of socialist transformations the problem of retaining the support of the middle strata gains considerably in importance. Lenin stressed the special importance of anticipating the main trends in the regrouping of class forces impelled by the passage from one phase of the struggle to the next, of distinguishing temporary allies from the constant, the stable allies from the vacillating and conciliatory.

To define the content of the anti-monopoly struggle correctly, we must take into account the socialist perspective. This strategic orientation assures closer cohesion and unity of the progressive, democratic forces, broader and deeper ties with the non-proletarian masses, and growth of their combat potential in step with the growth of the social, political and economic transformation of society.

Those are some of the questions that should be examined in the discussion concerning the allies of the working class in the present general-democratic, anti-monopoly stage of the struggle.

Lessons of the First Russian Revolution

Georges Cogniot
President,
Maurice Thorez Institute

The 1905-07 revolution in Russia was the first bourgeois democratic revolution in which the working class acted as an independent political force leading the oppressed masses. It showed that the center of

the world revolutionary movement had shifted to that country. Russia's working class became the vanguard of the world proletariat. But bourgeois historians question this. They describe Lenin's idea of the revolutionary potentialities of Russia's working class as 'chimerical' and accuse the great proletarian strategist of never having given serious thought to the difficulties* arising from his conception of the bourgeois democratic revolution to be performed by the working class with support from the peasants.

Yet the facts refute this contention and others like it. Objective analysis reveals that the 1905-07 events were indeed what Lenin called a 'dress rehearsal' of the October Revolution, which transformed the world. The blow delivered to tsarist rule in 1905 by Russia's workers and peasants was also a blow to the world capitalist system. The Russian revolution, the first popular revolution of the imperialist epoch, led off a series of class battles in East and West.

The international working class and the Russian Revolution

Workers in various countries took a keen interest in the revolutionary struggle in Russia as early as the end of the nineteenth century. 'It is beyond doubt,' wrote Leo Frankel, a Hungarian revolutionary close to Marx and Engels, one-time leader of the Paris Commune, in 1879, 'that the old Russian society is pregnant with a new development. And it is beyond doubt that we are on the eve of a revolution. This revolution will give birth to a new Russia ... All the peoples of Europe would enthusiastically welcome such a revolution ...'

When the 1905 revolution broke out the whole of international reaction backed the ruling classes of Russia, but then the Russian working class enjoyed the support of the workers of all countries.

At the height of the revolution Wilhelm II put the German navy on stand-by alert and massed troops on the Russian frontier. Paris bankers advanced money to the tsar's regime as part of a proposed loan, and German bankers deferred payment of interest owed to them.

Reactionary Paris newspapers, such as *L'Autorité, La Gazette de France* and *Le Gaulois*, and publications like *Revue des Etudes Franco-Russes* backed Nicholas II's decision to use the army for suppressing the revolution rather than showing the sort of 'weakness' that had 'ruined Louis XVI.' In Paris, the clerical, monarchist and nationalist press assessed the tragedy of January 9, 1905 as effective suppression of a 'rebellion,' of a 'criminal revolt.' This was, in fact, the tenor of comments of the reactionary press in all countries.

The bourgeoisie's hostile attitude to the Russian revolution made

*Edward H. Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923*. Vol. I. London, Penguin Books, 1969, p. 54.

for greater international solidarity of the working class. Lenin wrote that the European bourgeoisie was 'prepared to give millions and billions to stop the conflagration in Russia' (Coll. Works, Vol. 9, p. 434), and stressed the European workers' fast-growing active sympathy with their Russian class brothers. After 'Bloody Sunday' – January 9, when the tsar's government massacred St. Petersburg workers on a peaceful march to the Winter Palace – workers held meetings and demonstrations outside Russia's embassies and consulates in all countries, and a fund-raising campaign got under way. It was the first time in modern history that the workers had shown such unanimity and joined in so powerful a solidarity movement.

The Russian revolution found a particularly strong response in France, where the working-class movement had been on the rise since 1902. Reports came in from everywhere about demonstrations of indignation against the 'tsar with blood-stained hands' and protests against granting Russia loans. *L'Humanité*, the Socialist newspaper, expressed sympathy for the Russian working class the day after the St. Petersburg massacre, in an editorial signed by Jean Jaures. 'From now,' it said, 'there is a river of blood between the tsar and "his people." By striking a blow at the Russian workers, the tsar has inflicted a mortal wound on himself.'

The executive commission of the trade union federation of Seine Department launched an ardent appeal to Russia's workers. 'Brothers,' it wrote, 'in spite of the frontiers and barriers that the despots of all countries raise between peoples, we have common thoughts of emancipation and suffer in common. Crushed by a hated regime, enslaved by an autocracy with which the French bourgeoisie has allied itself and weary of seeking justice, you are turning to the great liberator of the oppressed, revolution . . . The working people of the world will thrill with hope at the news of your heroic efforts.' The appeal ended with a pledge of solidarity: 'The working people of Paris, the revolutionary city, are with you heart and soul. They say to you: you may rely on us and rest assured of our aid. Down with the tsar! Down with the exploiters! Long live the social revolution!'

Late in January the General Confederation of Labor leadership resolved to hold protest meetings all over France against the crimes perpetrated by the tsar's regime. Some newspapers invited their readers to contribute funds in aid of the victims of the massacre. For three months the people of France seethed with anger.

Solidarity demonstrations were also held in 1906 and 1907, on the anniversary of 'Bloody Sunday.' Jules Guesde, Paul Lafargue, Jean Jaures and other leaders of the French Socialist movement hailed the Russian revolution.

Similar sentiments were expressed and solidarity actions carried

out in all other industrial countries of Europe.

In Britain, the Social Democratic Federation, Independent Labour Party, Fabian Society and trade unions demonstrated in support of revolutionary Russia in Glasgow, Liverpool, London and other cities.

The Russian revolution was acclaimed by the German working class. Mass meetings in Berlin in January and February 1905 welcomed the revolution and condemned tsarist terror. Hundreds of similar meetings were held in other cities. 'The proletariat of Western Europe,' wrote August Bebel in *Die Neue Zeit*, 'wishes the Russian proletariat victory. It will not envy them that victory. It knows that what the proletariat of a great country gains benefits the proletariat of all other countries.'

On the banks of the Vltava and Danube, the sentiments of the working class were no less warm nor its action less vigorous than on the Spree. Czech and Hungarian workers showed growing solidarity with their Russian brothers.

In numerous countries the solidarity movement also spread to the intelligentsia.

French progressive intellectuals led by Anatole France, Octave Mirbeau and Elisée Reclus founded a Society of Friends of the Russian People, which became an information center and a support base for Russian democrats. The action was backed by many outstanding authors and the sculptor Auguste Rodin. In a letter to the Russian historian Kareyev, the French historians Aulard, Seignobes, Sagnac and Mantoux expressed their sympathy with the Russian liberation movement. Anatole France called the Russian revolution the dawn of a new era. He foresaw the future. 'It is on the banks of the Neva, Vistula and Volga,' he said on December 16, 1905, 'that the fate of a new Europe and the future of mankind are being decided today ... Whatever the outcome of this immense and formidable enterprise, the Russian proletarians have already produced a decisive effect on the destiny of their country and the world. The Russian revolution is a world revolution.' A vast campaign was launched in defense of Maxim Gorky, who was held in Petropavlovsk Fortress at that time.

French democratic students were as active as their elders. On January 23, 1905, Paris students marched through the Latin Quarter, singing the Internationale. Next day they defied the police to assemble outside the Russian Embassy.

Similar events took place in many other countries. On February 27 a mass meeting of Budapest students sent the Russian workers a message of greeting. 'Russian brothers,' they wrote, 'you have set mankind an example of struggle for freedom. You have shown how to

fight against the most monstrous forms of oppression ... Your final victory will herald our freedom.'

The Russian Revolution stimulates the class struggle.

Under the impact of events in Russia, French workers stepped up the class struggle. In 1905-06 strikes involved twice as many workers as in the previous two years; most of the strikes assumed a political character and some of them led to clashes with troops, and in the strike at Haviland's in Limoges (April 1905) and the Pas de Calais miners' strike in March-April 1906, called after an accident in the Courrières pit.

The strike movement reached a peak when, on May 1, 1906, the workers threw the bourgeoisie into a state of panic by calling for a general strike. Their slogan – 'We shall win an eight-hour working day from Brest to Kronstadt and from Toulon to Odessa' – was expressive of their solidarity with Russia's workers.

The peasant movement, too, showed an upward trend. Winemakers of the south started a mass action in 1907. There were clashes with troops, and the 17th Infantry Regiment, stationed in the town of Agde, rebelled and joined the peasants. Regrettably, the Socialist Party did not fully appreciate the importance of the peasant question.

Official France tried to break or at least dampen the workers' revolutionary spirit. For demagogical ends, the Clemenceau government, brought to power by the Radicals' victory in the 1906 election, set up a labor ministry under Viviani, a renegade from socialism. Viviani lavished promises of far-reaching reforms while crushing the strike movement by force of arms.

In Germany the number of strikers in 1905 was four times as great as in 1904. On the initiative of August Bebel and the revolutionary wing of the Social Democratic Party, its Jena congress (September 1905) recognized mass political strikes to be a basic form of proletarian struggle. German workers called these strikes the 'Russian method.' The decisions of the Congress, Lenin said, influenced Social Democrats everywhere.

The Russian revolution spurred German Social Democrats to step up their propaganda in the countryside, especially among the numerous agricultural workers in areas east of the Elbe, dominated by Prussian junkers. Unfortunately, in this case as well, it was only the beginning of work among the small and middle peasants, for no Marxist leader of the German Social Democrats had fully grasped the meaning of the policy of alliance evolved by Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

In Austria-Hungary the years 1905-07 saw twice as many strikes as in the previous four years. Under the direct impact of the October

strike in Russia, political strikes broke out in every part of the empire. They played a decisive role in winning universal suffrage. The Hungarian workers' fight in July and August 1905 was backed by peasant risings, especially in the trans-Danubian areas, where they continued for more than two months.

On November 5, 1905 the working people of Prague held a vast demonstration in Wenceslaus Square, demanding an electoral reform and protesting against police outrages. In a number of Bohemian communities, the working people also demanded national freedom and independent statehood.

After 1905 the working-class movement also surged high in Britain. There was a series of major strikes, in particular by South Wales miners (1905-06) and by railwaymen (1906).

In Belgium general strikes broke out one after another, with the strikers demanding universal suffrage.

The Bulgarian Workers' Social-Democratic Party, the Tesnyaks, led a series of class actions, notably the Pernik miners' strike (1906).

In Finland a general strike took place from October 30 to November 6, 1905 on the Social Democrats' initiative. The strikers demanded universal suffrage and freedom of the press. As a result a law on universal suffrage was enacted in 1906.

In Sweden there were 177 strikes in 1905. The longest was that of the metalworkers, which lasted from May to October. The Liberals, then in power, tried in vain to check the growing revolutionary sentiment. in spite of emergency laws against the working-class movement passed in 1906, that year saw 182 strikes, and 289 were called in 1907.

The strike movement in Italy grew steadily from 1901 to 1910 and involved about three million people as against 500,000 in the previous decade.

Thus, Europe was a scene of mass strikes many of which assumed a distinctly political character.

Growth of workers' organizations

The growth and consolidation of workers' organizations in numerous countries was a further international result of the first Russian revolution.

In France socialist unity, virtually achieved during the action of solidarity with the Russian people in the early months of 1905, was conducive to the founding of a United Socialist Party in April 1905. Unity was based on recognition of the class struggle and condemnation of Millerandism.* The influence of socialist ideas grew irresis-

*Political cooperation between opportunist Socialist leaders and the bourgeoisie. So named after Alexandre Millerand, Socialist minister of the French bourgeois government in 1899. – *Ed.*

tibly. As a result of the 1906 general election the number of Socialist MPs increased from 38 to 52. Along with a revolutionary proletarian group, however, the party included petty-bourgeois and opportunist elements who soon exerted a negative influence on its policies.

Early in the twentieth century the British Labour Party came into being. Lenin regarded that as a sign of growth of the working-class movement. He said it was the first step toward creating a mass political organization of the British working class and overcoming sectarianism. The British workers made it clear that they wanted to end 'pure' trade unionism and fight for political demands. The Labour Party scored notable gains in the January 1906 election. However, the Party leadership was in opportunist hands. In 1906 John Burns, the trades union leader, did not hesitate to accept a minister's portfolio in a Liberal cabinet. Subsequently, the Labour Party, whose mainstay was the labor aristocracy, became the mainstay of the most zealous opportunists of the Second International.

In Rumania the Russian revolution led to an upsurge of the working-class movement and contributed to the re-emergence in 1910 of the Social-Democratic Party, which during the war in the Balkans championed peace. Numerous strikes in Bulgaria made for the growth of trade unions. The Tesnyaks, who ever since 1903 had fought under Dimitr Blagoyev's leadership against the opportunist Broad Socialists, won important positions in the working-class movement.

In Italy, the General Confederation of Labor, an organization with a centralized, mainly Socialist, leadership, was created on the initiative of the iron and steelworkers' union.

The revolution evoked response in the United States. Societies of friends of Russian freedom sprang up in Boston, San Francisco and many other cities. The working-class movement grew under the impact of the events in Russia. In 1905 the Industrial Workers of the World was founded. Led by Eugene V. Debs, William D. Haywood and Daniel de Leon, the IWW fought against corruption and opportunism. The Blacks' fight for their rights, against racial discrimination, gathered fresh momentum.

Impact of the revolution on colonial and dependent countries

Under the impact of the 1905-07 revolution, a national liberation movement developed in the East. For the first time, the imperialists' drive for maximum profit and their rule in colonies and dependencies met with considerable resistance. The Russian revolution roused the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies to struggle against imperialist tyranny.

Events in Russia had a strong effect on the revolutionary process in China, which culminated in the establishment of the Chinese Republic

in 1911. The political awakening of the Chinese people was characterized above all by growing national awareness and patriotism and by an expanding revolutionary movement. Numerous revolutionary and patriotic organizations of students, the bourgeoisie, army men and officers and civil servants sprang up in the country and abroad, among emigrants and Chinese students in developed countries.

The first major action was a boycott of U.S. goods in 1905. At the close of that year Sun Yat-sen, whom Lenin considered a great democrat and an ideologist of the peasant revolution, founded a revolutionary and democratic party of intellectuals and progressive members of the bourgeoisie.

The 1905-1907 revolution awakened the revolutionary and national consciousness of the Iranian people, who in December 1905 held spontaneous meetings and demonstrations in Tehran and other cities, demanding the convocation of a representative assembly. In August 1906 the alarmed Shah decided to convene a majlis.

As far back as the late nineteenth century, the Young Turks had founded a bourgeois revolutionary movement in Turkey. The movement involved intellectuals, mostly army officers, doctors and petty officials representing the interests of the bourgeoisie and liberal landowners. A secret committee known as Unity and Progress became the Young Turks' chief political organization. Under the impact of the Russian revolution, the revolutionary movement in the Caucasus, and the revolution which broke out in Iran in 1905, a revolutionary situation took shape in Turkey. There were spontaneous risings in 1906-1907 in Erzurum, Trebizond and other Anatolian cities, as well as in the navy and in some army units. The Macedonians, Albanians, Armenians, Arabs and other non-Turkish peoples of the Ottoman Empire also stepped up their struggle. The bourgeois character of the revolution made for a rapid decline in the democratic trends of the Young Turks' movement.

In India the revolutionary democratic current regarded armed rising as the principal means of overthrowing colonial rule and winning independence. The movement reached a peak when, in 1908, the workers of Bombay called a mass political strike, which developed into street fighting against British troops. During peasant revolts which assumed the greatest scale in East Bengal, attempts were made to make contact with the striking workers of cities.

Unrest spread throughout Asia, from Afghanistan to Indonesia. 'Hundreds of millions of the downtrodden and benighted,' Lenin wrote, 'have awakened from medieval stagnation to a new life and are rising to fight for elementary human rights and democracy' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 19, p. 86).

The echo of the Russian revolution carried as far as Latin America.

In Mexico the textile workers of Puebla and Veracruz formed the Great Circle of Free Workers in 1906. In 1909 the 'Manifesto of the Democratic Party' came out and working-class actions took place in Casas Grandes and Viesca. 'The fight developing in Russia was our lodestar,' Romero Flores, a veteran of the Mexican revolution (1910-17), said later.

Lessons of 1905-07 today

'In our time, when the international working class is winning the leading role in a vast and powerful general democratic movement against imperialism, the historic experience of the first Russian revolution and Lenin's ideas about the hegemony of the working class in the revolutionary struggle of the masses are particularly relevant,' said the CC CPSU in its resolution on the 70th anniversary of the first Russian revolution.

As far as the anti-monopoly democratic movement in developed capitalist countries is concerned, the primary and most important lesson of that experience is that the working class was the leader in the bid for democratic changes. In 1905 Russia's industrial proletariat showed itself to be an independent militant force. Today the working class of France, Italy, Portugal, Spain and many other countries and its Marxist-Leninist parties lead the fight against reaction, for freedom and social progress. 'The alliance of the French people,' said FCP General Secretary Georges Marchais at the 21st Party Congress, 'must be brought about by ... drawing in new social strata, which must be regrouped on a clear basis in a vast alignment. At the center of this vast alignment is the working class, its motive power and the spearhead of the struggle for change.' Every attempt to minimize the leading role of the working class tends to weaken the general democratic movement.

The principle of the leading role of the working class applies to the world revolutionary process as a whole. The Maoists, by advocating hegemony of the 'world countryside' over the 'world town,' misrepresent reality to weaken the international working-class movement.

Second, the experience of the first Russian revolution is evidence of the importance and need of the alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian sections of the oppressed, who in 1905 were mostly peasants. The policy of alliance and unification of all the classes and strata exploited by big capital, the ability of the working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, to offer these strata a broad social and popular policy, a policy of united fronts with parties expressing the interests of the bourgeoisie and middle strata and determined to fight against the monopolies, have their roots in precisely that experience. This is what Lenin called a 'Left bloc' during the first Russian revolution.

Third, the experience of 1905 shows that the workers' fight for democracy does not at all put them in a false position, as the Mensheviks contended. Whereas in 1905 the Bolsheviks insisted that the fight against absolutism and remnants of feudal rule, for a democratic republic, was the prime task, in countries like France the main problem today is to fight for far-reaching democratic changes, a drastic restriction of monopoly power, and advanced democracy.

Lenin said that there is no 'Chinese Wall' between the struggle for democratic freedoms and the struggle for socialism. Trotsky did not understand the dialectic of the bourgeois democratic revolution developing into the socialist revolution. He wanted simply to skip the bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution, which would have led to the isolation and defeat of the working class. Like Trotsky, today's 'leftists' deny the importance of the stage of struggle for democratic changes in countries under the iron heel of monopolies.

The history of the past 70 years has confirmed Lenin's conclusion about the democratic and socialist objectives drawing closer together. This conclusion is at the basis of the present-day concept of anti-monopoly democracy, which provides for a transitional type of society and state power.

Another important lesson of the 1905 revolution is related to the decisive importance of the party as vanguard of the working class and educator and organizer of the masses. The principal method of accomplishing the tasks of the anti-monopoly struggle is to build up the political and organizational influence of the Communist party among the working class, in the enterprises. The Party must develop its own initiative and mobilize the masses everywhere. A strong Communist party capable of calling on the masses to speak out on all vitally important issues is the best guarantee of preserving and promoting the unity of democratic parties.

In spite of the difference in historical conditions, the activity of Lenin and the Bolsheviks during the first Russian revolution has lost none of its validity. To study and creatively apply the fundamental lessons of 1905 today means helping to raise the international working-class movement to a higher level.

---

political panorama

The masses in motion

Gilberto Vieira
General Secretary, Communist Party of Colombia

Colombia, a nation of 24 million, has entered a new stage in the mass democratic struggle at a time of mounting crisis of the whole moribund socio-economic structure of society. Capitalist development in the country is lopsided, dependent on North American imperialism, and with semi-feudal survivals in the rural areas. Political life is based on a firmly entrenched *two-party* system.

For more than 125 years the traditional parties, the Liberal and Conservative, have dominated the national political scene. With the emergence of the military as a political force, which made its claim to power in the coup d'état of 1953, the Liberal and Conservative leadership proceeded to forge a close class alliance (the National Front) to ward off the military challenge in affairs of state while preventing a democratic solution of national problems.

That alliance was legalized in the Constitution, as amended by the stage-managed plebiscite of 1957. It introduced a bipartisan system of government based on 'sharing of responsibility' which provided for equal representation of Liberals and Conservatives in government and parliament. Liberal and Conservative nominees also alternated every four-year term as president of the republic. That blatantly anti-democratic act of Colombia's big bourgeoisie was hailed by the propaganda media as the only guarantee of peace and of ending fierce, bloody clashes in the country.

That two-party monopoly remains a major political obstacle to overcoming the structural crisis and expanding the popular struggle. For a long time all attempts to set up political parties and movements opposed to the two-party system had failed.[1] Only the Communist Party, founded in 1930, managed to overcome the powerful political barrier of the two-party system blocking its way and gain a firm foothold in national life. In the 45 years since then it has forged confidently ahead, despite temporary retreats.[2]

In recent years the National Popular Alliance (ANAPO) formed

under General Rojas Pinilla has been trying to establish itself as a new party. A movement of the middle strata suffering from capitalist development, it is Peronism Colombian style, with right and left-wing factions. ANAPO reached its zenith in 1970 and has since declined markedly.

The Christian-Democrat Party has not only failed to advance but actually declined despite the vast Catholic majority and support from Christian-Democrat governments in Europe and Latin America.

Lately various ultra-leftist groups have been mushrooming all over the country, but their vagueness, absence of nationwide coordination, endlessly shifting positions and proclaimed freedom of factionalism make it hard to distinguish between them. They include Maoist and neo-Trotskyite groups styling themselves the 'vanguard of the revolution.' For all their mutual rivalries, they have one thing in common: out-and-out anti-communism and rabid anti-Sovietism.

With the National Front discredited, its spiritual fathers launched a step-by-step reform that would gradually dismantle it and restore so-called representative democracy. The first stage ended in 1970 with elections to municipal councils and department assemblies. The second stage culminated in 1974 with elections to the National Congress and presidential elections, which put an end to the two-party parliamentary sharing and alternating of representatives in the presidential office. But the Conservative and Liberal monopoly in the machinery of state, judicial and electoral systems institutionalized by the Constitution will continue until 1978.

In the 1974 election campaign the ruling class strove to polarize public opinion over the Liberal and Conservative presidential candidates. But to millions of Colombians the Conservative candidate, Gomez Hurtado, was one of the active supporters of the ultra-reactionary dictatorship of the 1950s headed by his father. Seeing him as an embodiment of the fascist threat, they voted overwhelmingly for the Liberal candidate, Lopez Michelsen, whose family is known for its democratic traditions and who promised the people freedom and denounced rising prices and even the 'desarrollismo' concept of capitalist development.

The ANAPO vote declined sharply and the Christian Democrats also made an extremely poor showing. Substantial progress was recorded by the Communist Party in collaboration with the National Opposition Union (UNO)[3] which, despite internal differences, put forward a single list of candidates.

Although by and large the masses still harbor illusions regarding the government, the main thing, in the Communist view, is that those who voted for Lopez Michelsen, as well as for other candidates, are insisting on the fulfillment of election promises and putting forward

new demands. In May 1974, the CP Central Committee stressed that the elections had marked the beginning of a *new political process* which could produce a *new* situation in the country, a new political climate and a *new government*.

The present administration is an expression of the rule and domination of Colombian and foreign financial and monopoly capital connected with the latifundists. It encourages foreign investment and has opened the floodgates to foreign loans – a continuation of the very policies of previous governments so vehemently criticized by Lopez Michelsen during his election campaign.

Loans totalling $400 million are envisaged in 1975, with another $500 million in 1976. At that rate the external debt of $3.5 billion chalked up by the end of 1974, could well double before the end of the administration's term of office. This feeds inflation and the further deformation of economic development. And new taxes are making things still worse for the people as a whole and the middle sections in particular.

The regime has taken a negative stand on the issue of national resources (a major issue in the struggle of every developing country). Under the pretext of 'emergency economic measures,' President Lopez Michelsen has extended humiliating privileges to foreign monopolies operating rich gas fields, which allow them to export hydrocarbon products without compensation; it has also engaged in a policy of 'partnership' under the signboard of 'Colombianization' of oil.[4] New decrees make it simpler for imperialist monopolies to take over rich reserves of coal and nickel to the detriment of national interests.

President Lopez Michelsen asserts that his administration has conceived a stabilization plan aimed at reducing inflation without detriment to growing employment. It represents a series of measures that could have been adopted only by a president supremely confident of his mass appeal and is designed to create favorable conditions for the ruling oligarchic group at the expense of the living standard of the vast majority.

The president claims that there is no crisis in Colombia, citing as proof figures of increased savings and, especially, higher profits of major companies. He also claims that the problem facing the administration is not higher production but higher consumption, adding that there is no question of producing more, because we are already producing *more than enough* cotton, textiles, garments, rice, soybeans and meat.

This educated and experienced statesman ignores the inescapable fact that, in a *dependent* capitalist country like Colombia, modern capitalism leads to the irrational state of affairs where the working

people cannot buy and consume the products of their labor. The Colombian market is too narrow to absorb all the produced commodities, especially when attempts are being made to expand production for the external market at a time when export conditions for some products are worsening.

A characteristic feature of the present stage in the crisis of the whole capitalist system obviously ignored by the administration is that, while the market is constrained by the low purchasing capacity of the people, the profits of big capitalist enterprises are steadily rising and prices are kept high, which in turn narrows the market and mass purchasing capacity.

People see that prices for services and prime necessities continue to rise, though unemployment is also going up. The stabilization plan is in fact leading to greater inflation, higher prices and unemployment and is of benefit only to Yankee imperialism, the latifundists and big local monopolies. Overall, there is taking place not only a relative,[5] but also an *absolute impoverishment* of the working class, peasants, artisans and the middle strata in general. These are concrete, active factors in the development of the popular struggle and mobilization of the masses to action for higher living standards and better working conditions.

A new Colombian development is the upsurge of the mass movement. An entirely new climate for mass action and organizations has been created as a result of the winning of certain democratic guarantees and rights, for example, the freedom of street processions and demonstrations, which had been all but wiped out by the dictatorships during long periods of states of emergency (a favorite form of big bourgeoisie rule in the years of the National Front parity system).

But we Communists harbor no illusions about 'constitutionality' or the extent of 'Colombian democracy.' Like all other bourgeois-democratic systems, it is a deformed democracy, mainly in the interests of big capital, which uses some democratic forms as a tool of its class rule.

Whenever possible the oligarchy bans strikes, suspends the legal rights of trade unions and suppresses mass strike actions by such measures as curfews. Killings of peasants, workers and students continue. Participants in demonstrations, strikers and political agitators are jailed. Extensive military operations are being conducted in rural areas, where the only authorities are the military and police, who take vengeance on the peasants for their failures in the anti-guerrilla struggle. Food rationing is introduced, arbitrary detention and torture are commonplace.

Achievements in the sphere of civil rights are limited and cannot be considered irreversible, but they do help expand the struggle for

democracy and overcome obstacles to mass action and organizations. That is an important aspect of the situation achieved as a result of mass action by people unafraid of 'violating' government bans and restrictions.

From the very beginning of the Lopez Michelsen administration, large sections of the people moved from passive expectation to active manifestations of discontent, to protest and action. As a consequence, the administration's prestige has declined, and this has encouraged the mass struggle and more sweeping demands.

The Communist Party currently stresses the need to expand the struggle for genuine freedoms for the people, against threats of declaring a state of emergency used by the authorities to blackmail the labor and popular movement; for the rights of workers and their trade unions, against police surveillance of trade unions and the arbitration courts that function during strikes; for the rights and freedoms of rural workers whose organizations are persecuted by the latifundists and the bureaucrats serving them and whose lands have been occupied by army units under the pretext of fighting guerrillas; for the repeal of all reactionary laws violating public freedoms, and against the reactionary military patronized by U.S. military missions, whose privileges are detrimental to national sovereignty and economic interests.

The upsurge of the struggle is in direct relation to the growing role of the working class. Strikes of both workers and employees are mounting, and large rallies and demonstrations are held to protest government measures. A form of mass struggle peculiar to Colombia are *civil strikes,* which involve a whole city or district. They are called in support of demands for effective government solution of problems of water or electricity supply, public transport systems, schools, etc.

Another peculiar form of struggle employed in various regions is the blocking of transport routes, usually to protest rising transport costs.

The movement for housing has acquired a mass character, often erupting into pitched battles in which squatters take over vacant lots in an attempt to resolve the extremely difficult housing situation in expanding cities.

In the countryside, farm laborers and poor peasants are occupying uncultivated lands of big latifundists, frequently offering resistance to the armed forces defending the 'sacred right' of semi-feudal interests.

Mass actions tend to evolve into political action,[6] and the Communists must encourage this. We are doing much to unite the expanding mass struggles into one stream and turn them into a national struggle with specific anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist objectives.

In solving this important task we must raise the political level of the mass struggle. It is also necessary to find correct solutions in the

confrontation with right-opportunist sentiment (currently associated primarily with illusions regarding the Lopez Michelsen administration), as well as with anarchistic and adventurist views, which represent a serious threat. Without a consistent proletarian orientation mass action may erupt into premature spontaneous outbursts providing the class enemy with an opportunity for provocations.

In the Communist view, the causes of the mounting ideological and political struggle for influence among the increasingly active masses are: the emergence of ultra-leftist groups, which manage to win over some supporters; weakening of the traditional two-party system, reflected in clashes between rival Liberal and Conservative party groups; mass realization of the need for urgent socio-political change; the growing role of the Communist Party, against which imperialism and the big bourgeoisie are pitting certain 'ultra-revolutionary groups' in the hope of misleading the increasingly radicalized masses.

We realize that we can give correct orientation to the mass struggle and help overcome anarchistic trends only by resolute and active participation in all forms of that struggle. In other words, only daily purposeful active work in the mass movements can rouse the people to action against Yankee imperialism and the two-party oligarchy and assure a genuinely democratic way out of the structural crisis.

The direction political developments take depends on the actions of the masses, on popular and worker unity. History shows that the power of the big bourgeoisie and its allies thrives on the absence of unity of the working class and the people as a whole.

During the cold war period the helm of government was in the hands of the most reactionary circles influenced by fascist ideas, especially the Franco variety, and the official policy was one of 'fire and sword' to suppress the democratic opposition. The methods employed were much like those of the fascist tyranny in Chile.

A drive was launched to split the working class. The united trade union center (CTC) was systematically persecuted. With the support of the big capitalists and the U.S. embassy, a new trade union center of Catholic, it was claimed, orientation was organized. Called the Colombian Workers' Union (UTC), it was well financed and during the grim decade of 1948-1958 was the only officially recognized labor center; its platform was one of rabid anti-communism and class collaboration.

In 1960, the CTC held its congress in the town of Cartagena. The government demanded that Liberal trade union leaders break with the Communists. The police ejected delegates representing the majority of the trade unions from the congress, after which the CTC became a contemptible appendage of the U.S. embassy.

Communists and other independent labor organizations set up a

committee of trade union unity and solidarity uniting the organizations expelled at the CTC congress. They decided to form an independent class-oriented Colombian Workers' Trade Union Confederation (CSTC), which consistently upheld the interests of the working people and became the organizational basis of united action. That proletarian labor center, speaking for almost 200,000 workers, was set up in 1964. For 10 years the Liberal-Conservative regime refused to recognize it. Finally, on August 20, 1974, the Lopez Michelsen administration gave it legal recognition.

The CSTC at once began to prepare for its second congress, a congress of unity. The ruling classes did all they could to disrupt its efforts. They launched a vociferous campaign of slander and provocation, spearheaded by the Minister of Labor, who accused the CSTC of subversive activities aimed at bringing down the government by means of *civil strikes*. The purpose behind those provocations was to deal a blow against not only the CSTC but the mass struggle as a whole.

At the very last moment the 'Independent Revolutionary Labor Movement' (MOIR), a Maoist grouping paying lip service to unity, was used against the Second Congress. When the MOIR leaders saw that they had no influence at the congress they began to attack it. That perfidious anti-democratic maneuver was widely publicized in the big bourgeois press.

The Second Congress of the CSTC, which by then represented 400,000 workers, was a major success. It opened up new prospects of working-class unity, which the Party is forging in the crucible of class struggle. It means greater Communist responsibility and broader tasks in the revolutionary drive for unity.

The Party has set the following main tasks for the present: 1) consolidate the unity process, expanding it to new areas, independent organizations and rank-and-file members of the CTC and UTC; 2) set up new trade unions in industrial and agrarian centers, organize the unorganized masses of the working people; 3) support every mass action with extensive solidarity campaigns: this is a duty of the working class and the most effective means of achieving unity of the working class and the whole people; 4) actively help raise the class consciousness of the working people, educating them in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

The road to popular unity is a difficult one. The Communist Party belongs to the Left front – the National Opposition Alliance (UNO) formed in September 1972 on the initiative of the Broad Colombian Movement, a break-away group from ANAPO. Initially, the UNO included the Broad Colombian Movement (MAC), Communist Party and small Christian-Democratic Party which, however, soon left the

Front in connection with the events in Chile. The UNO collectively drew up and circulated a nine-point program as a basis for carrying out the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution with the long-term prospect of transition to socialism. A year after the UNO was formed it was joined by the MOIR group, which gave up the slogans of non-participation in elections and armed struggle advanced by other rival Maoist groups.

As mentioned before, thanks to the Communist Party's unity policy, the UNO took part in the 1974 elections with a presidential candidate of its own and common lists of candidates to the Congress, department assemblies and municipal councils.

A meeting of our Party's Central Committee in May 1974 noted: The elections demonstrated that the UNO is an important fact, the embryo of a patriotic national liberation front. It has become a school of struggle, strengthened the opposition to sectarianism and made it possible for the country as a whole to understand the role of the Communist Party as a uniting force.

However, the UNO's development was temporarily paralyzed by right-wing and ultra-leftist tendencies. A liberal faction emerged which advocated reconciliation with the Lopez Michelsen administration. Simultaneously, the MOIR shifted to a sectarian position, with its supporters striving to hold up and restrict the unity process. Three MPs elected in 1974 left the Broad Colombian Movement after criticism of their inconsistent stand, announcing their intention to set up a socialist party 'without foreign tutelage.' The Communist Party holds that the crisis in the UNO can be overcome by a consistent policy of unity, expansion of membership, and defense and propaganda of its program.

The struggle within ANAPO is between the supporters and opponents of unity of all left forces. There still remains the strong nationalist trend whose adherents support the false 'two imperialisms' thesis. But left views are making headway, and more and more of the rank-and-file are coming to realize the need for united action. Since the death of Rojas Pinilla, the 'Colombian Peron,' the Communists have been seeking joint action with left-wing ANAPO forces and are working in its mass local organizations. The unity policy and collective action are advancing in the face of the traditional 'caudillismo.' These are *new* aspects of a *new* situation.

Does a critical analysis of the political situation in Colombia warrant the conclusion that it must inevitably lead to more confrontations, the introduction of a permanent state of emergency, an anti-democratic authoritarian government, and even a reactionary coup d'état? Of course, the danger exists, but it can be avoided.

The Communist Party has defined the new administration as a

continuation in power of the big pro-imperialist bourgeoisie in alliance with the latifundists. However, it will not be simple for the administration to go back on its commitments to the masses that elected it and resort to emergency measures and mass repressions without losing credibility. That would be contrary to the interests of the Liberal Party leadership, to which the President belongs, and this explains some of the 'reformist' aspects of the regime's policies.[7]

Furthermore, Lopez Michelsen is influenced by the growing resistance to U.S. imperialism's predatory policy of oppression, also opposed in different ways and to various degrees by a number of Latin American governments. Under the pressure of public opinion Colombia has re-established diplomatic relations with socialist Cuba (against the OAS bans) and shows readiness to promote trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, although this is hindered by obstacles artificially set up by imperialist agents in the state apparatus. The administration is, to a degree, in solidarity with Venezuela and Ecuador, which are protesting against the discriminatory trade reform bill passed by the United States, and for diplomatic reasons it supports the anti-imperialist struggle of the Panamanian people and government for the restoration of sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

The Communist Party holds that recent events all over the world have made a positive impact on the situation in Colombia. The international situation is characterized by advances of the forces of peace, progress and socialism. It is highlighted by the policy of international détente and stimulates the struggle against imperialism. The consistent policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community yields tangible results benefical to the peoples. Contrary to the claims of Maoists and Trotskyites long since refuted by facts, far from holding up revolutionary changes, détente opens up better opportunities for them.

But the détente policy does not mean passivity on our part. It demands vigilance, because aggressive, reactionary forces trying to discredit the principles of peaceful coexistence and calling for more war preparations remain active. We are attentively following the 'differences of opinion' between Colombia and Venezuela, whose ruling circles are unable to come to terms on the old border dispute on the continental shelf and in territorial waters, mainly because they fear the dissatisfaction of chauvinistic circles which U.S. imperialism sets off one against the other.

Hence the importance of carrying out the tasks set in the November 1974 joint statement of the Communist Parties of Venezuela and Colombia, which calls for the strengthening of fraternal ties between

our peoples, making impossible the military confrontation being provoked by forces striving to prevent the announced oil nationalization in Venezuela and to forcibly halt the upsurge of the democratic struggle in both countries.

The Communist Party's 12th congress, to be held in December, will be a major landmark in the revolutionary process in Colombia. The preparations for it will give Party members the opportunity critically to analyze and discuss the Party's policies, which will help rectify mistakes by collective efforts, liquidate shortcomings in revolutionary activity, and set Party guidelines for the new stage. This analysis and discussion must be combined with more active participation in the mass struggle, the class battles, in broader anti-imperialist action on a higher level.

Preparation for the congress is also connected with the implementation of the plan of Party building. The expansion of united action calls for a larger Party membership. That is the basis for a qualitative improvement of its work.

As before, the Communist Party of Colombia sees its task in promoting international Communist unity on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism and Marxism-Leninism. At the same time, we are contributing to the best of our ability to the creation of a world anti-imperialist front. These are prime objectives of the time.

1. That was the fate of the National Party which President Rafael Nunez (a highly controversial figure) attempted to form at the end of the 19th century, the Republican Party (a fleeting reaction to the dictatorship of General Reyes in 1911), Jorge Eliecer Gaitan's Left National-Revolutionary Alliance (1932), and the spate of socialist parties that appeared and vanished with kaleidoscopic speed.

2. Due to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influences and fierce fascist-type repressions that drove the Party underground. The Party responded with armed guerrilla struggle in the grim decade of 1948-1958.

3. In the 1970 elections the Communist candidates were elected to municipal councils and department assemblies, and in 1974 the Party won seats in the National Congress.

4. Colombia is compelled to import oil because the foreign monopolies have deliberately cut back production in order to impose higher prices, which the state refinery has to pay for our own oil. The monopolies have cynically declared that if the government does not increase the price soon the oil will start to 'disappear.'

5. On the whole their incomes are rising 'not as fast' as those of the owners of capital, President Lopez Michelsen conceded in his message to Congress.

6. Often mass actions are anti-imperialist in character, and Communists carry out explanatory work, encouraging for example, protest actions against the raising of service fees by government enterprises entering into unfavorable loan contracts with U.S. financial corporations.

7. For example, legal recognition of the CSTC, the law on factory day nurseries, expansion of women's rights, appointment of a number of democrats as rectors of state universities, etc.

From cradle of bourgeois freedoms to state-monopoly capitalism

Letters from the USA

ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE REVOLUTION IN NORTH AMERICA

Two hundred years ago the shots that rang out in Lexington on April 19, 1775, began a revolutionary war which culminated in the birth of an independent state – the United States of America.* Those shots, as William Z. Foster pointed out, were heard around the world. The consequences of the American Revolution went far beyond the boundaries of the American continent.

What is the progressive significance of the American Revolution? Why do the Communists of the United States, and with them the Marxists of other countries, consider it important to express their view of the Bicentennial observances?

Stressing the worldwide significance of the American Revolution, Marx said that in the American colonies of Great Britain 'the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first Declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century.'** But Marx also pointed to the limitations of that revolution which had 'initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class' and was, therefore, unable to live up to the democratic principles advanced by its leaders and, in particular, to abolish slavery. Marx and Engels foresaw that the traditions of the revolution and the promises of bourgeois democracy would be subverted and betrayed in the course of capitalist development, and explained how and why this would happen.

Lenin elaborated on Marx's ideas. 'In not a *single* one of the most

*The war (1775-1783) ended with Britain's recognition of the independence of the United States of North America. It was a war of liberation and culminated in the victory of the U.S. bourgeois-democratic revolution. – *Ed.*

**Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow 1973, Vol. 2, pp. 22-23.

advanced countries in the world,' he wrote, have the questions of bourgeois-democratic revolution 'been *completely* settled on *bourgeois-democratic* lines' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 33, p. 53). Noting that the socialist revolution 'is not separated by a Chinese Wall from the bourgeois-democratic revolution,' Lenin attached prime importance to consolidating the bourgeois-democratic gains, and to using them as a starting point for building socialist relations by the victorious proletariat. Drawing on the experience of revolutionary Russia, he formulated the following correlation between the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions: 'The first develops into the second. The second, in passing, solves the problems of the first. The second consolidates the work of the first. Struggle, and struggle alone, decides how far the second succeeds in outgrowing the first' (Ibid., p. 54).

History has confirmed this. While state-monopoly authoritarianism reigns in the citadels of bourgeois democracy and the anti-democratic trends grow stronger, the ideals of the great bourgeois revolutions of the past centuries have been fully attained and greatly surpassed in the countries of the socialist community. The people of the United States, for example, still face the challenge of defending many of the democratic rights and freedoms inscribed in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution 200 years ago.

In the front ranks of the struggle stands the U.S. working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard. The Communist parties of other countries, progressives the world over, are ranged by their side, for to them the Declaration of Independence is not a purely American thing, but a document of historic significance for the entire world which has absorbed all the advanced ideas of the English revolution and the French encyclopaedians, and, as William Z. Foster said, boldly proclaimed the inherent right of the people to revolution. This is why the Bicentennial of the American Revolution is rightly associated with the topical problems of the workers' and progressives' struggle for general-democratic goals today.

The Bicentennial is celebrated on a spectacular scale in the United States. Officially, the celebrations began on March 1, 1975, and will end on December 31, 1976. Some of the events of the War of Independence are to be re-enacted as part of the celebrations. And the climax will come on July 4, 1976, with observances of the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia.

With the establishment by Congress of an American Revolution Bicentennial Administration in December 1973, differences of opinion emerged concerning the content of the celebrations. At first the prevailing view, promulgated by the federal, state and city administra-

tions, would give the celebrations a purely formal character, manifested in patriotic oratory and displays of the flag, parades with martial music, art exhibits, fireworks, and the like. But as time passed, another view gained adherents, according to which the celebrations should reinform and reinforce the people's dedication to the principles, purposes and goals set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

These divergent views have now congealed into a sharp conflict. The democratic public, which associates the Bicentennial with the topical problems of U.S. reality is raising its voice for the latter approach. It is therefore apparent that the Bicentennial has become another sphere of struggle in the USA over crucial domestic and foreign policies.

This came into evidence, among other things, on April 20, 1975, at the ceremony highlighting the first round of the Bicentennial observances, the 200th anniversary of the encounter between British troops and the colonists at Concord, Massachusetts, which symbolizes the beginning of the War of Independence. Of the 100,000 attending the ceremony, 30,000 were grouped under banners of a 'People's Bicentennial.' In contrast to the cold war rhetoric of the official organizers, the protesters denounced U.S. monopolies and the government's military spending.

U.S. ruling circles, however, carry on undaunted. They look to the celebrations to provide a bonanza for business interests and a spur to recovery from the economic crisis. Billions of dollars are being spent for the many hundreds of events scheduled by the federal government, the cities and states and numerous organizations. For instance, Philadelphia alone expects to spend $372.4 million on special events and public works.

These circles also want the revolutionary-democratic utterances of the leaders of the struggle for independence to be interpreted in such a way as to check the growing disaffection of the masses with the U.S. two-party system of electoral politics, largely discredited by the Watergate affair.

Moreover, elements of the governing circles calculate on using the Bicentennial to rally popular support for policies furthering U.S. state-monopoly capitalism's global aims. Blind to the new balance of world forces, and undeterred by the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Indochina and by setbacks in other quarters of the globe, these diehard sections of the U.S. financial-industrial-military-political complex cling to the discredited policies 'from positions of strength,' and are attempting to prevent the consolidation of the international political détente with a military détente. However, their pursuit of this policy encounters increasing resistance from the U.S. masses, which the ruling element is trying to overcome by manipulating the Bicen-

tennial and emphasizing the purely military aspects of the American Revolution, while obscuring its class content and the many progressive general democratic provisions of the Declaration of Independence, which are so relevant and topical now.

Since the Bicentennial is topical as well as historical, international as well as national, the Communist Party USA considers it advisable to acquaint the readers of *World Marxist Review* with the issues and stakes involved in the struggle around this extraordinary event. Accordingly, prominent U.S. Marxists will present their views concerning the 200 years of U.S. history in a series of letters to be published consecutively in the journal through the remainder of 1975. In their entirety, they will present a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the Bicentennial and its implications both for the peoples of the USA and for the world.

The letters of this series will describe how a state originating in a democratic revolution became the main force of global counter-revolution, how the proclaimed ideals of bourgeois democracy have become in this most advanced country of developed capitalism a crisis of bourgeois democracy. And CP USA General Secretary Gus Hall, in a concluding article of the series, will present the Communist Party's view of the future of the United States of America.

The first letter in the series appears in this issue.

John Pittman
Member of Political
Committee, CC, CP USA

The class character of the American Revolution

Herbert Aptheker,
Director, American Institute
of Marxist Studies

In the United States today there are two apparently contradictory views of the American Revolution which dominate the news media, the publishing industry and academia. One, associated with the attitude of the Daughters of the American Revolution and given sophis-

ticated reiteration in the writings of Daniel J. Boorstin, among many others, holds that the unique feature of the American Revolution was that it was not a revolution, or, at most, that it was a conservative revolution. This concept fills the official pronouncements and spirit of the Bicentennial Commission of the United States Government.

The other view holds that the American Revolution was a perfect one in conception and execution; that it was the quintessence of human accomplishment and that its applicability to the present is complete. To the degree that this view emphasizes the shortcomings of present-day U.S. society and dominant policy, it possesses progressive elements; but in its tendency to make the event of the 18th century an unblemished model for all time, it falsifies history and tends to reinforce the foundations of the status quo, especially since it ignores the hegemony in that revolution of the classes possessing the means of production, which, then, included not only the bourgeoisie but also the slaveowners. Such a view of the revolution results not only in downplaying the reality of class defferientation and struggle in the Amcerica of the 18th century; it also tends to minimize – or even ignore – the realities of chattel slavery and of the genocidal policy pursued toward the Indian peoples and the vile racism that served as the rationalization and prop for both atrocities.

Seeing the revolution in this uncritical and false manner tends also to support the quite conservative and reactionary view that holds that a revolutionary outlook in the present for an American is on its face un-American and truly alien. This was the characteristic view of such notorious reactionaries, for example, as the late Nicholas Murray Butler, formerly president of Columbia University, who insisted that since – in his opinion – the revolution of the 18th century produced a perfect society or at least a model for a perfect society and even a method for alterations should blemishes appear, one who lived in this paradise and still retained a revolutionary outlook was either a madman or an agent of some hostile foreign power!

There also exists in the United States today, especially among ultra-Leftists and other political infants, an utterly cynical view of the American Revolution in which the event as a whole is simply dismissed as farcical or meaningless or hypocritical or demagogic and other such labels reflecting the emptiness of the heads concocting them. The practical result of this view – as in everything else associated with the ultra-Left – is to assist the ruling class in ballyhooing the revolution and turning its 'celebration' into an occasion for selling toothpaste and deodorants.

The revolution which resulted in the creation of the United States of America was the product of the interplay of three fundamental forces: a) the contradiction in the relationship between colonizing

power and colonists; b) the contradictions within the colonies expressive of their class divisions and the fact that whenever these contradictions reached politically explosive phases the power of Britain was exercised in support of the status quo and in opposition to popular forces; and c) the development through several generations of the sense of a distinction between being an 'American' and being an Englishman; that is, the forging of a new nation and therefore of a distinct national consciousness. One may add that the dialectical interlocking of these forces served to influence and exacerbate each, so that a) and b) helped in the forging of c) and the latter helped accentuate the former, etc.

Those specific aspects of the revolution which explain why Lenin could refer to it as 'one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 62) include the following:

The American Revolution was the first successful colonial rebellion in modern history and it marked the overcoming in armed struggle by an aroused population of the greatest military and naval power in the world at that time.

It affirmed in achievement and in theory – as in the Declaration of Independence – the right of national self-determination.

It postulated the equality of all men, again notably in the Declaration of Independence. Of course, its authors meant men and not women and meant propertied men and not indentured men, nor enslaved men, nor colored men; but for its time even the limited meaning of its usage was a significant advance over conditions then prevailing in the world. Furthermore, with the sweep of its language, other times and other societies would universalize the concept so that it would indeed include the great idea of the essential equality of humanity – in its needs, dreams, aspirations and capacities.

The revolution and the instruments of government resulting from it expounded the concept of popular sovereignty. Again, with those who announced this, its meaning was limited to the concept of 'people' in the 18th century – male, white, propertied. But many among the people, then, too, read this quite differently. Furthermore, the idea of popular sovereignty was something quite new for hitherto sovereignty inhered in the Sovereign and all these words were spelled with capital letters to reflect the great dignity associated with them and the reverence required. In that sense, the very term 'popular sovereignty' was a linguistic innovation if not contradiction and its fullest implementation in all areas of life was and remains the basic agenda of history ever since the 18th century.

The revolution was based on the political theory that the purpose of government *ought to be* one which makes possible among its

citizenry – note citizenry, not subjects – 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness' – the latter phrase a significant alteration from John Locke's* affirmation that government should protect 'life, liberty and property.' It is not that the Fathers of the Revolution were men who rejected the notion that the security of private property was the basic purpose of government; on the contrary, they accepted this as axiomatic. But, nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the Lockean concept was amended and that the amendment makes possible – indeed, invites – broader and more humane purposes of government than those announced by the 17th century revolutionists.

The revolutionists insisted that only a government with the purposes just described was a government; without such purposes so-called government degenerated into tyranny and when such degeneration appeared, the revolutionists declared (and were practising) that it was not only the right but it was the duty of those inhabiting so afflicted a land to make every effort to alter it, to bring it into accordance with proper aims of government and that if such alteration could only be accomplished through revolution, then that, too, became both a right and an obligation.

The revolutionists came to the conclusion that monarchy and inherited nobility were incompatible with popular sovereignty and with purposes of government which envisaged support for the pursuit of happiness as well as contradicting concepts of human equality. Therefore, they instituted republican forms of government in each of the rebelling colonies and in the central government; in doing this they 'smashed' the former state and forged a quite new one. Special attention is to be given to the fact that the two central aspects of the revolution – independence and a republican form of government – were guaranteed by the Constitution whose adoption sealed the revolution. That is, just as one would be treasonous if he sought the elimination of the independence of the United States of America so also would one be treasonous if he sought to terminate the republican form of government. Both remained significantly threatened for a generation after the revolution succeeded in battle and it is characteristic of revolutions that once successful they do not permit any contesting of the essential purposes of the revolution – whether that be independence and a republic, or independence and socialism. The Constitution of the United States in guaranteeing a republican form of government to each of the states simultaneously is affirming that there is no 'freedom' to seek to establish a monarchical form.

*Of John Locke (1632-1704), English philosopher and educator, Karl Marx said: '. . . a classical spokesman of the judicial ideas of bourgeois society as distinct from the feudal.'

More extended notice of the 'smashing' of existing colonial state forms may be useful. As the revolutionary process unfolded, beginning in the 1760s, there came into being extra-legal and sometimes illegal organizations of Committees of Correspondence, Sons (and Daughters) of Liberty, Sons of Neptune (reflecting the key role of maritime workers in the revolutionary movement in the cities) and other groups called Associators. All these were tools for communication, propaganda, and, above all, organization; they eventuated into a governing form with a new name and content – a congress – and finally into the Continental Congress.* The simplicity of these titles was deliberate and reflected the action-directed and popular nature they possessed. Their presiding officer was called simply 'president,' though some of the Right in the revolutionary movement suggested more resplendent titles like 'Your Highness' or even 'Your Majesty.' Even the place in the then most populous city – Philadelphia – where the Congress was to meet was a matter of debate, with again the conservative wing of the revolutionary movement urging the State House, hitherto used by the royal officials, as a proper locale. But this was rejected at the invitation of the carpenters of the city and with the agreement of the more radical wing of the revolutionary movement. Thus, the Congress met in the carpenters' hall – the latter now capitalized and rendered as Carpenters' Hall, and much of the population of the United States does not realize that that hall was simply the meeting place of the carpenters (and other mechanics and artisans) of the city.

The concept of popular sovereignty was given flesh and blood insofar as the revolution did represent the will and the power of the vast majority of the population. Precise figures are not available but all the evidence suggests that at least 70 per cent of the population was significantly and consciously part of the revolutionary effort. It was the so-called 'common' people who formed the bulk of the pressure groups, who enforced the boycotts, who rid the country of the king's officers, who formed the armed forces of the revolution and who bested the greatest military and naval power then in the world.

It is the American Revolution that introduces significant guerrilla warfare with the great names of Marion, Sumter and Fox; and, indeed, the war as a whole so far as the revolutionary forces were concerned was fought in guerrilla style as befits a people's war. That is, the armies of Washington and Greene hit and ran and hit and ran again. Those armies often did the 'impossible,' crossing icy waters as at Trenton and storming mountains as at Stony Point; and they fought in a way the colonists had learned from the Indians – hiding behind

*Existed during the Revolution and Confederation up to 1789. – *Ed.*

trees and boulders, depending upon individual initiative. For generations after the war, the nobility of England referred to the Americans as 'tricky' and 'unmeanly' for they did not fight in the regulation way that the drafted and mercenary armies employed by European royalty had developed.

The British took all the major cities in rebeldom; they were on the coast and no one then could long withstand the British navy. So New York and Philadelphia and Charleston were taken. But once the British troops moved inland they faced not only accumulating logistical problems but also a hostile population which was not backward in manifestating that hostility.

It was in the South that the British had their greatest military successes and took most territory. That was because some 35 per cent of the population therein was made up of chattel slaves and these slaves, having been denied freedom by the revolutionists – though this had been repeatedly demanded – acted in their own behalf. In some cases, where freedom for enlistment was forthcoming, they did join the revolutionary army (perhaps as many as 5,000 did this), but, in general, slaves went to where freedom was and a result was that perhaps as many as one hundred thousand fled plantations in the South from 1775 through 1783. British commanders in the field suggested to London the wisdom of raising the flag of abolition and affirmed that if this were done the revolution would be over in the South in a month. London rejected the suggestion because many among the richest slaveowners were themselves Tories and also because the British West Indies contained some 750,000 slaves – and once the flag of abolition is raised it is very difficult to confine it.

A somewhat similar situation prevailed with the perhaps 300,000 Indian population in the colonies. That is, they were not able to unite among themselves and, playing upon this fatal disunity, the Americans and the British were able either to win over or to neutralize certain sections of the Indian peoples. The result was that some among those people fought for one side and some for the other – and some abstained altogether. But, in any case, without unity, successful strategy for themselves was not possible and with the end of the revolution a policy of federal enmity produced catastrophe for the Indian peoples.

In these two cases in particular the severe limitations of a bourgeois-democratic effort – even in the 18th century with the bourgeoisie young and, in a historic sense, progressive – are made palpably clear.

The international quality of the revolution is outstanding. Of course, in the early stages of the movement, beginning in the 1760s, the colonial protest movement was part of the general protest move-

ment in England. Thus, when the colonists demanded, as they did, 'the rights of Englishmen,' the King rejected this not only because they were colonists and not Englishmen, but also because, as he said, 'if I yield to the mob in Boston, how shall I control the mob in London?' Further, among the colonists, the demands came not only from merchants and planters against commercial and trade policies which, of course, favored the English ruling class; demands came also from seamen and workers and servants and even slaves. These, too, had their particular and very pressing grievances – opposition to the quartering of troops in their homes and neighborhoods, opposition to the employment of British troops in the colonies at wages a fraction of those normally paid colonial workers, the impressing of 'common' people into the army and navy of the Crown.

Organized opposition from these masses was a fundamental feature of the American Revolution and to yield to such opposition from such a source meant to the Crown and nobility and ruling circles of Britain (and many of their allies in the colonies) simply the end of civilization.

Significant in the outcome of the war was the refusal of the Canadian population to play a counter-revolutionary role; basic, too, was the revolutionary turmoil in Ireland which led the English Crown to dispatch some of its best troops not to Boston but to Dublin. And, of course, the rising European movement to culminate in the French Revolution already induced volunteers from France, Holland, Poland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Hungary to serve the American cause. In addition, power rivalries between France and England, Spain and England, Holland and England made possible the successes of the diplomacy of the American revolutionaries.

The revolution did, then, break one of the links in the chain of colonialism. It did overcome monarchy and establish a republican form of government based on the concept of popular sovereignty. It eliminated the vast vestiges of feudalism, as primogeniture, quit-rent, entail. It contributed to the termination of imprisonment for debt and indentured servitude. It provided for the separation of church and state; it enhanced the concept of education; it helped promote some aspects of the rights of women; it led to the manumission of several thousand slaves and to the elimination of chattel slavery in the North and to some forward movement in the outlawry of the international slave trade.

Some contemporaries wanted more; the mass organizations in particular pressed for further advances, especially in terms of assuring widespread popular political power, curbing economic monopolies and advancing educational possibilities. Some women and a few men did point out the glaring failure to think of and treat women as people and the free Black population petitioned repeatedly for an end to

slavery as a cancer which would grow with the growth of the republic and if not excised now at its birthing time would one day threaten the nation's existence.

But the hegemony of the 18th century revolution being in the hands of those who owned the means of production, the severe limitations of such classes – even in their 'finest' hour – as to the meaning of 'democracy' and of 'freedom' were clear. This encompassed the racism born with the birth of capitalism as well as the male supremacist outlook and practice strengthened by that capitalism (and slavery). Above all, the propertied classes held to an overall elitism so that Alexander Hamilton was able to warn of 'The People, Sir, the People is a great Beast;' and John Adams was wont to use as synonyms, 'the rich, the able and the well-born,' and John Jay – first Chief Justice of the United States – felt it to be self-understood that, as he said, 'those who own the country should govern it.' Even Thomas Jefferson, having in mind urban masses, referred to them as the 'swinish multitude.'

To them and their classes, freedom meant an absence of restraint, and was a political matter entirely and not at all economic. The economic system under which they flourished was 'freedom' so far as they were concerned and the problem of successful government was to restrain tyranny (monarchy) on the one hand and 'anarchy' or 'chaos' on the other, by which they meant real mass, popular rule. Still, then too, in the 18th century, it was the participation and strength of the masses that made possible the success of the Revolution and made possible whatever positive achievements it could and did record. Those achievements – and what they portended – were enough so that there was good reason for the British band that accompanied Lord Cornwallis' surrender to Washington at Yorktown in 1781 to play the tune 'The World Turned Upside Down.' The music from the British band hinted that this surrender was something new, was not the time-honored ceremony of one monarch's hirelings having bested another, but was rather the triumph of revolutionary republicans.

Lenin, while leading a revolution of an infinitely higher form of democracy – a revolution for socialism – could well appeal to the revolutionary traditions here, in his 'Letter to American Workers,' and to remind them that their country was founded by a 'really revolutionary war.' That which was most advanced in that revolutionary war came from the brains and experiences and blood and sweat of their class brothers, their fellow toilers in the 18th century. In our own era, that which is best in the world and in the body politic of the United States lies in the consciousness and organized strength of working men and women of all colors and all nationalities.

Here in the United States the deepest meaning of the Bicentennial of the revolution is to comprehend that revolution as a great milepost of the past 200 years of human history along the way to the achievement of colonial and national liberation, the termination of racism and all forms of elitism and the emancipation of the working class. And it is the victorious working class, it is socialism, which, as a 'by-product,' brings to fruition for the 20th century the promises in the immortal manifesto of revolution, which is the birth certificate of the United States of America.

The status of women — a criterion of social progress

Yelena Lagadinova
Member, CC BCP, Chairman of Committee of Bulgarian Women

The UN decision to declare 1975 International Women's Year is an acknowledgement of woman's part in the progress of society, aimed at cementing the unity of the world's progressive forces in defense of women's rights.

What is it that makes governments, politicians, public leaders and international organizations deal with the social, economic, political and legal situation of women? The reason lies, first of all, in the greatly extended activity of women in national and international affairs. The world cannot solve its present complicated economic and social problems without the women, who now comprise one-third of the producers of material and cultural values. Their part in safeguarding and consolidating peace is very great, for as mothers they want peace and fight for it, moved by their natural love for their child, the children of all the earth.

But in many countries there is a chasm between the recognition of this and women's actual situation. Despite legislation against sex discrimination, the factual inequality of women is still one of the scourges of capitalism. 'The social situation of the fair sex,' wrote Karl Marx, 'is a precise measure of social progress.' Unequal pay for equal work, and job discrimination resulting in a far higher percentage

of unemployment than among men, unskilled and low-paid work, and an unequal place in the family – this far from complete enumeration of the facts compels women in capitalist countries to fight for equality and genuine freedom. And the situation of women under socialism, where discrimination and inequality are ruled out, serves them as a beacon.

Naturally, the socialist countries welcome International Women's Year. Their social policy and practice confirms the Marxist-Leninist approach to the 'women's question' and proves that socialism is the only realistic historical perspective for the emancipation and harmonious development of women.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria entered International Women's Year after 30 years of socialist development, highlighted not only by high rates of economic growth and striking achievements in society, science and culture, but also by the essentially new situation of women.

The Bulgarian Communist Party has always heeded the Marxist postulate that the working class will not succeed in its historic mission – liberating itself and humanity from the capitalist yoke – if working women stay out of the struggle. The Bulgarian women made a weighty contribution to the victory of the socialist revolution both by participating in the liberation movement and by raising generations of revolutionaries.

This is why one of our initial revolutionary legislative acts, passed on October 16, 1944, just 37 days after the winning of freedom, decreed the equality of the sexes. Persons of both the sexes, it says, have the same rights in all fields of economic, state, cultural and social-political activity. This laconic act is of the utmost significance. It enabled our women to become active builders of socialism. And a series of subsequent acts, like the Marriage Act of 1945, the Dimitrov Constitution of 1947 and the 1971 Constitution of the PRB, formalized the equality of women in our country.

But it was still a long and difficult road from legal to factual equality, which we traversed in the course of the general development of our socialist society. To begin with, factual equality requires definite economic resources for the broadest possible inclusion of women in social production. 'To effect her complete emancipation and make her the equal of the man,' Lenin stressed, 'it is necessary for the national economy to be socialized and for women to participate in common productive labor' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 43).

September 9, 1944 was the day on which Bulgarian women were launched on a new life, giving them equality and their due place in society. But the real turning point came with the historic Central

Committee Plenum of April 1956, which provided woman with true factual equality.

The April Plenum resolutions accelerated social progress, stimulated the people's creative initiative, powered a precipitous growth of the social productive forces, and assured massive women's participation in material and cultural production. Between 1956 and 1972 the number of employed women rose 250 per cent – from 382,000 to 1,337,000. By 1973, women comprised 45 per cent of the work force in industry and 46.9 per cent in agriculture. Out of every 100 women of working age, 68 are employed in socially useful labor, and another 14 are studying. Among the country's engineers 27.1 per cent are women, doctors 41.8, economists 58, etc. This compares well with the United States, for example, where only 1.6 per cent of the engineers and 6.7 per cent of the doctors are women.

In our country all jobs are open to women, save those injurious to health and their maternal functions. Girls are provided professional orientation facilities based on scientific research, defining and describing the conditions and requirements in all types of work, and singling out occupations suitable for women from the medical, social-psychological and sociological points of view. Continuous improvement of the job environment and living conditions, a work regimen suitable for women (seasonal and part-time work, etc.) make employment increasingly attractive for all age brackets.

However, our society is concerned not only with the quantitative aspect of women's participation in social production. There is also the qualitative aspect of the social conditions promoting higher job proficiency. The Party attaches tremendous importance to improving women's skills and qualifications. Recent years have witnessed the quickest growth of their numbers in the non-material fields and in such progressive industries as engineering, electronics and chemicals. Women are employed on an ever larger scale in highly-mechanized and automated fields requiring higher skills and much more highly paid. In 1973, as many as 55.3 per cent of all specialists with a secondary education and 38.8 per cent with a higher education, were women. Social labor, and the influence of the job environment, of the workmates, extend the woman's scope and assure interests transcending the home and family. Also, they make for financial independence.

Cumulatively, this creates favorable conditions for professional, intellectual and moral improvement, and for personal freedom. This is why Bulgarian women seek employment not only for the financial compensations, but due to a deep-rooted inner need to participate in building the new society. We had a public opinion poll in 1969, 'The Woman in Economic, Public and Cultural Life, and in the Family.'

Asked whether they would work if they and their families were fully provided for, gainfully employed married women gave the following answers:

– I would still work as long as I could (56.7 per cent).
– I would work until eligible for pensioning (22 per cent).
– I would work part-time (1.9 per cent).
– I would work after the children grew up (1.6 per cent).
– I would work from time to time (1.5 per cent).
– I would work until the baby came (0.2 per cent).
– I would not work (15.2 per cent).

In a poll in 1973, 96 per cent said 'No' to the question: 'Would you give up your job if your husband's income were doubled?'

This means the social values of Bulgarian women have changed. Work has become a purpose in life, and they cannot picture their lives without it.

Access to socialist education, to the values of national and world culture, is an important factor in women's emancipation. We still remember the time, following the socialist revolution, when we had to battle against illiteracy and semi-literacy among women, especially in rural areas. Today, 51.8 per cent of the students in just the higher educational establishments are young women (1973/74 academic year). But that is only one aspect of the matter. Upon acquiring knowledge, women become equal and full participants in developing science, literature and art.

Lenin showed that the woman would not attain complete social equality until she has equal access to the system of administration (See V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works,* Vol. 30, pp. 347-348). Today, 26.8 per cent of our Party members and 50.6 per cent of the members of the Dimitrov Youth League are women. In the local representative bodies 37 per cent of the deputies are women, and 18.7 per cent in the People's Assembly, whereas the figure for the French parliament is 1.7 per cent, Belgian 2.8, and British 2.9. And out of every six enterprises at least one has a woman as its director or deputy director.

Family relations have changed substantially as we built our socialist society. There are more families where the woman has an education higher than her husband's (about 12 per cent of total) and an equal or even higher income (35.4 per cent.) In many of these families the woman got her education after marriage with the material and moral support of her husband. This is evidence of progress in overcoming the old unequal relationship and of the consolidation of new family ties, based on complete equality and mutual respect.

The 10th Congress of the BCP found it necessary 'to launch a broad program of measures based on a scientific conception of the place and role of women in socialist society in order to help create the best

possible conditions for the woman to perform her lofty mission as mother, for her participation in labor, her professional and cultural growth, and for her due part in administration.'

A working group was formed consisting of researchers, specialists, public and political leaders, to tackle this assignment. Under the guidance of the BCP Central Committee it worked out a concept of optimum conditions assuring harmonious combination by women of their main social functions as mothers, producers and active members of society. Some of the findings were worked into the December 1972 Program of the BCP for raising the people's standard of living, and were still more fully incorporated in the CC BCP Political Bureau decision of March 6, 1973, on enhancing the role of women in building a developed socialist society.

These documents reflect the distinctive socialist approach to woman's juridical status: socialist society considers it insufficient to equalize her rights with those of men. By virtue of the woman's special role related to motherhood, she bears serious responsibilities in bringing up her children, and is therefore provided with additional benefits and rights.

These benefits are continuously increased. The fully paid maternity leave of four, five or six months (depending on the birth of the first, second or third child), has been complemented since November 1, 1973, with provisions for leave to attend the infant. It is respectively six, seven or eight months, during which the mother receives a grant equalling the minimum wage of 80 leva. In addition, a mother may take unpaid leave until the baby is three years old, with the entire period added to her seniority. This likewise applies to women in farming. Women students with a baby receive a monthly grant of 80 leva and an additional child allowance. And any young mother who prefers returning to her job prior to the expiration of her supplementary paid maternity leave gets an allowance of half the national minimum pay in addition to her wage or salary.

The prenatal period comes under special protection. If the prospective mother has a health-hazardous job, she is transferred to other work after the fourth month of pregnancy, and in some cases immediately after conception. The list of jobs harmful to health is regularly reviewed and extended. A woman may not be dismissed after the fourth month of pregnancy and before the child is eight months old. Neither may she be dismissed during her maternity leave or the extended unpaid leave. Nor may the terms of her labor contract be altered. The Labor Code prohibits any refusal to conclude a labor contract with a woman on grounds of pregnancy. This is an important gain of our labor legislation.

Women are allowed to retire on more favorable terms than men.

They are eligible for pensioning on reaching the age of 45, 50 or 55, depending on their job, provided they have worked for 15 or respectively, 20 years. The benefits for mothers who have born and raised five or more children until the age of eight, are even more substantial.

Women's health is attended to free by a far-flung network of specialized medical institutions. There are 228 consulting centers in towns and 2,066 in urban areas to look after the health of infants. The number of kindergartens is growing, and due concern is shown for improving them.

The woman and her family have benefited tremendously from the solution of the housing problem for young families and families with many children, from the expanding production of low-priced children's clothes and foods, the expansion of services, etc. However, no matter how effective society's concern may be, woman's social equality will not be complete until it is exercised in the family, until the family lives in the right moral ambiance and there is a fair division of labor among its members. In effect, this means a new, socialist type of family, in which the question of the parents' social ideals and consciousness as members of socialist society, their scientific and cultural interests, acquire paramount importance with a decisive bearing on the upbringing of the rising generation.

All this is part of a policy aimed ultimately at a gradual transfer to society of the main concerns and responsibilities for the rising generation: assuring the best possible physical and spiritual development of children regardless of the material status of the family, with the responsibility of parents consisting mainly in spiritual upbringing. This, by the way, will also encourage the all-round development of the parents, especially mothers.

The Party program guarantees attainment of these difficult aims. The State Council has endorsed it as the foundation of state policy in the social domain, and new steps are being taken this year in line with the program within the limits of the country's resources. Our Party and government will again show the world that a recently backward and small country following the socialist way can do more for the all-round development of women in a short period of history than the richest capitalist countries have done from the beginning of time. This is the purpose of the statement by Comrade Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary CC BCP and Chairman of the PRB State Council, on the signing of the International Women's Year Declaration in the presence of statesmen of 35 countries, handed to the U.S. Secretary-General in December 1974. Comrade Zhivkov said: 'My views and the policy followed by my country agree with the spirit of the ideas set out in the Declaration. The State Council and the government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are systematically implementing a pro-

gram aimed at the effective equality of women's rights, the harmonious development of women, enhancement of their role in political life, the country's economic and social progress, and in assuring the material and cultural welfare of the people.'

Certainly, our country's advance along the socialist way, which assured the rapid and comprehensive solution of questions relating to the social equality and development of women, would have been impossible on such a scale and in such a short time if Bulgaria had not been in the socialist community and had been denied the cooperation and assistance of other socialist states, and especially the fraternal, disinterested and versatile aid of the great Soviet Union and its Communist Party.

The women of Bulgaria are proud to be members of a society where the working woman, mother and citizen, is so deeply respected. They will use International Women's Year to express their profound solidarity with the women of the world fighting for equality, peace and social progress. We are sure that using the available experience and resources, leaning on the ideals of the great humanitarians, mankind is already able to tackle the overall solution of historically vital social problems, including the emancipation and development of women.

Another battle won

Letter from Uruguay

Dozens of demonstrations swept Uruguay on May Day in response to the call issued by the illegal National Labor Convent.

On the eve of the holiday the military authorities and police arrested over 2,500 people to prevent manifestations. Many were tortured in the manner typical of the fascist dictatorship imposed on June 27, 1973, but emphatically rejected by the people, above all the working class.

But no repressions could prevent this traditional and militant display of the working people's strength. As early as April 4, 17, 24 and 30, demonstrations were held in all parts of Montevideo. The city was flooded with calls to observe May Day with the National Convent. Slogans on the walls and millions of leaflets were evidence of the NLC's determination. The highly influential National Convent keeps

a close watch on the intrigues of the dictatorship, which is trying to smash the powerful trade union movement.* The latter's strength was displayed in the victory of the builders of the Salto Grande Hydropower Plant, who won their demands despite the arrest of 1,800 workers, and prevented the deportation of Argentine workers employed on the joint Argentine-Uruguayan construction project.

Carta semanal, the illegal weekly of the Communist Party, called on the people to take an active part in the May Day demonstration and thereby display their determination to overthrow the dictatorship. Neither the alerted repressive apparatus, nor the atmosphere of fear created by the authorities, nor even official warnings that demonstrations would involve 'a risk to life,' could prevent them from taking place in eight districts of Montevideo and in several other cities.

In the capital demonstrations continued from morning to evening. Columns marched through the center of the city, the working-class suburbs, even one aristocratic district. As on the eve of May Day the streets were strewn with leaflets. Workers, students, progressive intellectuals chanted slogans calling for struggle against the dictatorship, for their vital demands, restoration of legality and release of political prisoners, for the unity of democratic, patriotic civilian and military circles with a view to forming a provisional government of a broad popular coalition.

The public expressed its solidarity with the marchers. The whole of Montevideo was in turmoil, though it was reminiscent of an enemy-occupied city. Many were wounded, hundreds arrested and tortured.

The May Day celebrations had broad repercussions all over the country. The people resolutely condemned the repressions by the dictatorship, especially against the youth, young Communists, to hinder them from acting in alliance with the organized working class.

The people's sincere jubilation over the victories in Vietnam and Cambodia and over the successes of the democratic process in Portugal was a challenge to the dictatorship's foreign policy. On that day Uruguayans also celebrated the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism, stressing the outstanding role in it of the Soviet Union.

The dictatorship lost, and the working class, the whole people, won yet another impressive battle.

J.B.
Montevideo
May 9, 1975

*As this issue was going to press, news was received about a confrontation between President Bordaberry and a section of the armed forces. The NLC again called on the people to be vigilant – *Ed.*

Trends of change in the Philippines

Francisco Balagtas
Member of CC, CP
of the Philippines

In October 1974, a little more than two years since the imposition of martial law, which led to the outlawing of the CPP-led mass movements, and the arrest of their leaders, the dictatorship had to re-examine its attitude toward the Communists. The underground CPP leaders met President Marcos, in response to his impassioned plea for national unity in the solution of the increasingly acute socio-economic and politicai problems confronting the Philippines and the Filipino people. As a result, an agreement was reached on a number of important issues: unconditional amnesty was proclaimed, political prisoners were released, outlawed mass movements became legal again, and the CPP (operating as a legal party for less than eight years in its more than 44 years of existence) is now a legal organization.[1] At a mass meeting attended by more than 50,000 peasants organized by the CPP and addressed by its leaders, including its General Secretary Felicisimo Macapagal, President Marcos also spoke and issued instructions to hasten the implementation of agrarian reforms, this time to include rice and corn lands in excess of seven hectates. In recent years the regime has taken steps aimed at promoting relations of mutual benefit and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Philippines' contacts with non-aligned countries in Asia and Africa are becoming more regular.

What brought about these changes? To understand these developments and to be able to make a correct assessment of them, it is necessary to eschew emotionalism, subjectivism and over-simplification. Flexible in tactics, Communists are ready to use the possibilities offered by the new situation, while remaining aware of the pitfalls. In its assessment of the current trends the CPP combines firmness in principle with a class approach making possible a deeper insight into the compulsions behind the changes currently under way. Such changes are due to the operation of definite internal and external

factors determining the character of the dictatorship's evolution.

The social base of the regime, primarily the exploiting classes, is narrow and unstable. Even if the local businessmen support the government, not all do so unswervingly, preferring to take a wait-and-see attitude. Now the government is alienating even those groups of the bourgeoisie who until recently hailed it enthusiastically. They are particularly alarmed by Marcos' tendency to carry out radical agrarian reforms and other social measures, and develop cooperation with socialist countries.

Nor is the ruling group itself monolithic. Its left wing is represented by the reformist bourgeoisie not linked with foreign monopoly capital, while its right wing, linked with foreign monopoly, is still dominant. A shifting center of the ruling bourgeoisie composed of those who are either not linked with, or are chafing against the terms of their partnership with the foreign monopolists, is continuously balancing between its right and left sectors, and between the ruling class as a whole and the mass of working people. Where the working-class movement and the left bourgeoisie are still weak, the center forces would most likely lean toward the right wing on the interrelated issues of labor-capital relations. Herein lies the difficulty of uniting with the center forces with a view to isolating the reactionaries.

The regime's difficulties are further aggravated by the existence of a considerable opposition both from the right and 'left.'

The land-owning oligarchy, ousted from power since 1972, is most strongly opposed to the dictatorship. Traditionally identified with the feudal land-owning class, the Catholic church hierarchy has also been alienated from the dictatorship by the implementation of agrarian reforms and by the threat of taxation of previously exempt Catholic-owned private schools.

Some sections of the local bourgeoisie only give the appearance of having surrendered to the dictatorship, but in fact are actively preparing to strike back.

Having deliberately provoked the imposition of martial law in their belief that such a situation would favor their advocacy of the armed struggle,[2] the Philippine Maoists are attempting to mobilize all the opponents of the regime, including the most reactionary feudal and pro-imperialist forces. The Maoists are trying to infiltrate Catholic, Moslem and other organizations to project their advocacy of the armed overthrow of the government.

Anti-government positions have also been taken by the lower rungs of the Catholic church – young priests and nuns who, usually coming from families of toiling people, feel deeply the suffering of the people. However, due to inexperience, they tend toward adventurism. Although a growing contradiction is developing with their own reactio-

nary hierarchy, they take a common antagonistic attitude toward the regime, if for different reasons.

The vacillations of the bourgeoisie, the activities of the opposition, including pressure to restore bourgeois parliamentarism, and the narrowness of the social base of the regime as a whole compel the government to seek popular support from the peasants organized in village barangays[3] and cooperatives, and from workers organized in a single trade union center based on the principle of one industry, one union. In implementing this policy the regime has to reckon with the Communist Party, the vanguard of the toiling masses expressing their will most fully and consistently. Communists are now allowed to work within these government-sponsored organizations within the limits of martial law and regulations.

The regime has been also forced to reconsider its initial position with regard to other urgent domestic problems, above all that of the Moslem minority in the south who are pressing for autonomy. After the attempts to suppress the Moslem movement by armed force had failed, the government adopted a course toward political settlement, and conceded a number of demands put forward by the Moslems.[4]

Filipino Moslems have a proud and long liberative tradition, which neither the Spanish, American nor Japanese colonizers were able to suppress. Only a policy allowing full expression to the cultural integrity of the Moslems, coupled with a socio-economic program aimed at enabling them to catch up with the more advanced Christian population – all within the framework of national-democratic unity – will persuade them to live peacefully with their Christian brothers within one nation and one state. This unity could become an important factor in overcoming separatist trends and sentiments advocated by the extreme faction of the Moslem movement.

External factors considerably affect the formulation of Marcos' policies. An instructive lesson was taught by the deepening crisis of the capitalist world economy.

For some time the ruling circles tried to persuade the public that the imposition of martial law would be followed by an 'economic miracle,' due to strengthening the already close ties with foreign monopoly capital. In June 1974 a group of advisers of the regime marshalled impressive statistics on international currency reserves, gross national product and per capita national income growth rates. The year 1973 reversed a decade-old pattern of trade deficits, when increased production and exports resulted in substantial trade surplus.

However, the deepening crisis of the capitalist world economy, the political and social upheavals in the leading capitalist countries demonstrated the futility of relying on international monopoly capital. In the same year 1974 industrial growth rates fell drastically to 3.5 per

cent compared with 12 per cent in 1973. Recession and stagnation spread to a number of industries; inflation is growing while wages cannot catch up with soaring prices. Even the official circles were forced to admit the inevitability of economic deterioration in view of the energy crisis. All this testifies to the futility of attempts to overcome acute socio-economic problems through alliance with the imperialist monopolies, first and foremost American and Japanese. It is indicative that in President Marcos' Address to the Nation in September 1974, the second anniversary of the proclamation of martial law, there was not a hint of the 'economic miracle' so widely propagandized only a few months before. On the contrary, the speech shows that the regime has to search for a more realistic approach to the existing difficulties, and orient itself on a policy of national self-reliance.

In contrast to the crisis and upheavals of the capitalist system, the successes and growing stability of the countries of the socialist community appear particularly impressive. Their cooperation with the developing countries is growing from year to year, which helps the latter strengthen their national sovereignty and pursue an independent course of national development. These factors are taken into account by the ruling dictatorship and its supporters, including its staff of technocrats.

The ruling circles are also influenced by the anti-imperialist policy of the developing countries which are assuming control over their natural resources and taking collective actions in the international arena to assert and strengthen their political and economic independence against imperialist powers and their multinationals. These states' active foreign-policy line is strengthening the positions of all those in the Philippines, including the bourgeois reformists and revolutionary democrats, who aspire to pursue a more independent course of national development.

Lastly, the recent victory of the people of Vietnam and the patriots of Cambodia was an event of tremendous importance, for it signifies a major shift in our region in favor of the forces of national liberation, progress and peace. Last April the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, of which the Philippines is a member, collectively recognized the government of liberated Cambodia.

In the light of the events in Indochina President Marcos and his advisers were reported to be discussing the question of revising military agreements with the USA, not excluding their total abrogation. The government is prodding the United States to start consultations concerning these agreements, notably, the future of U.S. military bases on our territory.

Thus, objective processes at home and abroad compel the semi-

constitutional dictatorship and the bourgeois reformists in its service to pursue a more independent course of national development and a policy of national self-reliance, while preserving its capitalist orientation. Though still heavily tied to the multinationals, this course is a departure from the blind pro-American policy pursued only a few years ago.

In conducting their work among the masses, the Filipino Communists do not shut their eyes to the difficulties engendered by the new situation. They are aware of the existing limitations. The decision to abandon the armed struggle in favor of political mass struggle was of a profoundly principled character. The Sixth Congress of the CPP (February 1973), held under extreme conditions of clandestinity, called on the Communists to fight for the legality of the Party and adopted a policy of class alliances, the core of which is working-class unity, its alliance with the peasantry, and with other left, democratic and patriotic forces. This course is directed against bourgeois-feudal exploitation and foreign monopoly domination.

In opposing imperialist domination, and the related policies of low wages, prohibition of strikes, trade union restrictions and other measures harmful to the working people and the national interests, the Party refused to be drawn into unprincipled, personalized alliances, with no positive program, such as the anti-Marcos alliance which includes both the extreme right and extreme left forces. The Communists not only reject adventurist, sectarian actions, putschism, conspiracy and anarcho-terrorist revolutionism, but also demonstrate their irreconcilability toward the class enemy, and struggle against capitulation to, and conciliation with, the exploiting classes. The CPP Program, adopted at the Sixth Congress, points out that the Party members must always be in a state of preparedness in every way to prevent attempts at obstructing the people's way to peaceful revolutionary transformation of our society. This injunction retains its validity even in conditions of legal existence and legal struggles.

The vanguard of the Filipino working class supports all measures meeting the interests of the masses – agrarian reforms, industrialization generating more employment, a more independent foreign policy, and above all broader contacts and mutually advantageous cooperation with the socialist and non-aligned states. Now the Communists are faced with a particularly difficult task: to fully and skillfully utilize the greater mobility they enjoy to strengthen their links with the working masses and militantly struggle for their day-to-day interests, even while firmly restraining excessive and unrealistic demands usually raised by the extremists.

In the existing situation the Communists consider it their task to unite their efforts with those of other left, democratic and patriotic

forces, including the left and centrist elements within the ruling regime, and to isolate the extreme right forces and their foreign monopoly backers.

The policy of class alliances has its peculiarities in town and countryside. In rural areas the bourgeois reformists can be expected to push through, in varying degrees, agrarian reforms. In the face of continued opposition from the big landowners, they will need the support of the peasants, including their independent class organizations. The Party can and must use this in the common interests of the anti-feudal struggle.

The difficulty in urban centers of industry springs from the fact that the dominant bourgeois reformists are heavily and extensively linked with foreign capital. In upholding the working people's interests the Communists, true to their proletarian duty, will continue to demand decent working and living conditions for them and thus contribute to stepping up the people's struggle against the imperialist monopolies and their junior Filipino partners. At the same time they are aware that the rise of the popular movement may scare the ruling classes, who will not stop at using the entire weight of the state machinery against the workers.

So the struggle for the unity of all patriotic forces is by no means an easy task in a situation where martial law prevails, where U.S. imperialist influence, while declining, is still strong, and where the Maoists continue to play a divisive role among the left forces. Moreover, a sector of the left, democratic and patriotic forces do not yet share the CPP assessments of the current situation. In defining their attitude to the government these elements, not viewing developments in their dialectical interconnection, tend to focus their attention not so much on the changes that are taking place, but on the political past of the forces who imposed martial law in 1972.

Undoubtedly this past cannot be disregarded. Every conscious revolutionary must be aware that although the most reactionary section of the exploiting classes – the landed oligarchy – has been ousted from power, it still preserves considerable influence and tries to use the heterogeneity of the ruling group in its own interests with a view to establishing contacts with the rightist elements within it. It would however be utterly wrong to ignore the tendencies operating within the framework of the regime influenced by the historical alternatives confronting it. In its assessment of the prospects of the current situation the CPP takes account of the world confrontation between socialism and imperialism, in the course of which the alignment of forces is increasingly changing in favor of socialism and its allies.

The main alternative is linked with the choice of path of development the country should take. At this stage and with the present

alignment of class forces, it is necessary and timely to raise the issue of an *independent path of national development*. As against the capitalist path of development still being pursued by the dominant wing of the ruling circles, independent development has an anti-monopoly direction and may become a stage of transition to the non-capitalist road. An important prerequisite of independent development is the setting up of an effective system of planning and a strong public sector serving the national interests.

The policy of independent development can be implemented only if there are definite objective and subjective conditions such as, for instance, a change in the alignment of forces in favor of the left, democratic and patriotic forces, including those in the ruling camp itself. And although these conditions are still not present, the struggle for this course is a feasible political goal even now. In striving to achieve it, the progressive forces also take into account the fact that President Marcos himself has appealed for and is pursuing a policy of national self-reliance.

In the present situation it is particularly necessary to develop grass roots activity by the peasants through the village barangays and cooperatives and, more significantly, by the workers organized in government-sponsored trade unions. We must waste no time, for the foreign monopolists and their local allies from among the landowners and the bourgeoisie spare no effort to convert these organizations into instruments of their economic and political domination. Exposing the intrigues of right reaction, the Party should at the same time rebuff the activities of the extreme left who, under the guise of concern for the working masses, lead them in struggles for excessive demands, which only play into the hands of our enemies and can only have tragic consequences for the working class, the progressive movement and all working people.

The Filipino Communists are not going to waste time in engaging in utopian experiments in a situation where state power is still dominated by foreign monopolists. Instead, they will concentrate on organizational work aimed at promoting working-class unity, its firm alliance with the peasantry and with other left, democratic and patriotic forces, including the left and center forces of the regime. For this purpose, they will strengthen their own revolutionary mass movements, besides working within government-sponsored mass organizations. Only in this way can the Communists maintain the organizational and political independence of their Party in the national-democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front.

1. Under martial law no legal political party is allowed to exist.
2. See F. Balagtas, 'Maoists in the Philippines.' *WMR*, June 1973.

3. Local assemblies set up on the government's initiative in urban and rural areas and used by the authorities to mobilize the population for referendums and other official campaigns.

4. At a meeting of President Marcos with the leaders of the insurgent groups of the Sulu and Mindanao islands last April, it was decided to appoint representatives of the Moslem minority to posts of responsibility in the local administration in the south of the country, admit Moslems to the armed forces and earmark funds for the development of Mindanao Island.

DIARY

A representative of the Peruvian Communist Party has joined the *World Marxist Review's* Editorial Council, bringing the number of fraternal parties on it to 49.

World Marxist Review has begun appearing in India in Punjabi (Punjab State) and Malayalam (Keralal State), bringing the number of national editions to 46.

Laszlo Nagy, representative on the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on the *WMR* Editorial Board, attended the 17th congress of the Communist Party on Finland.

Peace and Socialism International Publishers took part in the 20th International Book Fair in Warsaw. At a press conference held by the Publishers for journalists covering the fair, Vladimir Shundeyev, *WMR* Executive Secretary and member of the Editorial Board, spoke about the work of the journal and its publishing house.

Interpressphoto-75, the exhibition held in Berlin last May under the motto '30 Years of Peace in Europe – Hope of World Peace,' was attended at the invitation of its organizational committee by Sarada Mitra, member of the National Council of the Communist Party of India and member of the *WMR* Editorial Board.

Several works were awarded the special prize and honorary deplomas of the *WMR* Editorial Board.

---

the press

New prescriptions, old maladies

Abram Mileikovsky
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

SOME NEW TRENDS IN BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ECONOMY

Not so very long ago the crisis of bourgeois political economy was a subject handled only by Marxist scholars. Now the discussion has been joined by bourgeois economists obliged to reconsider and revise their views and coin new concepts for the discredited old ones. The result has been new trends in economic thought transcending the traditional schools of bourgeois political economy. In this we have a manifestation of the influence of Marxist ideas.

The deepening of capitalism's general crisis has brought out the bankruptcy of its economic doctrines. Especially characteristic in this respect is the evolution of the large body of literature on economic growth.

There was the growth fetish: growth, it was claimed, would bolster the economic and social foundations of capitalism. That was the keynote of all the literature on the subject in the 50s and well into the 60s.[1] But the fallacy of these conceptions became clear in 1968-69 when, despite a relatively high growth rate, there was intensified inflation, sharp socio-political crises in France and Italy, the unrest in America's Black ghettos, etc. But a much stronger blow was dealt by the unprecedented intertwining of crisis processes in the past few years.

Bourgeois theorists found themselves compelled to admit that their recommended economic policy could not cure capitalism of its social ills.[2] In his *Politics and the Stages of Growth,* Walt Rostow takes a critical look at his earlier views and admits that the 'mass consumption society' is anything but the acme of prosperity. And he adds a new stage, which he defines as the 'search for quality,' its main objects being economic growth combined with social welfare, law and order, and national security.[3] Another economist to forsake the U.S.

'consumer society' model is Jean Fourastie, who sharply criticizes it in his *Lettre ouverte à quatre milliards d'hommes*.[4] Raymond Aron has gone through approximately the same evolution, as evidenced by his book *Les desillusions du progrès*.[5]

John Kenneth Galbraith, too, has had second thoughts about the 'new industrial society' as the salvation of capitalism. In his controversial interview in the London *Observer* late in 1970 he set out to prove that industrial nations must reduce their economic growth rates to prevent the social strain that adds to the world tensions.[6]

The growth fetish is giving way to urgent appeals for restraint. In 1968 an international group of businessmen and economists founded the Club of Rome to propagate the idea of slowing down economic growth and abandoning the luxuries of the consumer society in order to maintain the ecological balance. The Club authorized a research team at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to study and demonstrate the ruinous environmental effects of high growth rates. The study was begun by Prof. Forrester, the systems analysis specialist and completed by one of his associates, Prof. Meadows. Its results were published in *The Limits to Growth*.[7] Its main idea is that if world industrial output continues to grow at an annual rate of 7 per cent, the effect on the environment will be such as to bring mankind to the thin edge of destruction by the end of the century.

However, the book deliberately obscures the fact that ecological balance can be achieved only through rational use of the potentialities of the scientific and technological revolution. Bourgeois economists and sociologists urge 'taming the consumption instincts' of the working people who, they allege, are exploiting the growth policy to demand unreasonable wage rises and this, it is further alleged, is the principal cause of the present economic difficulties.

Keynes and the Keynesian economists claimed that their growth model would prevent or at least moderate crises. It is only natural that they are now being blamed for an economic policy that has produced galloping inflation.

Inflation, in fact, has thrown the capitalist pundits into utter confusion: they had predicted a long period of economic stabilization in the leading imperialist powers, but reality in many ways changed their notions of capitalism's nature.

For in the past inflation was a concomitant of war or postwar dislocation. This is partly true this time, too, for the present inflation is largely the result of the cold war arms race and the devastating 'minor wars' which persisted throughout the cold war period. But the point is that it derives from state-monopoly regulation of the economy. Under this system, the monopolies, generously subsidized by the state, are to one or another degree economic stimulators of

inflation. The Keynes idea of deficit financing through 'regulated inflation,'[8] which found many followers, led to inflated national budgets and mounting national debts. The top monopolies were able to increase their postwar profits not only by intensifying exploitation, but also by employing, with state support, the inflation lever to redistribute national income in their favor.[9]

Inflation is no longer confined to money circulation which, to one or another degree, is controlled by the state. It is strongly powered by the monopoly pricing system which does not come under state control. In conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, monopoly rivalry over profitable investment spheres and markets results chiefly in production of new goods and creating markets for them. The big corporations use their monopoly position to set artificially high prices. This means that rivalry for new spheres of influence leads to systematically higher prices. In fact, the corporations set prices in anticipation of high monopoly profits.[10] And so, the present inflation deflates not only the Keynesian theory, but also the so-called neo-classical school of its critics.

It is probably right to distinguish two main schools of thought among those who believe that capitalism can extricate itself from the crisis through its own intrinsic forces. First, there are the neo-classicist critics of the keynesian theory. They stand by the old postulate of market equilibrium, maintaining that capitalism still has its built-in self-regulating mechanism.

This finds expression in a number of theories, all of them associated with the neo-classical school. There are, to name a few, the theory of 'effective' or 'workable' competition, represented in the United States by such economists as J.M. Clark, E. Mason, J. Bain; the theory of a 'social market economy' in the FRG (W. Eucken, H. Arndt and others); the theory of 'industrial organization' in Britain (P. Andrews, J.D. Richardson and others).

The neo-classicists exploit the popular distrust of government ability to regulate the economy and blame inflation, with all its hardships, on disregard of the laws of the market. They propose giving private business maximum initiative, because it abides by the laws of the market which, in their judgment, determine both the norm of capital accumulation and the way it should be distributed among the various industries. They are vehemently opposed to bourgeois democratic reforms envisaging active government interference in the economy. This, they feel, would tend to bring the masses into politics, something which could be utilized by the socialists and the communists. The neo-classicists rely on, and advocate, more power for monopoly capital and on the regime being supported by the 'silent majority,'

composed mainly of the petty-bourgeoisie and sections of the working people who have not lost faith in free enterprise.[11]

Representatives of the second school of thought, seeking to fill the vacuum caused by the bankruptcy of old doctrines, have advanced a theory that goes beyond the traditional concept of market equilibrium. One of its purposes is to prevent the spread of Marxist ideas among those disillusioned in bourgeois economics.

The most prominent representative of this school of thought is, of course, John Kenneth Galbraith. His 1973 book, *Economics and the Public Purpose,*[12] caused something of a furor in the bourgeois economic press. For Galbraith sharply criticizes the traditional bourgeois schools of economics, both Keynesian and neo-classical, accusing them of being divorced from reality. In Galbraith's view, Keynes, for all his seeming innovations, did not go beyond the confines of economics based on the laws of market competition as interpreted by the 'managing subject.' And Galbraith is apprehensive: if economics students are taught old postulates which are at odds with reality, they will look for answers in Marxist literature. The purpose of Galbraith's book is to bar the road to Marxism. He sets out the sum-total of his views, which even earlier had made him the recognized leader of the contemporary institutional-social school of bourgeois economics and one of the outstanding exponents of the 'industrial society' and 'convergence of the two systems' concepts. The central idea of his theory is that economic processes in developed capitalist countries, in this age of the technological revolution, are to a decisive degree determined not by the market and the industries dependent on market conditions, but by extra-market institutions – the state, the big corporations, the trade unions. And Galbraith examines their role in the social transformation of capitalism.

The sensation of the book is Galbraith's revision of his 'industrial society' views and conclusion that the word socialism should no longer be suppressed and the economic structure should be remodeled by introducing a planning system to coordinate industrial development. However, having accepted the 'new socialism,' Galbraith hastens to point out that his socialism is neither doctrinaire nor ideological and springs from pragmatic considerations of U.S. economic development. What new circumstances, requiring a new approach to economic planning in the United States, has Galbraith discovered?

He holds that the big corporations will have an increasingly important say in both the economy and politics. In the last few years a growing number of both adherents and opponents of the so-called managerial revolution have been debating the problem.[13] Galbraith, however, puts forward a new view. The United States, he claims,

cannot be regarded as a wholly corporate state. Its societal problems are due to the emergence of two sectors in the economy – the planning system and the market system. The former includes one thousand giant corporations producing approximately half of all the goods and services not provided by the state. The latter includes around 12 million small firms scattered throughout the economy and governed by the spontaneous laws of competition. The 'planning' system, according to Galbraith, is reliably immune from socialism. The monopoly status of the big corporations, which are claimed to be run not by capitalists but by managers, is balanced by the monopoly status of the large trade unions, which assure guaranteed wages. The only exception are the weapons firms which should be nationalized, because their dependence on government orders opens the doors to corruption among government officials responsible for negotiating contracts.

Galbraith has to concede that because of their policy of price hikes, the 'mature corporations' once praised for creating the 'affluent society' by mass-producing relatively inexpensive goods, now share with the military-industrial complex the responsibility for mounting inflation. However, he holds, the culprits are not the capitalist owners of large corporations but their managers who give in to the trade unions demanding higher wages. The evil, he says, can be remedied only by continued state wage and price controls.

The market system should be the main target of 'pragmatic socialism' because it lacks the 'planning' system's immunity from the major social upheavals threatening the stability of U.S. capitalism. Its faults jeopardize education, health services, urban amenities, environmental protection, etc., which is why it must become the key target of reforms envisaging active state intervention in the economy, mergers of small firms, the setting up of labor unions in them, and a greater role for public property.

And who is to carry out the suggested reforms? Galbraith pins his hopes on the Democratic Party. His new book appeared as a justification of the program of the party's radical wing when its 1972 presidential candidate was Senator George McGovern, whose adviser Galbraith was. Galbriath's 'socialism' does not go beyond the type of 'mixed economy' based on state-monopoly capitalism operating in a number of West European countries, where the share of the state sector is much higher than in the United States. He sees a 'mixed economy' primarily as a tool for ensuring coordination between industries, something the 'planning system' of giant corporations engaged in fierce competition for spheres of profitable investment cannot, obviously, achieve. But Galbraith prefers to ignore the latter in order to preserve his myth of a 'planning system' unrelated to the

market. His book does not expose monopoly capital as the main enemy of the working people, and his criticism of monopolies is aimed at stabilizing the system of state-monopoly capitalism in the United States.

Characteristically, nowadays economists who eschew the word socialism even for purposes of social maneuvering advocate more centralized forms of state-monopoly economic programing. Notably Herbert Stein, at a time when he headed President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, declared at an annual meeting of the American Economic Association that the U.S. would probably require an economic planning agency. The idea of such an agency to coordinate the investment policies of large corporations in the light of national interests is also supported by another leading U.S. economist, Wassily Leontief.[14] Of course, Galbraith's advice not to be frightened by the word socialism and to use it pragmatically in U.S. conditions is a reflection of changes taking place in the heartland of capitalism at the present stage of the latter's general crisis. It is noteworthy, however, that proposals of this kind do not satisfy such prominent economists as R.L. Heilbroner,[15] A.G. Gruchy[16] and other representatives of the institutional-social school of thought.

Gruchy, for example, criticizes Galbraith for ignoring ideology in his interpretation of 'pragmatic socialism.' He points out that the first West European national planning program, recommended by Galbraith as an instructive example, appeared in 1945-48 in France thanks to the combined efforts of Socialists, Communists and all participants in the Resistance movement. He also links the shift from neo-liberal views to a system of planning in a framework of a 'social market economy' in the Federal Republic of Germany with the defeat of the Christian-Democrats and the victory of the ideology advocated by the Social-Democrat leader Willy Brandt.[17] Following Gruchy, W. Peterson criticizes Galbraith for regarding the corporate technostructure as the linchpin of his 'planning system' and for declaring that the Administration is a tool in its hands. According to Peterson, the 'planning' system represents a symbiosis of big business and the state.[18] Galbraith's critics do not go beyond bourgeois reformism but, unlike him, they do not see large corporations as an institution capable of overcoming class antagonisms.

On the eve of an economic conference called by the U.S. President in September 1974, a group of scientists of the radical school published a statement to the effect that the experts invited to that conference were incapable of offering solutions for the problems facing the country as they (the experts) were primarily concerned with ensuring record corporate profits.

The radical school in political economy has received official recog-

nition. Its representatives are members of the American Economic Association, their books and magazine articles are widely read in the United States and other capitalist countries. Their theoretical and ideological positions are much too diverse for a sweeping description. The very definition of radical political economy is vague: in the capitalist West it is considered the domain of scholars who see the need to concentrate theoretical studies on socio-economic problems, notably, that of the distribution of the national income, as well as of economists critical of imperialism and its crimes from moral and ethical positions, and those who call themselves the 'New Left.'[19]

Far from identifying themselves with the reformist camp of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois political economy, economists reflecting the 'New Left' ideology speak of their readiness to storm the bastions of capitalism and level them to the ground. Some place themselves to the 'left' of the Marxists and espouse socio-economic views claiming to represent a 'new' substantiation of the revolutionary process as opposed to 'traditional Marxism.'

For all its vagueness, the radical school in political economy is a reflection of the ideology and interests of intermediate social strata in capitalist countries. But while remaining essentially petty-bourgeois, it differs from older schools, Unlike traditional petty-bourgeois critics of monopoly who advocate a return to free competition, the radical economists, especially those of the 'New Left,' flatly deny any positive role of capitalist competition. Most hold that a new society must replace capitalism, but they have no realistic program for it. These economists straddle the fence between bourgeois and proletarian political economy, whereas the logic of class struggle inexorably demands that a choice be made. Hence the inevitability of a process of differentiation. Some radical economists sincerely opposed to the crimes of imperialism and its immoral policies can doubtlessly come over to the side of the working class, whose interests are most consistently expressed by Marxist-Leninist political economy. The fundamental Marxist-Leninist theoretical premise is that the objective laws of development of the productive forces of capitalism and the consequent changes in the relations of production turn the majority of the society into wage and salary earners and make production social in character. This creates the conditions for consistent revolutionary change. In defending their vital interests, fighting for social rights and democratic freedoms, and demanding far-reaching democratic reforms aimed at curtailing monopoly power, the masses come to see the need for a fundamental change in the economic and social system, for the replacement of capitalism by socialism and communism.

Mankind's historical experience, especially the experience of socialist revolutions, confirms the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist

analysis of the laws of socio-economic development. The strategy and tactics of the working-class revolutionary struggle based on that scientific analysis are aimed at winning over the overwhelming majority of the masses, which will inevitably force the negligible minority of reactionaries unable to halt the march of history to capitulate. Convinced of the superiority of their scientific positions and the attractive force of the humane ideals of communism, Marxist-Leninists seek the formation of a broad anti-imperialist coalition both within the capitalist countries and on a worldwide scale. They are prepared to engage in theoretical debate with the participants of such a coalition, while firmly upholding their ideological principles. Militant, uncompromising Marxist criticism helps to undermine bourgeois political economy, expand and strengthen the progressive schools opposed to it.

1. See R. Harrod, *Economic Essays*. London, 1952; R. Harrod, *Towards a Dynamic Economics*, London, 1956; E. Domar, *Essays in the Theory of Economic Growth*, New York, 1957; J. Robinson, *Economic Philosophy*, London, 1962; *Keynes' General Theory. Reports of Three Decades*, Ed. by R. Lekachman, New York-London, 1964; W. Heller, *New Dimensions of Political Economy*, Harvard University Press, 1966; A.M. Okun. *The Political Economy of Prosperity*, Washington, 1970; R. Solow. *Growth Theory, An Exposition*, Oxford, 1970.

2. See J. Robinson, *Economic Heresies*, New York, 1971; J. Robinson, The 'Second Crisis of Economic Theory,' *The American Economic Review*, May 1972; G. Myrdal, *Against the Stream. Critical Essays on Economics*, New York, 1973; J.K. Galbraith. 'Power and the Useful Economist,' *The American Economic Review*, March 1973; J. Hicks. *The Crisis in Keynesian Economics*, Oxford, 1974.

3. See W. Rostow, *Politics and the Stages of Growth*. Cambridge. 1971.

4. J. Fourastie, *Lettre ouverte à quatre milliards d'hommes*, Paris, 1970.

5. R. Aron, *Les desillusions du pregrès*, Paris, 1969.

6. *The Observer*, November 22, 1970, p. 25.

7. *The Limits to Growth: A Report for The Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, New York, 1972.

8. See J.M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, New York, 1936.

9. See A.F. Brimmer, 'Inflation and Income Distribution in the United States,' *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, February 1971; J. Mouly, 'Prices, Wages, Unemployment: Inflation in Contemporary Economic Theory,' *International Labor Review*, October 1973; S. Melman, *The Permanent War Economy. American Capitalism in Decline*. New York, 1974.

10. See G.C. Means, 'The Administered-Price Thesis Reconfirmed,' *The American Economic Review*, June 1972; J.M. Blair, *Economic Concentration: Structure, Behavior and Public Policy*, New York, 1972.

11. See D. Patinkin, *Studies in Monetary Economics*, New York, 1972.

12. J.K. Galbraith, *Economics and the Public Purpose*, Boston, 1973.

13. See A.A. Berle, *Power*, New York, 1969; J.M. Blair, Op. cit.; D.R. Fusfeld, 'The Rise of Corporate State in America.' *Journal of Economic Issues*, March 1972; P. Burch, *The Managerial Revolution Reassessed*, Lexington Books, 1972.

14. *The New York Times*, March 14, 1974.

15. R.L. Heilbroner, *Between Capitalism and Socialism, Essays in Political Economics*, New York, 1972.

16. A.G. Gruchy, *Contemporary Economic Thought. The Contribution of Neo-Institutional Economics,* London, 1972.

17. See *Journal of Economic Issues*, June 1974, pp. 243, 247.

18. See *Journal of Economic Issues*, June 1974, pp. 489, 490.

19. See M. Bronfenbrenner, 'Radical Economics in America,' *Journal of Economic Literature,* September 1970; R.C. Edwards and others (eds), *The Capitalist System. A Radical Analysis of American Society,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972; H. Sherman, *Radical Political Economy.* New York, 1972; *Modern Political Economy. Radical and Orthodox Views on Crucial Issues,* Ed. by J. Weaver, Boston, 1973; D.R. Fusfeld 'Types of Radicalism in American Economics.' *The American Economic Review*, May 1973; M. Bronfenbrenner. 'What the Radical Economists Are Saying,' *Harvard Business Review,* September-October, 1973.

Books and the press

POLITICAL BOOKSHELF

ESSENTIAL FOR PROGRESS

At present, with Communist and Workers' parties active not only in bourgeois countries, but also directing the construction of the new society in socialist countries, scholarly study and analysis of the experience of Party development are essential for the further progress of the world communist movement.

The Party's leading role in building socialism and communism, democratic centralism as its basic organizational principle, conscious discipline and inner-Party democracy assuring members' active participation in elaborating and implementing Party policy – these were the topical problems of international relevance discussed in a recent exchange of opinion by scholars and Party leaders of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. The papers of the symposium, held in Prague under the auspices of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC CPC, and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC CPSU, have been compiled as a collection issued by Political Literature Publishers in Moscow and Svoboda Publishers in Prague. The collection dwells on Party ideological work, Lenin's principles of determining the class nature of the Party and its social base, youth education in the communist spirit, and Party guidance of the mass media. Opportunist and revisionist theories concerning Party development are criticized.

Mezinarodni vyznam leninskych principu vystavby strany (International Relevance of Lenin's Principles of Party Building), Prague, Svoboda, 1974, 383 pp.

V.I. Lenin, the book says, evolved a teaching on the proletarian party of the new type by 'generalizing the vast experience of the Russian and international revolutionary movement, and developing the Marxist theory on the necessity and role of the class party of the proletariat in the new historical situation. As Lenin conceived it, the Party is the vanguard of the working class, its organized detachment and highest form of political organization. It facilitates the self-determination of the working class and helps the workers understand and perform their historic mission' (p. 356).

The experience of the USSR, the world's first socialist country, and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union shows that, though still the spokesman of working-class interests, the CPSU 'becomes and consolidates itself as the vanguard of the entire Soviet people' as a result of the consolidation and development of the socialist system (p. 132).

The closest possible links with the masses is a key principle of Lenin's theory. It depends largely on these links whether the Party's activity is effective. Drawing attention to this point, the collection notes that the Party must always stand beside the masses, head and educate the masses, strengthening its leadership in all areas of socialist construction. The book emphasizes 'the objective and universal character of the growth of the Party's leading role in building socialism and communism' (p. 45). Not surprisingly, this crucial point is the target of fierce attacks by revisionists. Czechoslovak scholars referred to the experience of the CP of Czechoslovakia in showing that departures from this principle weaken the Party, undermining the process of socialist construction. 'On the basis of false theoretical, ideological and political premises,' right opportunists in Czechoslovakia 'advanced ideas of a "new party model"' (p. 173) in 1968, amounting to 'a revision of all the basic Leninist principles of Party building and activity' (p. 175). What this meant, in effect, was 'liquidation of the Communist Party and of its leading role in socialist society' (p. 179). But the right-wing attacks were repulsed and the CP of Czechoslovakia 'has again consolidated itself as a Leninist Party' (p. 189).

Bourgeois ideologists and their helpers continue their attacks on the principle of democratic centralism. Yet 'theory and the practice of revolutionary struggle show that democratic centralism as a principle of the development and activity of Marxist-Leninist parties is of universal relevance' (p. 71). Past experience shows that democratic centralism gives the broadest possible scope for the initiative of Communists, and assures the best conditions for the participation of all Party members in working out and promoting the Party's political line.

'The facts testify,' it says in the book, 'that to fulfill its international duties, the Marxist party of the working class must work for the solution of national problems and concern itself with the vital interests of the masses in each country. Conversely, the national objectives cannot be reached without the active involvement of every detachment of the communist movement in the general struggle against imperialism and for the new social system. This reflects the dialectical unity of the national and particular and the international and general in the working-class movement, and is clear evidence that there are no objective reasons for contradictions between them' (p. 361). Acceptance of these laws by all Communist parties is essential for further progress in the common struggle against imperialism.

The publication, which appeared in Czech and Russian, shows 'the significance of the eternally vital, topical and continuously developing Leninist teaching on theParty, the important objectives facing us in this field, and the responsibility shouldered by the parties in developing theory' (p. 379).

Frantisek Hajek
Deputy Editor-in-Chief of
Nova Mysl

A FESTERING WOUND

The 30-year-long aggression of U.S. imperialism in Indochina ended early this year in ignominious defeat. As the last of the aggressors scurried to join the rout of their puppets, the victorious patriotic forces set about rebuilding their devastated countries. Having expelled the interventionists, they have the sympathy and support of the democratic and progressive forces of the world, and they view their future with confidence and optimism.

The aggression in Indochina brought its peoples unheard-of hardships: millions were killed, other millions maimed and disabled, still other millions uprooted and torn from their families, their homes destroyed, their soil contaminated, their lives beset with incalculable miseries. But these wounds are reparable and will heal, as has been shown by peoples who suffered similar calamities from the aggressions of the fascist-militarist bloc in the period of the Second World War. This is not so in the United States. The wounds inflicted by U.S. imperialism on the people of the United States are deeper and more virulent. Not a few in the USA believe that healing their malignancy requires radical surgery.

It is the chief merit of the book under review that it focuses

A. Kendrick, *The Wound Within: America in the Vietnam Years, 1945-1974*, Boston-Toronto, Little, Brown and Company, 1974. 432 pp.

attention on these wounds. The title and subtitle – *The Wound Within: America in the Vietnam Years, 1945-1974* – differentiated the book from scores of other works purporting to report and interpret the causes and effects of the aggression, but which concentrate mainly on these in relation to Indochina. The author musters a massive array of facts – relevant and irrelevant, trivial and important, disorderly, set forth in a hodgepodge without sources for checking their accuracy – to substantiate his observations. These latter range from the superficial to the banal and liberally distribute the blame for inflicting the wound on everyone but the guilty. Nevertheless, some of the book's verifiable factual material supports more significant conclusions.

The author, perhaps unintentionally, makes a fair case for showing that the aggression in Indochina was part of the attempt of U.S. ruling circles after the Second World War to achieve world hegemony. Unlike many commentators who date commencement of U.S. intervention from the Eisenhower Administration, he correctly traces the U.S. involvement to Truman, noting that whereas 'the United States was on the side of the Viet Minh against Japan in World War II . . . the change in American policy and attitude was the result of the Cold War against Communism in the postwar years and the application of the Truman Doctrine to Asia in the Korean War' (p. 16).

As *Fortune Magazine*'s annual report on the 500 leading U.S. corporations makes clear, the author's conception of 'ruling class' does not take into account the domination of U.S. economic, political and social life by a few score financial-industrial monopolies. The 'catastrophe' is one of their own making through their insensate greed and drive to maximize profits through the exploitation and oppression of both the U.S. working masses and those of other countries. It is this that inflicts the deepest wound on U.S. society and infects it with the virus of malignancy.

He takes pains to absolve U.S. imperialism from responsibility for the aggression – his omission of data on further monopolization and monopoly profits is significant as well as conspicuous. Yet, as CPUSA General Secretary Gus Hall expresses it, the expansion of monopolies into conglomerates and multinational corporations, increasingly dominated by the banks, and the extraction of unprecedented profits during the postwar years were the only features of U.S. society not afflicted by crises. Corporate net profits and interest payments to banks and the super-rich in 1946 amounted to $30.5 thousand million, or 11 per cent of the gross national product, whereas in the second quarter of 1973 they reached an annual rate of $305 thousand million, or 27 per cent of GNP, that is, they were ten times more.

The author's thesis that the aggression proved to be 'catastrophic'

for the ruling class is correct in the sense that it exacerbated and deepened all the contradictions inherent in state-monopoly capitalism, and thereby contributed to the catastrophic consequences of the entire U.S. imperialist global strategy.

Yet, the discriminating reader will find that the book's factual material makes clear how U.S. imperialism's use of anti-communism and racism, while facilitating the implementation of its global strategy, widened and deepened the wound.

It gives evidence of the aggression's contribution to the present-day crisis of confidence in bourgeois democracy and its institutions. And although the author dissociates himself from those 'who would place the onus of Vietnam on the particular decision-makers involved' (p. 17), his factual data records the complicity in the aggressions of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, of their administrative aides and advisers, of the Pentagon, and of the majorities in both houses of the Congress, many of whom remain in policy-making posts today. The facts are especially enlightening concerning the duplicity and falsehoods with which all of these administrations, aided by a majority of the mass media, deceived the U.S. population. The book relates the aggression to the growth of authoritarian tendencies culminating in the Watergate conspiracy. And its data on the growth of urban decay, drug addiction and crime supports the author's view that '"so deep a wound," in the phrase of Euphues, "cannot be healed with so light a plaster"' (p. 410). One of its positive features is the weight it gives to the anti-war movement among the U.S. population.

Since such a book's total impact on the social changes, both objective and subjective, occurring in the period of its publication should figure largely in its evaluation, Alexander Kendrick's work may be said to be pertinent now during the U.S. Bicentennial observances and on the eve of the 1976 presidential elections. The U.S. imperialist aggression in Indochina is already a subject of contention in the people's 'agonizing re-appraisal' of U.S. foreign policy in connection with both events. Neither those who want to cover up the real causes and consequences under the pretext of 'national reconciliation,' nor those who speak for the least realistic elements of the financial-industrial-military-political complex in lamenting that Indochina was not bombed 'back to the Stone Age' will find support for their views in the book. On the other hand, those who speak for the U.S. workers and masses and the real interests of the U.S. majority will find the book helpful in advancing their demands for a radical change in U.S. foreign policy.

John Pittman

NEW BOOKS

T. Angelova, *Ivan Ormanov,* Sofia, Partizdat, 1974, pp. 226.

Ivan Ormanov, gifted scholar and an experienced and convinced Marxist-Leninist revolutionary, was an associate of Dmitri Blagoyev and Georgi Dimitrov. This is the first attempt at a biography of this prominent figure of the international revolutionary movement. A bibliography of Ormanov's works is attached.

V.N. Vysotsky. *Terminal Action, Potsdam 1945,* Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya Publishers, 1975, 208 pp. (in Russian).

Terminal was the code name for the 1945 Potsdam Conference. The author describes the diplomatic preparations for it and the foreign-policy scene on the eve of Hitler Germany's defeat, and examines the historic Potsdam decisions, their significance and bearing on our time.

M. Colin, *Ce n'est pas d'aujourd'hui. Les femmes en lutte* (Not As Of Today. Women in Struggle), Paris, Editions sociales, 1975. 246 pp.

The author, a leading personality in the General Confederation of Labor and director of the GCL journal *Antoinette,* gives an account of the struggles of working women in France. Once a working woman herself, she describes the varied trade union activity to promote the independence and equality of women. Appropriately, the book appears in the International Women's Year.

B.M. Leibson, K.K. Shirinia, *The Swing in Comintern Policy.* The Historic Significance of the Seventh Comintern Congress (in Russian), Moscow, Mysl, 1975. 420 pp.

The two Soviet historians delve into the world situation on the eve of the Seventh Comintern Congress and examine the resolutions of the Congress and the significance of its ideas for the contemporary world Communist movement.

G. McLennan, *Quit the Market – Join the World,* London, published by the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1975. 29 pp.

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain examines the economic and political situation in the country following two years of membership in the EEC. He explains the standpoint of his Party, a consistent and uncompromising fighter for the interests of Britain's working man.

Crisi politica e reforma dell'Universita (Political Crisis and University Reform), Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1975, 209 pp.

The book is based on the papers of a conference on democratiza-

tion of the educational system, held under the auspices of the Italian Communist Party. It sets out the demands of the democratic forces, notably the Communists, concerning changes in universities, and discusses the growing self-awareness of students, their political involvement and the role of the Italian Federation of Communist Youth in the student movement.

J. Tomicki, *Dzieje II Miedzynarodowki 1914-1923* (History of the Second International 1914-1923), Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1975. 403 pp.

The period under review, beginning with the outbreak of the First World War, witnessed the betrayal of socialism and proletarian internationalism by the opportunist leaders of social-democratic parties, who made common cause with the imperialist bourgeoisie. The Second International collapsed. A wealth of evidence is marshalled from archives and documents to examine the attempts to revive the social-democratic movement politically, ideologically and organizationally as a counterweight to the Communist International.

Revolutionäres Parteiprogramm – Revolutionäre Arbeitereinheit (Revolutionary Party Program – Revolutionary Working-Class Unity), Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1975, 840 pp.

A scholarly work by research groups of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC CPSU, and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC SUPG. It examines the dialectical interaction of the struggle to merge Marxism with the labor movement and the struggle for the unity of the working class. It shows the role played by Marx and Engels in drawing up the revolutionary program of the working-class Party, and its significance for the unity of the labor movement.

Henry Winston, *Strategy for a People's Alternative*. A Critique of New Theories on the Working Class, Liberation Movements and Social Strata, New York, New Outlook Publishers, 1975. 47 pp.

The National Chairman of the CPUSA examines the following problems: mass working people's party versus the two-party sysem serving the monopolies; leading role of the working class in the anti-monopoly struggle; alliance of the organized Black liberation movement, the working class and all exploited – the Black minority in the United States is not an 'internal colony.'

THE PARTY PRESS

NEW PAPERS

A new French Communist paper, *Action*, began publication in May 1975.

The 21st Extraordinary Congress of the French CP, held October 1974, called for a build-up of the political and ideological activity of Party branches at enterprises. The new paper is to serve this need. It will be a national mass publication, designed to stimulate the work of Party branches in enterprises and help working people in their struggle.

As many as 1,200,000 copies of the first issue were circulated in practically all the country's major enterprises. Section secretaries and heads if FCP federations helped in the distribution.

W.D.

The history of the Communist press in Mexico goes back for all of half a century. The newspaper *Machete*, founded in 1924, was succeeded by *Voz de Mexico* (1938-1970). The journal *Oposicion*, organ of the C Mexican CP, dates back to the same period. Until recently it was a forthnightly, and is now being converted into a weekly. It helps Communists in influencing the industrial proletariat and the working masses fighting for economic and political demands, and explains the goals and positions of the Party.

Much preparatory work preceded *Oposicion's* conversion into a weekly. Collections of funds were begun at the end of last year. Proceeds from festivals and concerts were put into the weekly's fund. So were proceeds from the sale of books and phonograph records. Promotion work was done at factory gates and in town squares. Friendly mass organizations donated large sums. The Central Committee organized a collection contest among committees, cells and individual Communists. The first prize was a trip to socialist Cuba at the expense of the Mexican CP.

The fund collection for the new paper had a political complexion. Since the Party is on a semi-legal footing, considerable danger was involved. Many of the paper's promoters were arrested or fined.

But despite the difficulties the campaign was a big success: a million pesos was collected instead of the originally planned half million. This provides a sound financial basis for uninterrupted publication.

Samuel Melendres

Brief information about Communist and Workers' Parties

SUDANESE COMMUNIST PARTY

On August 18, 1946, members of several Marxist groups met illegally in Khartoum and set up an organization which they called the Sudanese Movement for National Liberation. At its Third Congress (1956) the organization adopted a resolution renaming it the Sudanese Communist Party.

From the outset the Communist Party was firmly linked with the working-class movement and took an active part in the struggle for national independence. Communists were also active in establishing mass democratic organizations – trade unions, youth, women's and other associations.

Local Party branches are set up at places of residence and work, and are united into regional organizations.

Four Party congresses have been held: in 1950, 1951, 1956, 1967. Besides, two special conferences were convened. One, in 1949, defeated the opportunist trend which sought to weaken the Party's political and organizational independence at a time of upsurge in the anti-imperialist struggle. The other, in August 1970, discussed Party work in the conditions of the progressive, anti-imperialist regime set up after the revolution of May 25, 1969.

The first Party Program was adopted by the Third Congress in 1956. Laying down the general line of the SCP, it set the task of carrying out a national-democratic revolution, envisaged rejection of the capitalist way of development, and called for the creation of a democratic national front for the struggle for patriotic, democratic government and gradual development along the road to socialism. A new program, expanding on the ideas formulated in the first one in the light of changes on the international scene and at home, was adopted at the Fourth Congress in October 1967.

The SCP played a prominent part in the struggle against the military dictatorship (1958-1964). After its overthrow in October 1964, and in the period from May 25, 1969, to July 19, 1971, Communists were in the government. In July 1971, the authorities accused the SCP of participation in an attempted coup against the Nimeri government by

a group of left-leaning officers. The Party was brutally attacked and several leading figures, including General Secretary A.K. Mahgoub, were executed. Since then the SCP has again been forced to operate illegally.

Toward the end of 1950 the Party began publishing, illegally, the newspaper *Al-Liva al-Akhmar* ('Red Banner'). From the end of 1951 it appeared legally for 10 months. In 1954-1958, the Party published the newspaper *Al-Maidan* ('Forum') in the name of the anti-imperialist front. It ceased publication when the military dictatorship came to power in November 1958. In October 1964 the paper resumed daily publication as an SCP organ and continued to appear till the Party was banned in December 1965. From 1966 to 1970, the Party put out the legal *Akhbar al-Usbua* (News of the Week). At present *Al-Maidan* is coming out illegally. In addition, there appears at irregular intervals an English-language paper, *Advance*, for the people of Southern Sudan.

Since 1947 the SCP Central Committee has been publishing a theoretical journal, *Ash-Shuyuyi* (The Communist), of which 138 issues have appeared. Regional Party organizations also have publications of their own.

NICARAGUAN SOCIALIST PARTY

Founded by Communists in 1939, the Party has been illegal ever since.

Its documents stress that the present 'independence of Nicaragua is entirely nominal, being merely the facade of a semi-colonial and feudal regime fully devoted to imperialism.' The Party program approved by the 10th Congress (October 1973) analyzes the social, economic and political situation in the country. It says that the immediate goal is to free Nicaragua from the domination of the United States and the local oligarchy and transform it into a genuinely independent state. This goal can be achieved through an agrarian, democratic, popular, anti-imperialist revolution bringing about a patriotic people's government to effect radical democratic and anti-feudal changes and pave the way for the transition to socialism. The program points out the need to combine peaceful forms of struggle with non-peaceful ones.

The NSP considers it impossible to eliminate the present dictatorial regime, establish a democratic system and achieve national liberation without armed struggle. On the other hand, it holds that conditions for such a struggle are still lacking. At this stage it calls for effort to extend links with the masses, build up NSP influence in progressive and democratic sectors, and work more vigorously to unite all pa-

triots in a democratic opposition. The Party advocates a democratic agrarian reform.

The NSP has lately increased its influence among the masses, especially among young workers and students and in the trade unions. The independent General Confederation of Labor, comprising most of the trade unions, operates under Communist leadership. A Confederation of Peasants and Agricultural Workers was founded in 1967 on the Party's initiative.

The Party urges all opposition forces to form a united front against the regime, an open military dictatorship. It strives to lend the democratic movement against Somoza a broader character and to equip it with a minimum program understandable to broad political and social groups opposing the dictatorship in one form or another.

The NSP firmly abides by Marxism-Leninism and stands for closer unity of the world communist movement.

It publishes a number of press organs.

UNITED PARTY OF HAITIAN COMMUNISTS

Established in November 1968 by the merger of the Party of Popular Unity (founded in 1959) and the People's National Liberation Party (founded in 1954), the UPHC operates in strict clandestinity, defending the interests of the workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals. 'The UPHC,' said the declaration on the merger of the two parties, 'is the politically conscious and organized vanguard of the working class fighting under the banner of Marxist-Leninist ideology. In accordance with Leninist organizational principles, it will lead the struggle of the proletarian class to accomplish the Haitian revolution, take power and build socialism.'

The Party has declared that it will maintain fraternal relations with all Communist parties and work for world communist unity on the principles of respect for the independence of each party and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

In May and June 1969, the government jailed and killed hundreds of Communists. Its anti-popular policy is supported by the U.S. reactionaries, who aid Duvalier, the dictator, in various ways.

The UPHC is based on the principles of democratic centralism. Its highest authority is congress and in between congresses Party work is led by the Central Committee headed by the Political Bureau.

The Party's national newspaper is *Boucan*, printed illegally in Haiti. Several UPHC press organs are published in Canada, Mexico and France.

In brief

CONFERENCE OF WEST EUROPEAN COMMUNISTS

The crisis in agriculture was the main item on the agenda of a conference of Communist parties of West European capitalist countries held in Paris. Welcoming the delegates on behalf of the French Communist Party, General Secretary Georges Marchais pointed out that the conference was continuing the line set by the Brussels conference of West European Communist parties, which represented a new stage in the expansion of collaboration among them. The Paris conference outlined a number of joint measures aimed at promoting farmers' solidarity and alliance with all working people in their struggle against the agrarian policies of capitalist states.

ARGENTINA

Reporting at a meeting of the national commission for recruiting new members, Athos Fava, Central Committee Secretary of the CPA, said that by January of this year the Party had 147,427 members, and the Young Communist Federation, 57,920 members. Significantly, 80 to 90 per cent of the new members are former Peronists.

The Party launched a new membership drive to mark May Day and the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism.

AUSTRIA

Almost 100,000 schillings have so far been collected in Austria for the people of South Vietnam in a drive launched by Young Communists and other progressive organizations.

CUBA

The Young Communist League of Cuba has launched a drive to assure that not a single child or adolescent remains out of school or work. It plans to draw all teenagers not attending school or engaged in useful work, into YCL-sponsored work organizations. Another concern of the League is for young workers to constantly improve their general and vocational education.

DENMARK

A plenary meeting of the Central Committee decided to hold the Party's next congress, at which a new Program will be adopted, in 1976. A report at the meeting was delivered by Party Chairman Knud Jespersen.

FRANCE

The Communist Party has submitted its draft Declaration of Freedoms for national discussion. Speaking at a news conference organized to launch the event, General Secretary Georges Marchais declared that in submitting the collective effort of hundreds of Party members and a special commission to the people's judgement, French Communists were pursuing the dual objective of, first, upholding the freedoms circumscribed by the government of big business and, second, promoting the continued development of freedoms in keeping with the economic, social and humanitarian demands of the time. The draft has five sections: individual and collective freedoms; economic and social rights; right of accessibility to culture and information; political rights and democratic institutions; legal guarantees. The FCP holds that, following a comprehensive and democratic debate, the Declaration of Freedoms should be adopted as a preamble to the national Constitution.

SOVIET UNION

The Central Committee of the CPSU held a national conference-cum-seminar on problems of mass propaganda work. It was attended by regional and city Party committee secretaries, chiefs and deputy chiefs of the propaganda departments of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the constituent republics and territorial and regional Party committees, by workers of central and local bodies responsible for cultural affairs and of publishing houses, representatives of national dailies and magazines, the national television and radio, unions of creative workers, the Central Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, the Central Trade Union Council, and the YCL Central Committee.

The participants exchanged views on problems of oral and visual propaganda and their role in the general system of Party ideological work. An assessment was made of an exhibition of visual propaganda aids.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM' 1975

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:
(La 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.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna-4, India.

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 nąmyn 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.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Av. António Serpa, 26-2°, esq. Lisboa - 1, Portugal

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.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panama, Rep. de Panama.

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.