WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Sept. 1976, Vol. 19, No. 9 75¢

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

September 1976, Vol. 19, No. 9

Features

3 The common cause of Europe's Communists
Ib Nørlund, B. Sinclair, D. Stanishev

10 Tasks of revolutionary forces in Iraq
A. Mohammed

18 A new era in the history of Vietnam
J. Lava

Party experience

26 Reliable compass for the Party and the people
K. Hager

35 Lessons of class struggle for power in Hungry
D. Nemes

47 Some aspects of scientific management of society in the USSR
V. Afanasyev

Exchange of views

55 Détente and the revolutionary process. International theoretical conference

Viewpoints

112 A new feature in bourgeois strategy and our experience
T. Sinisalo

120 Myths and realities of the 'white revolution'
H. Safari

129 Love of freedom cannot be killed

141 Who benefits by the assassination of Torres? Letter from Bolivia
L. V.

Facts and figures

143 Socialist Republic of Vietnam

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

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

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

Microfilm edition available through University Microfilms Library Service.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $6.00 a year. Single copies 75 cents. Overseas $9.50.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian. Czech, Danish, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mongolian, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, 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.

The common cause of Europe's Communists

Ib Nørlund,
Member of Executive Committee
and Secretary,
Communist Party of Denmark;

Betty Sinclair,
Member of National
Executive Committee,
Communist Party of Ireland;

Dimitr Stanishev,
Member of Central Committee,
Bulgarian Communist Party;

Vasilis Venetsanopoulos,
Member of Central Committee,
Communist Party of Greece.

The Berlin Conference of 29 European Communist and Workers' Parties was an important landmark in the development of the international communist movement. It was the biggest and most authoritative forum of European Communists, who now number nearly 30 million. If we add to this the place Europe historically holds in the economic, political and cultural life of the world, it should not be difficult properly to assess the importance of the Conference and the reasons for the vast interest in the document it adopted.

Ironically enough, the enemies of communism contributed unwittingly to the popularity of the Conference and the keen interest in its results, for up to the last moment they prophesied that the Conference would never meet. But it did meet and was attended by a maximum number of participants, including parties which for a long time and for various reasons had stayed away from such meetings.

The Conference was held in the comradely atmosphere characteristic of meetings of friends and fellow-fighters. The discussions were businesslike and frank, with full freedom of expression based on respect for one another's positions and views. The authors of this article — members of the *WMR* Editorial Council — were among the

delegates of their respective parties and are therefore in a position to state this on the strength of their own observations.

The Conference document notes that a limited range of questions were discussed. But these were the most pressing and vital problems of our time; the destinies of mankind depend on their correct solution. The very title of the document, 'For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe,' offers a clear idea of the important aspects of the situation that were collectively analyzed and the urgent questions on which the fraternal parties considered it necessary to work out common assessments and set common guidelines.

The document unanimously approved in Berlin rests on the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Its content has been made known not only to Communists, but to world opinion. It has been published in the press (including the August issue of this journal). There is no need, therefore, to set it out in detail. However, we wish to emphasize how very timely this document is — not only as a common Communist platform for promoting détente, durable peace and social progress, for rooting out reaction and fascism, but also as an earnest call for joint action by all individuals and organizations who want a Europe of peace and prosperity.

It will be remembered that the European Communist and Workers' Parties have played an outstanding part in the battle for peace. The 1967 European Communist Conference at Karlovy Vary called for a change from confrontation to relaxation of tension and drew up a concrete action program that has since become reality. The Berlin Conference took a new step in this direction by drawing up a new program for furthering détente through disarmament and security measures.

The time was ripe for such an initiative. Meeting a year after the historic Helsinki Conference, the Communists could review not only the major positive changes in Europe and progress in détente, but also the major dangers to universal peace, which has yet to be guaranteed. To our mind, the main danger is undoubtedly the NATO arms drive, which not only swallows money needed to satisfy the social demands of the people, but also keeps alive international distrust and tensions and is fraught with armed conflict.

Figures published shortly before the Berlin Conference by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute show that more than $6 trillion have been spent on military activities since the Second World War. 'This phenomenally large figure,' the Institute's yearbook says, 'is roughly equal to the gross national product for the entire world in 1975 and is more than five times the GNP of all the underdeveloped countries put together' (*International Herald Tribune*, June 18, 1976, p. 5). When one reflects on this insensate

squandering of wealth and resources — a result of imperialist policy — one can appreciate what the world stands to gain from the disarmament demands set out in the Berlin document. First of all there must be an immediate end to the threat of nuclear war, the unleashing of which would be the greatest crime against mankind.

The Berlin Conference demonstrated anew the Communists' dedication to maintaining peace and preventing a new conflagration that would again sow death and destruction in Europe and other continents. The masses will certainly appreciate the Communists' fight against the war threat, for more effective détente and mutually beneficial cooperation, for better understanding among nations.

The Conference did not confine itself to outlining ways and means of solving the disarmament and security problems, which affect all the nations of the world. The Berlin document also contains a program of measures designed to root out fascism and safeguard democracy and national independence. These questions, too, concern people in Europe and elsewhere. The expressions of militant solidarity of Europe's Communists with the Spanish people's fight to eliminate all the survivals of fascism, with the fighters for a new Portugal, with the people of Cyprus in upholding the sovereignty and integrity of their country, with the democrats of Greece and the democratic forces of Northern Ireland — in short, solidarity with, and support for, all fighters for freedom and independence was a concrete manifestation of the internationalism that was so apparent at the Berlin meeting. These and other examples are convincing the people that in the Communist and Workers' Parties they have true defenders of democracy and human rights, dedicated fighters against fascism, reaction and oppression.

The Berlin Conference reflected the multiformity and universality of the present-day international communist movement. This is especially evident in Europe. In the Conference Hall of the Stadt Berlin Hotel were delegates of Communist and Workers' Parties placed in power by the people and now directing the building of socialism and communism; parties of developed capitalist countries playing an important part in national politics, and parties striving to become mass working-class organizations. Multiformity is proof of the strength and vitality of the communist movement, but it is also a source of certain difficulties.

It would be wrong to deny that there are divergent views in the communist movement on certain problems of revolutionary policy and tactics. After all, there is nothing unnatural in the fact that widely different objective conditions and subjective experiences give rise to differences in views. They made themselves felt in the preparations for the Conference and required long discussions in the drafting commit-

tee and additional comradely consultations between some of the parties.

Bourgeois propaganda played this up, time and again claiming 'irreconcilable contradictions' and failure of attempts to convene the Berlin Conference. But is it really a matter of how many preparatory meetings had to be held? And does not the fact that they were held so often show that the preparations for the Conference followed democratic procedures? The important thing, from the standpoint of developing the communist movement, was that the Conference met in an atmosphere of mutual trust, equality and a clearly expressed will for cohesion, unity, mutual support and solidarity of the independent fraternal Parties.

The theme of internationalism was present in every speech at the Conference. The unanimously adopted document says that the participating parties 'will develop their internationalist, comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, strictly adhering to the principles of equality and sovereign independence of each party, non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for their free choice of different roads in the struggle for social change of a progressive nature and for socialism.' It was emphasized that the struggle of each party for socialism in its own country and its responsibility toward the working class and people are bound up with mutual solidarity among working people of all countries and all progressive movements and peoples. For the Parties we represented in Berlin, this broad view of international solidarity is inseparably linked with the concept of proletarian internationalism, a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism.

Analysis of the results of the Berlin meeting leaves no room for doubt that in spite of divergences over this or that issue, the Communists of Europe *are at one on the principal and fundamental problems of today*. This is seen in their common appraisals and views as expressed in the joint document.

Now as in the past, the Communists are firm primarily in their principled, uncompromising class stand on capitalism and the imperialist system. They are agreed that the economic and social structures of capitalist society clash more and more with the requirements of working men and women, of all people, as well as with the requirements of social progress and democratic and political development. They see very well that the difficulties besetting imperialism stem from its deepening all-embracing general crisis. At the same time, they note that the nature of imperialism is unchanged even though its positions have weakened owing to changes in the balance of forces.

Such is the basis on which the brother Parties pursue — with due regard to national conditions — their policies prompted by recogni-

tion of the historic need to replace capitalist society by a socialist society. The Parties are also at one in regarding the working class as the main force of social development expressing the interests of all working people, the interests of progress and general national interests. In this connection, the participants in the Conference reaffirmed their Parties' rejection of any policy or outlook aimed, in effect, at subordinating the working class to the capitalist system. Also, they stressed their readiness to contribute to cooperation on an equal footing with all democratic forces, especially with Socialist and Social-Democratic parties, in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

Furthermore, the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe are agreed in evaluating the historic significance of the alliance of the three main revolutionary forces of our epoch — the socialist countries, the working-class movement of the capitalist world and the national-liberation movement. They see their struggle for a Europe of peace, cooperation and social progress as a contribution to the solution of the political, economic and social problems of the world.

The fraternal Parties recognized the socialist countries' outstanding role in preventing a new world war, promoting international security and carrying forward détente. The Communists of Western Europe give the socialist countries due credit for their steady economic growth, which is predetermined by the very nature of the new society, and for their foreign policy, which is aimed at asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence and increasingly influences international relations.

This appreciation of existing socialism is all the greater because the Parties attending the Conference regard the struggle for détente as a struggle to provide international conditions for social progress. At the same time, they consider that increasing application of the principles of peaceful coexistence creates favorable conditions for the full independence and independent development of states and more favorable conditions for movements seeking democratic and socialist changes in capitalist countries, and for fuller implementation of the social, economic and political program of socialist countries.

There is no need to go at length into the fundamental and practical importance of this approach to the issue of détente. It is an open secret that to this day 'leftist' elements, for example, fail, or refuse, to see the connection between the struggle for social progress and peaceful coexistence. which they construe as 'surrender' and acquiescence to the preservation of the social status quo. The principled common position taken on these issues by the Communists of Europe will undoubtedly be an effective counter to such erroneous views.

Lastly, mention should be made of the participants' unanimity in

pointing out the damage done by aggressive anti-communism to the development of the movement for progress and peace. The fraternal Parties' document states in no uncertain terms that it does not mean those who are simply mistaken about the Communists, misunderstand their policy or criticize their activity. It is a question of anti-communism as a weapon cynically used by imperialist and reactionary forces not only against Communists, but against all democrats and democratic freedoms. 'These forces,' the document says, 'are conducting campaigns against the Communist Parties, the socialist countries, beginning with the Soviet Union, against the forces of socialism and progress, campaigns which aim to discredit the policy and the ideals of Communists among the mass of the people and to prevent unity within the working-class movement and cooperation among the democratic and popular forces.'

It is against these intrigues of imperialist reaction that the appeal of the Conference 'to isolate and overcome anti-communism' — an appeal which is bound to find widespread response in all countries — is directed. We believe that by treating anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as parts of one and the same phenomenon, the Conference dealt a strong blow to the calculations of capitalist circles that had lately tried to 'separate the issues' and implant in the world communist movement a tolerant and conciliatory attitude to anti-Sovietism.

However, this is by no means the only disappointment brought to the enemies of communism by the Conference. Even a cursory review of the main Conference results reveals, as we have seen, the miscarriage of reactionary calculations based on 'insurmountable contradictions' said to divide the Communists of Europe, on opposing some parties to others and on differences between them. The imperialist agents-provocateurs, who wanted to foment centrifugal trends in the communist movement at all costs, clearly failed.

We will disclose no secret if we say that the main target of reaction's provocative campaign during Conference preparations was the Soviet Union and its Communist Party. The bourgeois mass media, which misinform rather than inform, did not scruple to peddle every manner of falsehood about the 'plans' and 'intentions' of the CPSU in connection with the Conference. They claimed that an attempt was being made to establish once again an 'organizational center' of the communist movement, bind it hand and foot by 'directives' from Moscow, and so on, and so forth. All this was done to defame the policy of the CPSU and undermine its merited international prestige. We firmly believe, and practice shows, that the CPSU does not owe its prestige to a tendency to give orders but to something entirely different, namely, the tremendous services it has done to the inter-

national working class, the immense fraternal aid, international solidarity and support it gives to Communist and Workers' Parties in their fight for the interests of their peoples.

The calumnies of reaction went up in smoke as soon as the real nature of the Conference was revealed to all reasonably unprejudiced people. This was due in decisive measure to the forceful and profound speech of L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU, a speech in which there is not a shadow of the intentions attributed to the CPSU by capitalist propaganda. The speech, which deeply impressed the participants in the Conference, was inspired by genuine proletarian internationalism. It contained an in-depth Marxist-Leninist analysis of the problems of the struggle for peace, security and social progress facing the communist movement of Europe and the world.

The Communist and Workers' Parties have every reason to be satisfied with the results of their collective work in Berlin. These results give them a clear insight into the current situation and unite them in the struggle for their common ideals and common cause. Characteristically, the leadership of all the fraternal Parties have adopted decisions approving the activity of their delegations at the Conference and specifying measures for the implementation of its common conclusions.

Now in the capitalist West post-factum attempts are being made to discredit the outcome of the Conference by 'analyzing' who made a greater or lesser contribution to the meeting, whose views gained the upper hand, who won and who lost as a result of the debate. Such conjectures are, we think, a waste of time. The success of the Conference is a gain for the entire communist movement, for the peoples' struggle for peace, security and social progress.

Of course, the enemies of the communist movement, of peace, democracy and social progress, will persist in attempts to disrupt the Communists' unity and hamper their advance to a common goal. Some people in the capitalist camp suggest that the Berlin meeting was the 'swan song' of internationalism and that it had 'neither a past, nor a future,' as one newspaper put it. As participants in the Conference, we are confident, however, that that is just another short-sighted calculation, or another miscalculation, to be precise, on the part of reaction. The international communist movement, whose glorious history began more than a hundred years ago, has no intention of renouncing its revolutionary traditions to please anyone.

Tasks of the revolutionary forces of Iraq

Aziz Mohammed
First Secretary, Iraqi CP

Recent years have seen profound qualitative changes in Iraq involving a vast area of economic and social relations. The industries constituting the mainstay of the economy, primarily the extractive industry, are dominated by the state sector (70 per cent of total output). All oil resources have been nationalized. The state fully controls all bank operations, the greater part of foreign and wholesale internal trade and the manufacturing industry.

A progressive agrarian reform has deprived the big landowners of 60 per cent of their holdings. After redistribution and lease, poor and middle peasants cultivated some 3.5 million hectares. There is a cooperative sector formed under the agrarian reform law, although it is still made up mostly of service cooperatives. The cooperatives comprise farms accounting for 4.25 million hectares of land, or 70 per cent of the country's total. State and collective farms have been set up on an area of roughly 300,000 hectares.

These and other changes have restricted the development of capitalism as a socio-economic formation and stripped big business of political power. The country is ruled by a progressive, patriotic regime and has a revolutionary alliance uniting national-patriotic progressive parties and forces. Foreign policy is directed against imperialism, Zionism and reaction. Its aim is to contribute to lasting world peace, support the liberation movements of all peoples and maintain political and economic relations with the socialist community. With the signing of the Iraqi-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation in 1972, our relations with the first socialist country acquired a new quality.

Developments in the country are invariably in the focus of the Communists' attention, who proved to be fully prepared to analyze the new situation and equal to drawing their own conclusions from the changes taking place and to making correct Marxist-Leninist forecasts. This was particularly evident at the Third National Congress of the Iraqi Communist Party (Baghdad, May 4-6, 1976), held under the slogan 'For intensifying and deepening the revolutionary process and for Iraq's advance to socialism.' The Congress was an event of

exceptional importance in the history of both our Party and the Iraqi revolutionary movement. It was the first legal congress of our Party, which was founded over 40 years ago and had to operate in illegal conditions through almost the entire period. We had only two congresses before, in 1945 and 1970, both in clandestine conditions. This year's congress was convened in a period fundamentally new to the Party and the country, a period noteworthy for increasing patriotic cooperation between the ICP and the ruling Arab Baath Socialist Party, the Party's presence in the government, in which it holds two ministerial posts, the formation of a Progressive National-Patriotic Front (PNPF) and the legalization of the Party press.

Progressive social changes made their imprint on the preparations for the Congress. Eight months before it opened, the Central Committee circulated among the Party membership for discussion a new draft program and amendments to the rules taking account of the Party's legalization. Party organizations held extensive discussions on both drafts in which friends of the Party joined. Apart from branch meetings, there were dozens of district and regional Party conferences that drew thousands of elected delegates.

The methods of drafting the above documents and their wide discussion were indicative of the high standard of inner-Party democracy. They were genuinely collective and helped to strengthen links between leading Party committees and Party branches and to further Party unity. This procedure of preparations largely predetermined the success of the Congress, which unanimously approved both drafts. It is fair to say that the policy evolved on the basis of the Central Committee report and its discussion, the new program, the amendments to the rules and other decisions were a result of collective effort.

The Third ICP Congress summed up and expanded the policy followed by the Party ever since July 1968, when the Baathists came to power.

The ICP's concern with the problem of forming a patriotic alliance goes back to the 1940s. It worked for it at every stage of the national-democratic revolution. In this we proceeded from analyses of the motive forces of the revolution and the forces opposing it and from the experience of the revolutionary movement in our country and elsewhere. After 1968, too, the Communists' guiding idea was a class and political alliance meeting the exigencies of the given stage of the liberation struggle, a stage at which the tasks of the national-democratic revolution must be accomplished and the prerequisites of the transition to socialism created in cooperation with the Baathists. After this policy was reaffirmed by the Second National Congress of the ICP (1970), the Party and its Central Committee continued to

promote it in practice, linking it more and more closely with profound social and economic changes.

Marxist-Leninist analysis led us to the conclusion that our liberation movement owed all its gains to the existence, in one form or another, of a bloc of national forces, whereas its reverses had generally been due to division among the patriots. In keeping with this conclusion, the Party decided that a class alliance corresponding to the given stage should include the workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and progressive elements of the middle bourgeoisie and be based on an alliance of the workers, peasants and other working people.

As for the political alliance uniting the Baath Party, the ICP and progressive patriotic Arabs and Kurds, it was embodied in the PNPF. The emergence of the PNPF on July 17, 1973, was a result of the deepening revolutionary process in Iraq, a notable achievement of our national movement, a fruit of the efforts of the two main parties, Baath and the ICP. It was hailed by progressives in Arab countries and the world over.

Unlike the progressive alliances that were set up in Iraq in the past and were characterized by hostility to the existing regime, today's alliance is based on the cooperation of Baath, the party at the head of national power, the ICP and other patriotic parties and forces participating in the government along with the Baathists. They are all united by the Front's National Action Charter, a program formulated with due regard to the present, revolutionary-democratic period. The Charter rejects the capitalist road in favor of a socialist orientation.

An issue of special importance today is how effectively this progressive program is being carried out. The Third Party Congress answered the question. It spoke highly of the role and activity of the PNPF. At the same time, entirely in accordance with the National Action Charter, the Communists defined the prerequisites of stepping up the activity of the Front, both at Front level and within each member-party. A task of the patriotic forces is to make the implementation of Charter provisions compulsory, enhance the Front's role in national politics and transform the Front into a broad and active mass movement capable of exercising popular control over government and of giving the people a say in the drafting of economic programs. It is important that all other mass organizations should regard the alliance embodied in the Front as basic.

The Congress called for implementation of the Front program in respect of guaranteeing democratic, political, social and trade union freedoms, freedom of the press, opinion and convictions. To democratize public life and complete the transitional period in the country's political organization, it is necessary to end the practice of declaring a

state emergency, draft a permanent constitution and set up legislative and executive constitutional bodies and institutions. Furthermore, it is important to form local self-government bodies (elected people's councils) in all administrative areas and adopt other measures to promote democracy and ensure greater popular participation in the struggle for progressive changes. If carried out, these measures will strengthen the patriotic regime and guarantee its further progressive evolution. They will enable genuinely national forces more effectively to defend the revolution and its gains against reactionary attacks and imperialist conspiracies.

The trend of the revolutionary movement in our country and world experience point to the necessity for an alliance of revolutionary parties and progressive social classes and strata to carry out the tasks of the national-democratic revolution. They also confirm the possibility of the continued existence and development of this alliance in the interests of the socialist future of Iraq.

To a country like ours, where two major peoples, Arabs and Kurds, have been living side by side for centuries and where there are numerous smaller ethnic groups, the nationalities question is extremely relevant. Bearing in mind the interests of the Arab and Kurdish peoples and the working class of Iraq and the conditions of their struggle, the ICP has always supported the Kurds' national movement and their legitimate demand that Iraqi Kurdistan be granted autonomy. Our Party approved the law on autonomy whose enactment the PNPF insisted on and which the government approved in 1974.

The Third ICP Congress reaffirmed the Communists' fundamental policy of recognizing the Kurdish people's national rights, including their right to autonomy. We consider that the primary requisite of solving the Kurdish problem in Iraq is to promote democracy. At the same time, our Party Congress reaffirmed the ICP's condemnation of the right-wing reactionary leadership of the Kurdish national movement which had opposed the law granting autonomy, the regime's progressive policy and the Communist Party. The anti-government rebellion started by these forces was backed by the imperialist, Zionist and reactionary forces of our region.

However, the rightists' defeat was a foregone conclusion. This is understandable, for, as the Congress pointed out, life had demonstrated once again that the Kurdish problem cannot be solved in isolation from the problem of the Iraqi people as a whole, without revolutionary democratic changes, in isolation from the main contingents of the world anti-imperialist front. It is a problem that cannot be settled by entering into collusion with imperialist, reactionary and Zionist forces.

Currently the ICP leadership is campaigning for the consolidation and development of autonomy as an earnest of success in solving the Kurdish problem. This objective can be achieved provided the Kurdish people exercise their national rights, and by respecting their national sentiments and their right to develop their culture and language, as well as by preserving the composition of the population of Iraqi Kurdistan. It is just as important to preserve the progressive legacy of the Kurdish people, combat ideas and activities harming Arab-Kurdish brotherhood and guarantee the rights of every ethnic minority.

One of the main problems discussed by the Third Congress was the outlook for the Iraqi revolution. The conclusions drawn have found expression in the new Party program.

Marxism-Leninism makes it possible to grasp in a creative spirit the problem of transition to socialism and see the profound dialectical interconnection of the general laws of socialist construction and its distinguishing features in the country concerned. It is also important to use the dialectical method at the stages of social development leading up to socialism.

In line with Marxist-Leninist tenets and with due regard to Iraqi reality, our Party drew the strategic conclusion that the national-democratic revolution has entered a new progressive stage, the stage of non-capitalist development. We must now complete the fulfillment of national-democratic tasks by furthering the revolution in a socialist direction. This provision of the new Party program is based on analysis of achievements and changes intended to strengthen political and win economic independence. The program stresses that 'non-capitalist development, which means carrying out the tasks of the national-democratic revolution and creating the prerequisites of the transition to socialism, is embodied in anti-capitalist measures blocking the development of capitalism as a socio-economic formation' (*Tariq Al-Shaab*, May 16, 1976). However, these measures do not eliminate capitalist production relations nor prevent their expansion, especially in rural Iraq.

The non-capitalist road is not identical with the period of transition to socialism. The latter has its own laws. Besides, the situation today is still dangerous, for reactionary forces are trying to pull the country back to capitalism and make it dependent on imperialism (the experience of other countries furnishes similar evidence). They want to check the progress of the revolution. Private capital, which continues to grow in town and country alike, still wields economic, ideological and political influence in society and in government. It derives strength from the vast sphere of small-commodity production and from its own ramified links with world capital and the support given

by the latter. The rightists also take advantage of the country's continuing dependence on the capitalist world market.

Private capital strives to amass immense wealth at the expense of the state sector and does its utmost to exploit it and rob it of its progressive content so as to pave the way for its abolition and for a return to the capitalist road of development. The growing new bourgeoisie in the state sector — contractors, go-betweens and bureaucrats — are a potential threat of such a reversal.

On the other hand, objective conditions are developing that make it possible to prevent Iraq's return to the capitalist road. They can be effectively used provided the revolution is steadily pressed forward. Both the internal and external prerequisites of this are there. We are living in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, in a period when the socialist system is becoming the decisive factor of social development and appeals strongly to other peoples. The ideas of scientific socialism have an increasing impact, not only on the working class and other working people, but on new social and political forces, revolutionary democrats. The latter no longer limit themselves to anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles but resist capitalist development more and more often. By studying the ideas and conclusions of scientific socialism, revolutionary democrats become more aware of their importance and effectiveness in the struggle for the victory of the national-democratic revolution and the establishment of a society free from exploitation.

The spread of socialist ideas among large sections of the population is an objective factor contributing to Iraq's advance along a non-capitalist road. Our relations with the socialist community play a notable role in this. They help Iraq to cast off the shackles of dependence on the capitalist world market and create the prerequisites of building socialism.

The progress of our revolution as a whole benefits from an international situation highlighted by major achievements in implementing the Peace Program of the 24th CPSU Congress and by the historic victories of the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Portugal and Greece. The outcome of the anti-colonial struggle in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau was vastly important to the African and world national-liberation movement. These victories were achieved against the background of a new aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism in the political, economic and ideological fields. Also, the Third ICP Congress stressed the decisive role of the socialist system and of its vanguard, the Soviet Union, in world development.

Iraq's Communists highly appreciate the international significance of the 25th CPSU Congress, an outstanding event in the life of the Soviet people and in the world communist movement. They whole-

heartedly congratulated the Soviet people and their Leninist Party on their achievements in building communism and called upon the ICP leadership to continue strengthening the bonds of brotherhood and solidarity with the CPSU and other fraternal parties.

The Congress identified itself with the peoples fighting for their political and economic liberation, with all victims of imperialism, racism and fascism throughout the world. Our Party emphatically demands the release from prison of Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile.

The Congress devoted much attention to the situation in the Arab region and the Middle East. Being part of the Arab world and the national-liberation movement of the area, Iraq directly experiences the impact of the processes going on here. The Middle East has become an arena of bitter struggle between the forces of progress and those of imperialism, Zionism and reaction. This struggle is waged over vast natural resources, especially those of the Persian Gulf, in view of the strategic position of the Arab states. Zionism and imperialism deny the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to return to their homeland and establish a sovereign national state.

Zionist imperialist aggression and the occupation of Arab territories by Israel have turned the Middle East into an area of dangerous international tensions. Since its defeat in Indochina, U.S. imperialism has been concentrating more and more on our region, and this tends to aggravate the Middle East crisis. The split among the Arabs, moves aimed at weakening the Arab-Soviet alliance and the events in Lebanon are indicative of this trend. In short, the U.S. imperialists are sparing no efforts to regain their influence in the Middle East and to continue plundering it.

The Third ICP Congress condemned the betrayal of the rightist forces in the Arab national-liberation movement. The most obvious manifestation of this betrayal is the Sinai agreement* and Anwar Sadat's denunciation of the Egyptian-Soviet treaty of friendship and cooperation. Both these acts are a product of the 'new' home and foreign policy trend of Egypt's rightist leadership.

The Party Congress voiced deep concern over the bloodshed in Lebanon. While expressing admiration for the struggle of Lebanon's national-patriotic forces and the heroic Palestine Resistance, the Communists of Iraq noted regretfully that the attitude of certain Arab quarters to Lebanon did not benefit that country's patriots and people.

*The Egyptian-Israeli agreement on a partial withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai peninsula, signed in September 1975, was condemned by progressive Arab and world opinion. — *Ed.*

To go on developing their liberation movement in a revolutionary direction and overcome divisions and current difficulties, the anti-imperialist forces and regimes of the Arab world need unity. It is important to coordinate the positions of progressive countries, set up internal and all-Arab fronts of anti-imperialist forces and strengthen their alliance with the socialist community, especially the bonds of Arab-Soviet friendship, which all progressive Arabs regard as the key to victory over imperialism, Zionism and reaction. This was a conclusion drawn by the ICP Congress.

Our Party sees this as the only way to end Israeli aggression, free the occupied territories, create the basic prerequisites of victory for the Arab people of Palestine led by the PLO, contribute to the growth of the liberation revolution in the Arab world and give it a progressive content.

To us, the possibility of accomplishing the above tasks hinges in tremendous measure on the gains of the international communist and working-class movement. This movement, in which Lenin's glorious Party and the ruling parties of countries of the socialist community as a whole hold a vanguard position, has made notable progress in every field. The Third ICP Congress pointed with satisfaction to the correctness of the collective conclusions drawn by the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and borne out by life itself. It approved the activity of the Party's Central Committee, which had supported the proposal for a new international Communist meeting, because many of the tasks set by the 1969 forum have been carried out and important changes have occurred in the world since then. It is necessary to exchange views and strengthen Communist unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

In championing national-patriotic goals with the support of the working class and other working people, the ICP has always been loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Never in its long history has it set its national tasks apart from those of the world communist movement. These fundamental principles invariably serve the Party as a source of inspiration in framing its home and foreign policies. Iraq's Communists intend to go on building up their relations with the world communist movement, working for its consolidation and resisting all attempts to split it. They are convinced that upholding proletarian internationalism is of vital importance if every brother party is to achieve its national objectives.

The Congress stressed that respect for the independence of Marxist-Leninist parties in shaping their policies should not mean opposing national interests and tasks to international ones, or the principles of independence of each contingent of the world communist movement to the common worldwide historic mission uniting

them. Iraq's Communists have emphatically condemned Maoism for its rupture with Marxism-Leninism and for its hostile attitude toward the Soviet Union, other countries of the socialist community, the international working class and the national-liberation movement.

Implementation of the new program and the decisions of the Third Congress will enable the revolutionary forces of our country to take a new step forward. United by a common will and common cause, the Communists of Iraq intend to carry out these tasks through joint struggle in alliance with the Baath Party and all progressive forces. A lofty duty facing us is actively and creatively to implement the policy we have decided upon in the spirit of revolutionary patriotism and in Communist good faith. We will spare no effort to justify the trust reposed in Iraq's Communists by their brothers and allies in diverse situations and on various occasions. Our Party greatly appreciates this support and will continue to uphold without compromise the principles of proletarian internationalism, the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

A new era in the history of Vietnam

Jose Lava
Member of CC,
CP of thc Philippines,
Editorial Council member
of *WMR*

From June 24 to July 3, the thoughts of all Vietnamese centered on the building in Hanoi's Ba Dinh Square where the unified National Assembly of the country, elected late in April, held its first session. The Assembly comprises 80 workers, 100 peasants, 6 handicraftsmen, 98 intellectuals and public figures, 54 servicemen, 13 religious personalities, and 141 Party leaders and statesmen. They embody the people's national unity and cohesion, a bloc whose pivot is the worker-peasant alliance, with the Working People's Party of Vietnam playing the leading role.

In brief, the session formed the highest leading bodies of the unified Vietnamese state and approved its new name — the Socialist Republic of Vietnam — its coat of arms, anthem and flag. It elected a commission to draft a new Constitution and specified, in accordance

with the report submitted by Le Duan, First Secretary of the WPPV, the tasks of the unified Vietnam for the period ahead. The reunification of Vietnam on democratic and socialist lines is complete. This means that the people have attained their cherished goal for which they carried on a protracted and strenuous fight against the imperialist aggressors and their agents. It is not accidental that in those festive days the Vietnamese recalled more often than ever the confident forecast of Ho Chi Minh, their great son, outstanding internationalist revolutionary and leader of the world communist and working-class movement, First President of the DRV. 'Vietnam,' he said, 'is one country, the North and South of Vietnam are one family and no reactionary forces will be able to divide them. Vietnam will be unified.'

The great and just cause pioneered by Ho Chi Minh, for whom Saigon has been renamed, has triumphed completely. Expressing the will of the whole people, the National Assembly politically finalized their reunification and confirmed the desire to follow the road shown by Marxism-Leninism. The flag of a socialist republic flies above unified Vietnam. '...The Vietnamese revolution,' Le Duan said in his report to the National Assembly, 'is entering a new stage, the stage of a socialist revolution encompassing the whole country. It is a stage at which our people are fighting to build in their beloved homeland the finest society that has ever existed in the history of our country...'

The final reunification of Vietnam is a major event of international significance. For decades the word 'Vietnam' symbolized the people's heroic struggle for freedom, independence and unity; it also symbolized solidarity with that struggle on the part of all progressive, peace-loving and honest people. Today the Vietnamese people's friends hail the reunification as an event marking both the triumph of the historic cause of the Vietnamese people and the common victory of the forces of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism. Unified Vietnam has strengthened the positions of peace and socialism in Southeast Asia.

At the same time, the final reunification of Vietnam naturally prompts Communists and other revolutionaries the world over to take a closer look at the glorious history of the Vietnamese revolution and analyze its milestones in relation to the general trends of our time again and again. Needless to say, this goes primarily for those who for decades bore the brunt of the struggle, who organized and led it, paving the way for victory — the workers and peasants, the whole people of Vietnam led by the WPPV. However, the failure of the imperialist intervention and the nationwide victory of the revolution warrant conclusions going beyond the boundaries of one party or one country.

Today's brilliant victory of the Vietnamese people goes back to the August Revolution of 1945, which the WPPV defined, in line with Lenin's teachings, as a national and people's democratic revolution taking place in a new international context, with the working class leading. Accordingly, the Communists of Vietnam pursued the course of developing it into a socialist revolution. The essence of this policy was succinctly expressed by Ho Chi Minh. 'There is no way,' he said, 'to save the country and bring about national liberation other than proletarian revolution.'

Proceeding from these principles and using the favorable conditions created by the Soviet Army's victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism, the Vietnamese Communists followed a strategy which consisted above all in establishing genuine democracy as a most important step toward socialism, assuring the continuity of democratic and initial socialist changes and thereby reducing the time needed for the democratic revolution to develop into a socialist one. This policy met the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the people for freedom, independence and social progress. It made it possible to forge a durable worker-peasant alliance. At all subsequent stages of the revolution and the revolutionary war, the Party worked under the slogan of unity of the struggle for national independence and the struggle for democracy and socialism, and ultimately achieved victory.

Thus, the revolution furnished convincing proof of the vitality and validity of Lenin's doctrine of the inseparable connection between the struggle for democracy and national independence and the struggle for socialism. To be sure, the revolution applied this doctrine in a distinctive form due to the given historical situation and national characteristics. The fact that it took place in a colonial country where bourgeois-democratic tasks had not yet been carried out and survivals of feudalism lingered, likewise left its imprint. It is important, however, that the Vietnamese Communists, guided by Lenin's teachings, not only accomplished general democratic tasks, but used effective methods of bringing the working people into the struggle for socialism, which they carried through to victory in the North. And this is precisely the substance of Lenin's theory of revolution, a theory equipping revolutionary forces with a scientific methodology for finding the right way of transition to socialism in both developed capitalist and developing countries.

To us Philippine Communists, and I think to the Communists of other Asian and African countries which are only just setting out to effect anti-imperialist and national-democratic changes, the experience of the Vietnamese revolution is of particular interest because it stresses the importance of the national-democratic revolution as a

stage immediately preceding socialist changes. Of course, the depth, pace and forms of struggle to bring about anti-imperialist and national-democratic changes may vary from country to country according to national conditions. In the final analysis, this depends on the social base of the Communist Party concerned at the time of these changes and on its ability to win new allies in fighting for socialism. It is important to note, however, that today, when the activity and influence of the international working class and the forces of peace, democracy and socialism increasingly determine the direction and pace of developments, it is becoming possible, as the experience of the WPPV shows very clearly, to closely intertwine general democratic and initial socialist transformations in one revolutionary process.

Profound democratic changes were carried out even during the bitter War of Resistance under the leadership of the WPPV against the French colonialists, first of all an agrarian reform which brought about major changes in the countryside, strengthened the worker-peasant alliance and contributed to victory in the war. North Vietnam, which was fully liberated and maintained close links with the socialist world system, completed the land reform, abolished feudal exploitation in the countryside and then carried out socialist changes, the most important of them being the formation of agricultural cooperatives, the transfer of private trade and industry to the state and the beginning of socialist industrialization.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the first worker-peasant state to emerge in Southeast Asia (September 2, 1945), was a most important factor in carrying out general democratic changes in North Vietnam that developed into socialist ones. The people's political power was backed by a revolutionary army of workers and peasants who defended the people's gains. The DRV became a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the revolutionary process deepened and the foundations of socialism were laid.

Lastly, the experience of the Vietnamese revolution reaffirms the validity of Lenin's idea that the hegemony of the proletariat can be ensured at every stage of the revolutionary process, even in countries where petty-bourgeois strata predominate. The strategy which the Party followed in fulfilling this task was based on Lenin's analysis of conditions guaranteeing such hegemony. First of all, the Party developed the working people's mass struggle during which the proletariat of Vietnam expanded its influence and won over the overwhelming majority of the people, primarily the peasantry, by coming forward as the most determined fighter for national independence, freedom and social progress, and secondly, the working class main-

tained its organizational and ideological autonomy as expressed by its Party.

Characteristically, as the political and then the armed struggle intensified, the working class and its Party exerted growing influence on the people, who saw that the WPPV expressed their fundamental interests and aspirations more consistently than anyone else and was a reliable political and military leader and organizer of the whole of society. Accordingly, the social base of the Vietnamese revolution as a whole expanded while the imperialist forces and their agents were increasingly isolated, a development aggravating the crisis of the rotten Saigon regime.

All this confirms the fundamental Marxist-Leninist tenet that the more thorough and profound the revolutionary changes, the greater the number of people involved in them.

History tells us that revolution cannot be exported. The revolution, Lenin said, cannot 'break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 480). It is first of all a result of the development of the situation in the country concerned and is a matter for that country's people. At the same time, every socialist revolution today is part of the world revolutionary process and its future is largely conditioned by the general balance of world forces and the possibilities of obtaining aid and support from other revolutionary and democratic movements.

The experience of Vietnam is indicative of the immense and steadily growing importance of the international solidarity of revolutionary forces in defeating imperialism and reaction. The countries of the socialist community and the parties ruling in them have always seen one of their key international tasks in bringing about an end to the imperialist aggression and war in Indochina and in supporting and aiding the fraternal people of Vietnam. Their efforts in this direction have rightly been assessed by other Communist and Workers' Parties, the international working class and the revolutionary contingents of the national-liberation movement as a vivid example of genuinely fraternal, internationalist policy. The Vietnamese working people and Communists, and the leaders of the DRV and the Provisional Revolutionary Government in the South repeatedly expressed their heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the socialist countries. The final reunification of Vietnam is an important international achievement of the entire socialist world system.

The triumph of the Vietnamese people's historic cause is also a victory for other contingents of the world revolutionary process: the international working class, the national-liberation movement, all anti-imperialist, democratic, peace-loving forces.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, which joined efforts to resist

U.S. imperialist aggression, were invariably in the van of the movement of solidarity with Vietnam. The Communist Party USA showed itself to be a staunch champion of the Vietnamese people's just cause. The victory of the forces of national independence and socialism in Vietnam proves that the more united the Communists are, the more successfully the peoples carry on their struggle against imperialism.

Mention should also be made of the impact of the war on the United States itself. The war brought into being a mass political movement matched by very few movements in American history. This movement not only strove for an end to the war but also condemned many aspects of U.S. home and foreign policy. Millions of Americans came to realize that America's rulers were involving them in a world role having nothing to do with the 'defense of freedom, democracy and progress,' which official propaganda had for decades made out to be the goal of U.S. policy. The Vietnamese victory resulted in a more critical frame of mind and a radicalization of the thinking and political stance of large sectors of American society.

It took the Vietnamese people 30 years to win. Most of that period was taken up with wars imposed by imperialism. I think one of the fundamental lessons of the Vietnamese revolution is that a people defending their national independence and the freely chosen path of their development with devotion, unshakable resolve and courage, and ready to make any sacrifice to attain these objectives, a people supported by the socialist world system and all progressive forces, cannot be defeated.

The WPPV played a tremendous role in organizing resistance to the imperialist aggression, uniting the people in struggle and evolving an effective political and military strategy. The Party's competent ideological and political leadership on the home front, on the battlefield and in domestic and foreign policy earned it deep esteem from Communist and Workers' Parties. The vast experience gained by the WPPV in defending the working people's achievements against imperialist encroachments is of considerable value to many peoples and parties, especially those that fought or are fighting in the national-liberation zone.

Marxist-Leninists never make an absolute of any one form of revolutionary struggle. They consider that the choice of this or that form is determined by the situation and one must therefore be able to use all forms — peaceful and non-peaceful, political and military. This is also confirmed by the experience of the WPPV, which combined armed with political and, at certain stages, diplomatic struggle.

Now that the country has been reunified, the WPPV is faced with

important and complex tasks in building a socialist society all over the country.* The conditions in which these tasks are to be carried out are made distinctive primarily by the fact that the North and the South are at different stages of revolutionary change. The North has eliminated the exploiting classes, established socialist production relations and laid the initial groundwork for large-scale socialist production. In the South, private economy and small-scale production are still widespread, and the social system is bourgeois democratic.

In setting out to build a unified socialist Vietnam, the Party adheres to the general laws of socialist construction, which it applies with due regard to the national and concrete historical conditions, to the actual situation in each of the two main regions. The program for the socialist development of the SRV was set out by Le Duan in his National Assembly report. Bearing in mind the advantages of the socialist social system and the possibilities of using the manpower and resources of the whole country judiciously and according to plan, the WPPV defined the revolution's strategic task at this stage as follows: '. . . Leading the whole country toward socialism rapidly, energetically and unswervingly. The North must give a powerful spur to building socialism and perfecting socialist production relations; at the same time, the South must fight for socialist changes and socialist construction.'

The WPPV sees the way to accomplishing this strategic task in simultaneously shaping new productive forces and new production relations by carrying out what Le Duan describes as a threefold revolution: a revolution in production relations, a scientific and technological revolution, and an ideological and cultural revolution. The Party expects to essentially complete the task of building the material and technical base for socialism in 15 to 20 years.

The goals set by Vietnam's Communists are realistic. Unified socialist Vietnam is a big country rich in natural resources. The WPPV has gained much political and economic experience and enjoys the people's unqualified confidence and support. Lastly, the SRV has on its side so powerful a factor for world development as the increasingly close relations with the socialist community, primarily with the Soviet Union. The socialist countries' solidarity will contribute in vast measure to the Vietnamese people's effort for rapid economic rehabilitation and further progress along the socialist road.

There are many examples in the history of the 20th century showing that it is socialism and socialism alone that makes it possible to end in a historically short time an age-long lag inherited from the past and to do it without the suffering and privations imposed on the masses by capitalist exploitation. In the Soviet Union, the Central

*See 'Socialist Republic of Vietnam,' in the facts and figures section of this issue.

Asian republics and Kazakhstan have travelled such a road to socialism. The Mongolian People's Republic has done as much. Socialist changes have been effected in Cuba. The Vietnamese comrades study the experiences of fraternal socialist countries. This is indicated, among other things, by the participation of WPPV delegations in the recent congresses of ruling Marxist-Leninist parties and by the presence of an SRV delegation at the 30th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

To us Communists, especially those who, like the Communists of my country, are fighting for anti-imperialist and national democratic changes, the experience of the Working People's Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese revolution is of enormous interest. Revolutionary parties and movements study, and will study, this experience in order to draw from its conclusions and lessons relevant to the specific conditions in which they are fighting. By making common cause with the socialist countries, identifying itself with every contingent of the worldwide liberation movement, seeking normal relations with all Southeast Asian countries, establishing still closer relations with the peoples of Laos and Cambodia, and carrying out socialist construction tasks, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is building up its international influence and prestige.

Party experience

Reliable compass for the Party and the people

Kurt Hager
PB member and Secretary
of the Party

THE NEW PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY

The Ninth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG), held last May in Berlin, unanimously and enthusiastically approved the new Party program drafted by a commission led by Erich Honecker, who was re-elected the Party's General Secretary. The Central Committee report he delivered to the Congress emphasized that the new program defines the fundamental aims of the Party, 'gives it a clear orientation in the advance to communism and for several five-year periods will be the guideline of all our activity.'

Together with the conclusions drawn by the 25th CPSU Congress and Party congresses in other socialist countries, the program forms the basis of our Party's theoretical and practical activity over the coming period.

The draft of the program was published four months before the Ninth Congress in seven million copies and was widely discussed, and approved, by the Party membership in primary units and at district and regional conferences. It was discussed also by the friendly parties affiliated to the Democratic Bloc, trade unions, in factories, by members of the general public. The drafting commission received 1,905 proposals and amendments, all of which were carefully examined and 442 were, in one form or another, incorporated in the 125 amendments and addenda approved by Congress. It can truly be said that the entire people had a share in drafting the program.

It consists of five chapters: (1) The worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism; (2) Building a developed socialist society in the German Democratic Republic; (3) Tasks in foreign policy and national defense; (4) The Party as the leading force in building a developed socialist society and in the transition to communism; (5) Communism — our aim.

The new program formulates the inspiring task of building a developed socialist society and thereby providing the basic preconditions for the gradual transition to communism. This is a realistic aim and one that accords with the social requirements of the Republic's new development stage. By defining our strategic aim and the tasks involved in attaining it, we have given the people a clear and optimistic perspective. The people responded to the program and other Congress documents by new initiatives and by assuming concrete obligations in the socialist emulation drive.

In capitalist countries, the bourgeois parties and the ideologists, including those on the Social-Democratic right, have no clear answer to the question of capitalism's future. That is understandable for they are defending a society that has no future. Only a party guided by Marxism-Leninism and drawing on the historical experience of the revolutionary working-class movement, notably that of the CPSU, is in a position scientifically to prognosticate social development and set itself the task of building a developed socialist society and its gradual transition to communism. Only socialism gives the people an aim worth working for, namely, a future in peace, happiness and prosperity.

The new SUPG program absorbs the experience of the German revolutionary labor movement's age-long struggle against feudal reaction and capitalist exploitation, imperialism and militarism, fascism and imperialist war. The preamble emphasizes that the SUPG is the conscious and organized vanguard of the working class and working people of the GDR, the embodiment of the revolutionary traditions of the Communist League and of the revolutionary German Social Democrats. The Party, the preamble says, 'continues the work of the Communist Party of Germany, is true to the behests of the anti-fascist Resistance fighters, and has inherited everything progressive in the history of the German people.'

The historic merger, in April 1946, of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties resulted in working-class unity on a revolutionary basis and the emergence of a united, battle-seasoned Marxist-Leninist party, the SUPG, with clearly-formulated aims. This furnished the crucial preconditions for anti-fascist democratic transformations and socialist revolution, for a fundamental change in the history of the German people, a change toward socialism, now a reality in the GDR.

The gains of our people are tersely and clearly put in the program: 'In the German Democratic Republic the working class, in alliance with the peasants and other working people, has established and consolidated its political domination. It has founded a socialist worker-peasant state as a form of proletarian dictatorship. In line with Marxism-Leninism, it has refashioned property relations in respect of

the main means of production and built a firm political and economic base from which to carry out the social, cultural and ideological tasks of socialist society. Confidence in the future, steady improvement of living conditions, formation of the new mentality — such are the chief results of socialist construction. And in this process a new, socialist nation is being formed in the German Democratic Republic.'

The building of socialism in the GDR is intimately linked with the world revolutionary process, primarily with the successful development of socialism. The Soviet Union has made the decisive contribution to this. And the SUPG program underlines the epochal importance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet Union's victory over Hitler fascism. The program notes the momentous achievements and gains of the Soviet people who, led by the Party of Lenin, have built a developed socialist society and are confidently advancing to communism. As a contingent of the international communist movement firmly adhering to proletarian internationalism, the SUPG has invariably been guided by the experience of history, which furnishes ample evidence that the GDR's socialist gains are due to close, unshakable alliance and cooperation with the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries. The program contains this underlying principle of Party policy: 'In building the new social system, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany utilizes the experience accumulated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal Parties. Inviolable friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people will continue to be a source of strength and the basis for the development of the socialist German Democratic Republic.' Chapter I of the program points to the growing influence of socialism and of all the anti-imperialist forces, the continued shift in the balance of world forces to the advantage of socialism, peace and democracy, as favoring the development of socialism in the GDR.

The new program is a sequel to the successfully fulfilled decisions of the Eighth SUPG Congress. In the five years 1971-75, our workers, cooperative farmers, intellectuals, women and youth have scored outstanding successes. Overfulfillment of the five-year plan has enhanced the country's economic strength and substantially improved the material and cultural standards of its people. Unity of economic and social policy has stimulated the creativity and initiative of the masses, for everyone knows that the policy and activity of the SUPG have but one aim, the well-being of the people.

Our Republic is now a strong socialist state with a dynamically growing economy and has attained higher levels in science, education and culture. The GDR has, for all time, become an inseparable part of the socialist community. As a sovereign state it has won international

recognition and is a member of the UN and its specialized agencies. It is following a policy of peaceful coexistence and is making a constructive contribution to peace.

All these changes at home and internationally have found expression in the new Party program.

Taking as its starting point present development levels, the program clearly outlines the tasks for the future. It characterizes the continuted construction of developed socialism as a historical process involving deep-going change in the political, economic, social and cultural fields. A process, moreover, requiring 'planned utilization of all the advantages and motive forces of socialism, development of all aspects of social life, productive forces and production, social and political relations, science and education, socialist ideology and culture, the whole range of working and living conditions, and also the country's defense capacity.'

Naturally, developed socialist society retains all the regularities and features of socialism. What distinguishes it from the initial period of socialist construction are a higher level of productive forces and more mature socialist-production and other social relations. Socialism is not something lifeless, rigid, fixed once and for all, Lenin pointed out, for only socialism 'will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 25, p. 472). There is the proof of history that socialist development objectively requires transition from one stage to another. The triumph of socialist production relations cannot immediately be followed by the building of communism, of a classless society: we must first build a developed socialist society.

The SUPG program is based on the premise that there is no rigid, hard and fast boundary between the two phases of the communist formation. The chapter 'Communism — our aim' contains this passage: 'building the material and technical base of communism, transformation of socialist social relations into communist, and the development of communist consciousness, are prepared in the course of building developed socialist society. The pace at which this society is built and its transition to communist construction are determined by the conscientious labor effort, creative initiative and organized actions of the millions of workers of town and country.' An analysis of the common features and differences of the two phases of the communist formation will show, as mentioned above, that there is no hard and fast line between them. Hence, the full unfolding of all the elements of developed socialist society is, at the same time, the formation of the fundamental preconditions for the gradual transition to the highest, communist phase.

The chapter of the program that sets out, in 10 points, the basic features and criteria of developed socialist society should be seen as a major theoretical and practical achievement of our Party, the result of scientific analysis of the fundamental social processes which, in their unity, reflect both the specifics of the first phase and the interconnection of the first and second phases of a single, communist formation.

'Developed socialist society signifies the creation of all the material, socio-economic and ideologico-political preconditions for fully bringing out the essence of socialism — everything for the good of the people, everything in the interests of the working class, the cooperative farmers, the intelligentsia and other working people,' the Party program declares. It emphasizes that the Party has always acted in the interests of the people and will always see to it that the 'growing results of our labor effort, successes in production and wider use of technological achievements, benefit the working class and all working people and make for constantly rising living and cultural standards.' The Ninth SUPG Congress reaffirmed this inviolable principle of Party policy agreed upon at the Eighth Congress: unity of economic and social policy. This implies that higher growth rates and higher efficiency are not an end in themselves, but a factor in systematically improving the conditions of the working people.

The SUPG program sets high goals: solution of the housing problem by 1990; steady improvement of working conditions, health protection and industrial safety arrangements; gearing wages to high performance, and a steady rise of minimum wages. There is also provision for differentiated lengthening of paid holidays and transition to a 40-hour work week; family grants and extension of mother-and-child services; improved cultural, social and medical facilities for senior citizens; steady improvement in medical care; more effective environmental protection. All these measures serve the people and are expressive of the very essence of socialism.

Thanks to public ownership of the means of production, no class in socialist society can appropriate the fruits of the labor of other classes. The amount of work done and its quality is what determines a citizen's share in the part of the national income set aside for individual consumption. The principle of remuneration according to work done is fundamental to distribution under socialism, and that is why the program specifically stresses the need for its consistent application.

Steadily rising living standards can be assured only by higher productivity and stable economic growth. The prime mover of high development rates and labor productivity and efficiency is the intensification of socialist production. As the program stresses, 'It makes possible the growth of productivity in the national economy

necessary to raise living standards, as well as to assure consistent modernization and expansion of the material and technical basis of socialism in the GDR and the creation of the prerequisites for the gradual transition to communism.'

The Congress noted that, despite more complex conditions in the sphere of foreign economic ties, the prerequisites for further expanding the material and technical basis are on the whole favorable. The national economy has expanded substantially since the Eighth Congress, possibilities for increasing public production are greater, and it is on the whole better balanced. The Republic possesses a substantial scientific potential, there is a large contingent of highly skilled workers and engineers. Cooperation in the framework of socialist economic integration, with the Soviet Union in the first place, is constantly deepening. The GDR occupies firm positions in the world economy.

Taking all this into account, the SUPG program sets forth concrete tasks for further perfecting the material and technical basis, expanding the domestic energy and raw materials base, effectively utilizing secondary raw materials, saving materials, profoundly transforming the technological basis of industrial and farm production, creating a national agrarian-industrial complex.

The program sees scientific and technological progress as the main factor of intensification decisively affecting the solution of all other tasks. That is why it emphasizes the importance of fundamental and applied research, as well as cooperation with CMEA member-countries in this field. It orients scientists on the interaction of natural, technical, and social sciences. It calls for the concentration of efforts on the solution of key tasks of scientific research, deepening of the links between science and production, purposeful intensification of the processs of scientific work, as well as raising the quality of instruction at institutes of higher learning. In other words, the question is of further raising the level of scientific and technological research, of fuller and economically more effective utilization of the results achieved in the national economy.

The SUPG program attaches great importance to further strengthening socialist economic integration, cooperation and specialization with the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other fraternal socialist countries. We were able to set our objectives in the economic, social and political fields thanks to the long-term agreements on trade and scientific and technological cooperation with the countries of the socialist community.

An important aspect of building a developed socialist society is the perfection of socialist production relations as relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance, and the strengthening of collec-

tivism. Here, the SUPG program stresses, the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party increases and greater significance attaches to trade union activity.

The working class is the main political and social force of social progress in developed socialist society. It is the most numerous class in our country. The main feature of its development is the continued rising of its political and professional standards. 'An objective of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany,' the program notes, 'is to encourage the steady growth of the ideological and political standards of the working class, of the political and professional qualifications of the working people. This will help gradually to eliminate the essential distinctions between physical and mental labor.'

Close and firm relations of comradely and creative cooperation have formed between the working class, cooperative farmers, intellectuals and other sections of the working people. They rest on the basis of the socialist system of power, socialist property relations, and socialist mentality of the working people. The SUPG program defines the role and prospects of the class of cooperative farmers, intellectuals, artisans and handicraftsmen, women and youth in the process of building developed socialist society. It stresses that the convergence of social classes and strata is a historically natural process. This convergence 'takes place under the guidance of the Party, on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist outlook and ideals of the working class. It strengthens the moral and political unity of the people and combines with the expansion of the socialist way of life.'

The socialist state, defined in the program, as a form of proletarian dictatorship expressing the interests of the whole people, plays an important part in this process. Its tasks include managing the planned development of the productive forces, stimulating scientific and technological progress and uninterrupted growth of labor productivity, developing socialist relations of production, raising the educational and cultural standards and the socialist consciousness of the working people, and solving socio-political problems. Among its other functions are national defense and defense of the socialist system; protection of public and personal property, the rights and freedoms of the citizens; development of cooperation with the USSR and other countries of the socialist community; ensuring the sovereignty of the GDR and repulsion of any encroachments of imperialism against socialism. A special chapter of the program defines our foreign policy aimed at preserving and strengthening the peace and defending socialism.

As envisaged by the program, the main line in the development of socialist statehood consists in the further expansion and perfection of socialist democracy. The participation of citizens in running state affairs and the economy, the broad public activity of the working

people are hallmarks of a developed socialist society. This primary right, as well as other political freedoms and social rights — the right to work, rest, free education and health protection, material security in old age, in case of illness or disability — are guaranteed by the socialist state. The program stresses the equality of all citizens irrespective of race or nationality, world outlook, religion or social status, as well as equal rights for men and women in all spheres of government, economic and cultural life.

'Developed socialist society,' the program states, 'means further raising the socialist consciousness of the masses, actively shaping their Marxist-Leninist world outlook and communist ethics, consistently overcoming egoism, individualism and other manifestations of bourgeois ideology.' Proceeding from this, the program devotes close attention to education and culture, development of the socialist way of life.

It notes, in particular, that the unified socialist system of education, the nucleus of which is the 10-year general educational polytechnical school, will continue to be perfected. Communist education of young people is seen as a many-sided process which involves the moulding of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, acquisition of high-standard general education, and productive labor. Communist education presumes imbuing young people with an ability for creative writing and preparing them for tackling the tasks of socialist and communist construction.

Developed socialist society is distinguished by its high cultural standards. The SUPG program sets the guidelines for the development of socialist culture in all its breadth and diversity, in the spheres of both work and recreation, in improving the environment, in mastering the cultural heritage and developing the art and literature of socialist realism.

The program devotes a special chapter to problems of further moulding the way of life and individual behavior characteristic of developed socialist society. The socialist way of life is rooted in the socialist mode of production. Work, especially the activity of the working class, constitutes the sphere of life in which the creative abilities of man can display themselves to the fullest.

Honest and conscientious work, active participation in the solution of public tasks, new human relations, corresponding to the nature of socialist relations of production, do not develop spontaneously. For effective ideological and political work of the Party, the state and public organizations is needed and, as the program states, it must also be directed against phenomena alien to socialism and having a negative influence on the moral atmosphere of socialist society.

The further advance of socialist national culture and perfection of

the way of life is an important aspect in the development of the socialist nation in the GDR. Its characteristic features are determined by the working class. All the rhetoric of politicians and ideologues in the FRG to the effect that the 'German question' remains 'open' and that the 'unity of the nation' must be preserved, cannot alter the reality that a socialist nation is developing in our country and that the GDR is an inalienable component of the community of socialist nations. Relations between the socialist GDR and the capitalist FRG can develop, as the SUPG program states, only 'as relations between sovereign states, with different social systems, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the norms of international law.'

The new program defines the SUPG's long-term general policy. 'The Party's task is to exercise political leadership of the German Democratic Republic on the basis of a scientifically substantiated strategy and tactics.' The program sets the guidelines for the Party's ideological and political work, improvement of inner-Party life, and the Party's leading and organizing impact on all spheres of social development. 'The prime basis of the successful activity of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is its relations, based on confidence, with the working class, cooperative farmers, intellectuals and all other working people. The Party advances as it teaches the working people and at the same time learns from them; it believes in the creative strength of the people.' The program calls upon every Communist to be always guided by the interests of the socialist fatherland, serve as an example to others, and carry the ideas of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism into the hearts and minds of people.

The great idea of proletarian internationalism — fraternal cohesion with the CPSU and all other Communist and Workers' Parties — permeates the SUPG program. Our Party declares its desire to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the world communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and work for the unity of all forces fighting against imperialism, for peace and social progress. The SUPG contributed to the success of the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe. It will continue to work actively for the realization of the objectives mapped out in the final document, to fight for peace, security and social progress in Europe and the rest of the world.

The building of developed socialist society takes place — and this must not be forgotten for one moment — in conditions of active class confrontation with imperialism embracing all important spheres of public life. Socialism and all anti-imperialists have compelled imperialism to reckon with the changed balance of forces and accept the principles of peaceful coexistence. The general strategy of the coun-

tries of the socialist community, in which the Soviet Union is the leading force, is directed at making the turn from cold war to peaceful coexistence irreversible and creating external political conditions favorable to the continued building of socialism and communism. But the stubborn attempts of imperialist circles hostile to the cause of peace to wipe out the progress achieved in détente demand our continued efforts, great vigilance and an offensive ideological struggle.

The SUPG program makes it incumbent on the Communists of the GDR to be active fighters on the ideological front, propagandize the revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism and struggle against the ideology and policies of imperialism in all their manifestations. The Ninth Party Congress called for continued resolute resistance to bourgeois and revisionist views, anti-communism, anti-Sovietism and nationalism. It called for a resolute struggle against the policy and ideology of Maoism, which has sided with the most reactionary forces of imperialism and opponents of détente.

The SUPG program is a contribution to the creative application and development of Marxism-Leninism. It expresses the interests of the working class and all working people of the GDR and is, as Comrade Erich Honecker stressed at the Ninth Congress, 'a compass for all our people, a stupendous plan for building the socialist present and the communist future of our people.'

Lessons of the class struggle for power in Hungary

Dezso Nemes
PB member, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

In more and more capitalist countries the struggle for power is assuming the character of an immediate political task of the working-class movement. This has revived the debate over whether or not proletarian dictatorship is everywhere necessary in the transition from capitalism to socialism. In some developed West European countries the question has arisen not I think, mainly because bourgeois-democratic traditions and gains are greater there, though this does play a certain part in assessing options. One of the chief elements in

A further contribution to the discussion of problems involved in the transition to socialism. See articles by Ib Nørlund, 'The image of our own future'; Z. Karkabi, 'The problem of power in the transition period'; and T. Varela, 'Dialectics of the general and the particular' in the January, May and August 1976 issues of *WMR*.

the viewpoint that capitalism can be abolished and a socialist society built without proletarian dictatorship is, doubtlessly, the marked change in the international balance of forces and the steadily growing determinative role of the socialist world. Another element, and perhaps the decisive one, is the changing situation which makes it possible, indeed imperative, to form an all-embracing anti-monopoly alliance of the working class and other laboring classes and strata to overthrow monopoly dictatorship.

The fight for democratic popular government, which would put an end to monopoly domination and put the country on the road to socialism, has met with a positive response from many supporters of progress and socialism, who have expressed their solidarity with those fighting for this goal. There can be — and are — doubts that what has nowhere proved feasible, i.e., the building of socialism without proletarian dictatorship, could prove feasible in the changed situation. However, such doubts should not be allowed to weaken solidarity in the great battle to overthrow monopoly rule and establish popular rule, thereby creating the necessary conditions for building the new society.

Examination of new opportunities in the battle for power cannot, naturally, be limited to a study of past experience, though that experience must always be taken into account. The experience of the Hungarian working-class movement should, therefore, be of considerable interest.

The Hungarian proletariat twice fought for power and in both cases after a world war, but in widely differing circumstances: in the spring of 1919, when the Hungarian proletariat proclaimed the Soviet Republic, and in the winter of 1944-45, when popular-democratic rule was established and put the country on to the socialist path.

I propose to examine some of the lessons of these historic events.

Toward the end of 1918 a popular revolution made short shrift of the monarchy, which had unleashed a world war, with all the measureless hardship it brought the people. The mass movement was led by revolutionary socialists. Workers' and soldiers' councils were set up, followed in some areas by councils of propertyless and poor peasants. But power had been seized by a coalition of the liberal bourgeoisie and the Social-Democratic party. As a result, the factories, mines and banks were in the hands of the capitalists and the big estates in the hands of the landed aristocracy.

The Communist Party was founded in November 1918. Inspired by the example of Russia, it unfurled the banner of socialist revolution and began the struggle for a Soviet Republic. Four months later the struggle culminated in the collapse of the capitalist system and the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

A distinguishing feature of those stormy months was consolidation of the factory and territorial workers' councils. *Workers' control* spread rapidly to the factories and mines. Attempts by the coalition government to suppress the councils ended in failure. More, in some areas the workers' councils took over control of the factories. The territorial workers' councils controlled the local administration, and early in March 1919 actually took over local government in some parts of the country. The soldiers' councils significantly increased their influence in the army and in national politics.

This struggle against diverse reactionary forces made for progressively closer cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats, despite the fact that the official Social Democrat policy was designed to bolster the capitalist system, while the Communists called for working-class power. This led to sharp discussions, even clashes, between the two parties.

The coalition government, which included Social Democrats, proved completely incapable of extricating the country from the profound social and national crisis inherited from the monarchy. The popularity of the Communist Party was steadily growing and all attempts to destroy it failed. The slogan 'All Power to the Councils' was rapidly spreading among workers and poor peasants and a sizable part of the intellectuals. It even attracted support among Social Democrats. Their left wing vigorously campaigned for a Soviet Republic and for merger with the Communist Party. Amid this revolutionary upsurge, the centrists in the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions joined the left wing, while the reformist right wing was isolated, lost support and was pushed into the background. Meanwhile, the crisis of the coalition government rendered it completely helpless. On March 21, 1919, with the *merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties,* political unity of the working class was restored on a revolutionary basis and the proletariat took over power and proclaimed the *Soviet Republic*.

The coalition government, now in a state of collapse, *peacefully* handed over power to the proletariat. The ruling classes, having lost the support of the Social-Democratic Party, and now in a state of political disarray, were in no position to put up any serious resistance to the well-organized, united working class which had won over the decisive majority of the people. It was in these circumstances that the revolution triumphed through peaceful, though not parliamentary, means.

Former Social Democrats had a majority in the new government and in the leadership of the united party. But some of them consciously and sincerely accepted the Leninist principles and formed a *firm revolutionary bloc* with representatives of the Communist Party.

The bloc had a majority in all the leading bodies and could put through its policy even when some of the centrists and other faint-hearts hesitated or inclined toward capitulation.

The Soviet Republic enthusiastically set about reorganizing the life of the war-tormented country, though very soon it had to reckon with military intervention organized by the Allied powers. With implicit faith in its own forces and in the spread of the revolution in Europe, the workers' government lost no time in organizing its own revolutionary army which took the field against greatly superior enemy forces.

The fight lasted four and a half months, and among the Social Democrats, even those who at first had sincerely supported the Soviet Republic, there developed a feeling of defeatism, a tendency toward an agreement with the Allies based on dismantling proletarian power and accepting their brand of 'democracy.' The military victory of the Allied powers brought the Hungarian people a counter-revolutionary holocaust and a government that was to place the country under a fascist regime.

It will be recalled that in 1918-19 bourgeois democracy was established in Austria, Germany and Czechoslovakia: the bourgeoisie was able to divert the proletariat from the revolutionary path that led to the destruction of the capitalist system. But it had not reconciled itself to the substantial expansion of democratic rights and freedoms. It was preparing to abolish them and impose an undisguised bourgeois dictatorship. That is what happened in Italy, and there were fascist coups in Germany, Austria and other countries.

I mention this because I believe that it is appropriate to recall the lesson for which we paid so dearly: when a country is faced with a fascist or semi-fascist menace defense of the bourgeois-democratic system becomes an important task and might even be decisive in promoting social progress. But even more important is the defense of democracy after popular rule has been established, even if it does not proclaim socialism. No one is likely to doubt that counter-revolutionary subversion, organized by international reaction and its accomplices, is certainly no less a danger to a country that has instituted *popular rule and chosen the socialist path*.

Once the working class, in alliance with the decisive majority of the working people, has affirmed its power — the dictatorship of the proletariat, which does not need to conceal its essence because its aims are clear and in the interests of the majority — the working class must safeguard its power against the counter-revolutionary plans of its internal and external enemies. This is a crucial task of every popular government, and if it fails in it, it is doomed. But it is not the most important task of every popular government and, consequently, of proletarian dictatorship.

In May 1919, when the Hungarian Soviet Republic was waging a life and death struggle against the superior forces of the Allied powers, Lenin, in his greetings to the Hungarian workers, urged them to show determination and be irreconcilable to all vacillation. He emphasized: '... the essence of proletarian dictatorship is not in force alone, or even mainly in force. Its chief feature is the organization and discipline of the advanced contingent of the working people, of their vanguard; of their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build socialism, abolish the division of society into classes, make all members of society working people, and remove the basis for all exploitation of man by man' *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 29, p. 388).

Liquidation of the former ruling classes, with their greater part dissolved in the ranks of the working people, naturally narrows the function of suppressing enemy elements within the country. Attempts at subversion, stimulated, supported and organized by the imperialist powers, can slow down, but cannot halt, this. That has been amply demonstated by the experience of the socialist countries committed to a Leninist policy, no matter how international reaction has tried to distort the facts in its ceaseless slander campaigns.

In 1944-45 it was the Soviet Army, which expelled the fascist hordes from our country, that opened the road to popular rule. It took half a year for the entire country to be liberated. The fascists fled, carrying away everything they could in an attempt to leave behind a barren waste. They were not completely successful in this, but the war did cause immense damage. The Communist Party, which could now freely talk to the people after 25 underground years, drew up a program of democratic national regeneration, which was published in the liberated eastern part of the country toward the end of 1944. The Party became the initiator and organizer of the rebuilding effort and called on all other democratic parties to cooperate with it. Close cooperation was established between Communists and the Social-Democratic Party after most of the latter's leaders had come out for unity of the working class and for a people's democracy.

It was in these circumstances that, at the close of 1944, a *new, democratic power* was established, under working-class leadership, first in the liberated eastern areas and then throughout the country. The land reform, which put an end to the big estates, was carried out with revolutionary dispatch. Rebuilding required the exertion of every ounce of energy, first of all by the working class and the poor peasants who had just been given land, and also by other sections of the peasant population who were finding things difficult. The working class and peasantry were able to carry the main load of the rehabilitation effort because they were organized and knew that the rebuilt country would be their country and that the owners of the cartels, the

financial tycoons, the landowners and their underlings would never come back. They had implicit faith in the Communist Party's slogan: 'The country is yours and you are building it for yourself!'

This great rebuilding effort was carried out amid enormous economic difficulties and sharp political battles. For when popular rule was proclaimed, the factories and mines were still owned by the capitalists, who were plotting a political comeback. Together with the landowners who had lost their estates, representatives of the bourgeoisie joined the liberal Smallholders Party which was part of the national coalition. Posing as democrats and relying on the positions they still held in the government, the bourgeoisie made an all-out effort to oust the working class from government. This was accompanied by rabid anti-Sovietism and anti-communism. The bourgeoisie was particularly anxious to push through its counter-revolutionary policy in the leadership of the Smallholders Party. It also pinned its hopes on effective assistance from the anti-communist right wing of the Social-Democratic party. With the full support of the conservative Church hierarchy, it tried to exploit the reactionary sentiments of a considerable part of the civil servants. But the bourgeoisie banked chiefly on outside support, from Britain and the U.S.

The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki significantly raised these hopes. U.S. monopoly of the atom bomb, the bourgeoisie believed, would enable the Western powers to interfere in Hungary's affairs, too, and bring popular rule to an end. In fact, former landowners were taking steps to get back their estates, and capitalists intensified their sabotage of industrial rehabilitation. But the working class and poor peasantry rebuffed all these attempts and mounted a counter-offensive. The Communist Party slogan was: 'The land will never be given back!' The growing economic role of the popular-democratic government and wider participation of workers in management were solid barriers to counter-revolutionary sabotage. The mines were nationalized, followed by heavy industry. In August 1947, we launched our first three-year economic plan, initiated and drawn up by the Communist Party. By this time the banks had been placed under government control and later nationalized. All industry was nationalized in the spring of 1948.

The battle for socialist reconstruction helped to extend and consolidate working-class unity, which internal and international reaction tried, and failed, to prevent. The Leninist ideas were gaining wide currency and the conditions matured for a new merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties. It was finalized in the summer of 1948, on the basis of long years of joint struggle, the lessons to be drawn from it, and with the common aim of building socialism.

The reactionaries were equally unsuccessful in destroying the

popular-democratic alliance of the working class and peasantry, which included also the democratic wing of the Smallholders Party. The continuous strengthening of the worker-peasant alliance led to the disintegration of that heterogeneous party. The rehabilitation effort attracted a decisive majority of the intelligentsia. And so, the *popular-democratic alliance* of workers, peasants and intellectuals became the *focal point in the country's transition to the socialist path.*

The popular-democratic government made it possible for the *working class, the leading force in the process of national regeneration, to put the country on the socialist path by peaceful means.* The left parliamentary majority played an important part in this, as did also permanent mass participation in the rebuilding of the country and in the political struggle against reaction.

In 1946 the Communist Party set itself the immediate task — *developing the people's democratic revolution into a socialist revolution by peaceful means.*

How did it regard the dictatorship of the proletariat at that time?

Our Party considered that people's democracy leads to socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat. This view gave rise to a debate in the Party which became sharper as the country advanced along the socialist road. But it was the Party's official view and the overwhelming majority of the membership accepted it.

Nor were we the only one to hold that view. It was shared in other countries by parties in government, parties playing a leading role.

It would be wrong to imagine that that position was purely tactical and served to reassure those who were sympathetic to socialism but objected to the dictatorship of the proletariat, a concept so strongely 'discredited' by anti-communist propaganda. The Party's leaders, or most of them, really believed that if the country succeeded in taking the socialist road by peaceful means, working-class power in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat would not be necessary as a means of achieving socialist goals. It was neither at the Communists' wish, nor through their fault, that events refuted the idea. In the climate of the cold war begun by the Western powers and aggravated by U.S. atomic blackmail, at a time when internal political struggles had greatly intensified, the transition to the socialist road had to go hand in hand with consolidating of the dictatorship of the proletariat. For first, people's democracy performs the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which it did in Hungary. Second, working-class power had introduced a system of proletarian dictatorship in the form of people's democracy.

In other words, our assumption that people's democracy would lead to socialism without recourse to the dictatorship of the proletariat was wrong. But behind this assumption was *something new* to support it.

First of all, the world situation had changed, the international influence of the Soviet Union, the principal factor in defeating fascism, had increased and the Soviet Union effectively protected the people's democracies against imperialist attempts at interference. Secondly, in taking the socialist road under people's democratic rule, the Hungarian working class had *neutralized* the middle strata, in particular the middle peasants, and indeed, had made many of them its *allies*. It had led the country on to the socialist road with the backing of a *broad popular democratic alliance* and its power had taken the form of people's democratic rule based on this alliance.

This provided greater opportunities for the mass base of people's democratic rule to continue expanding in the course of socialist construction and for the middle strata, which had been neutral, to become the regime's allies. It speeded the isolation of reactionary forces, the abolition of exploitation, making all members of society working people.

However, the Party leadership of the time failed to draw a Leninist conclusion from the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Lenin's doctrine, the working people, including the middle peasants, who are merely neutralized while the struggle for power goes on, must be won over as allies of the revolution after the working class has taken power. The Party leadership held the erroneous view that the class struggle intensifies inevitably and continuously under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and set out to narrow the base of the popular-democratic alliance by wrongly accentuating the dictatorial aspect of the regime. This was coupled with mistakes in the economic and other fields, as well as with the other dire consequences of the personality cult. In spite of noteworthy achievements in socialist industrialization, all this resulted, not in isolating hostile elements, but in making more mistakes, which counter-revolutionary propaganda used for overt and covert subversion. In 1956 the enemies, having misled many people who did not understand the situation, tried to overthrow working-class power. After thwarting that attempt at counter-revolution, the new leadership of our Party had to set many things right, strengthen working-class rule and promote the Leninist policy of alliances of the working classes.

Speaking of today's debates, it would be interesting to see what specific realities prompt the assumption that in view of changed conditions in some developed capitalist countries, socialism there can be won without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Is it that the leverage of state capitalism has increased, or can be substantially increased under democratic people's rule and become the basis for the transition to socialist development (this was virtually out of the question in the past)? Or that the present level of production technol-

ogy and the pressures of big monopolies prompt small producers to cooperate, and if they can prevent their cooperatives from becoming monopoly appendages, or free themselves of this oppressing dependence through democratic people's rule, they will effectively contribute to the socialist transformation of the country? Or, again, that, in addition to the working class, a substantial and growing section of the middle strata is searching for a way out of the deepening social crisis of capitalism by moving toward socialism, a trend which finds expression in the position and aspirations of their political representatives?

Be that as it may, I believe the fraternal parties will carefully study these factors and draw appropriate political conclusions. It is beyond doubt, however, that if monopoly dictatorship, which pushes the countries it rules into a blind alley or involves them in dangerous ventures, is succeeded by democratic people's rule set on effecting a genuine socialist transformation of society and hence to leave no room for exploitation and make every member of society a working person, then this regime will — irrespective of the national form it assumes — perform the historic function of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The current controversy is on whether a multi-party system is desirable in a socialist society or should be avoided in all circumstances. Experience shows that socialist progress can be made in both cases. If a multi-party system helps to transform society along socialist lines, its positive aspects may become predominant and contribute to the expansion and consolidation of the popular-democratic, and subsequently, socialist alliance, of the working class and other working classes and strata even if valuable energies are wasted in political rivalries. If, however, the struggle for power becomes predominant in inter-party relations we think it is virtually inevitable that internal and external anti-socialist forces will don a 'democratic' or even a 'socialist' cloak in an effort to paralyze socialist construction and overthrow people's rule.

If the multi-party system in a socialist country is characterized by a political alliance striving for common socialist goals, and if its activity is determined by these goals, then Marxist-Leninist ideas are bound, in our view, to become widespread in the parties allied with the Communists, after a certain period. In the end, they can merge if they find it advisable.

Political developments in Hungary between 1945 and 1948, or following the abolition of the power of big landowners and capitalists and the transition to a socialist, planned economy, resulted in forcing the majority of anti-communist elements out of the coalition parties. Whereas the national regeneration program advanced by the Communists in the autumn of 1944 became a common program for the

entire democratic national coalition, in 1947 it was the first three-year plan, likewise proposed by us, that became the common program. The coalition parties, having got rid of the majority of anti-communist elements, recognized that the political leader of the country was the Communist Party and, after its merger with the Social Democrats, the Hungarian Working People's Party. This recognition did not come because our Party had *proclaimed* its leading role but because it had proved by its entire *activity* that it played this role. As a result, political rivalries between allied parties receded into the background.

The coalition parties (the Smallholders Party mentioned above and the Peasant Party, which grouped certain sections of the poor peasantry and intellectuals), having accepted the program and plans for socialist construction, joined in their implementation. This created most favorable conditions for the multi-party system to continue operating by working for the attainment of common socialist objectives. However, due to gross distortions in the policy of the Party leadership and the government in 1949, the exact opposite happened — the coalition parties' opportunities for activity were quickly curtailed and soon disappeared altogether. A considerable number of supporters of the former alliance of parties joined, albeit with less enthusiasm, in socialist construction. But the rest became passive. This was a consequence of the sectarian policy of narrowing the scope of the political alliance.

Afterwards, in attacking the working-class state, the counter-revolutionaries adroitly exploited the justified discontent of those who had 'retreated into their shell' to rouse some of them to action. During the abortive counter-revolution in the autumn of 1956, they raised the slogan of a multi-party system. Various parties began to form and an effort was made to use this as a *means of overthrowing workers' rule*. Those who had cooperated with the Communists were barred from the parties being re-established under their former names. True, some authoritative leaders were invited to join those parties in spite of their connection with the Communists so that their personal prestige might be used. But they refused to cooperate, for they saw through the counter-revolutionary plans. Failure of the counter-revolution marked the end of attempts to revive the multi-party system. In 1956 it was strongly discredited in our country as a weapon of the enemies of working-class power, of the agents of Western imperialism.

However, working-class power, its strength restored, was faced with the task of cooperating in building the new society with all who were willing to participate directly in it and help to correct past mistakes, including people who earlier had sought refuge in passivity.

The Party called for a political alliance of Communists and non-Communists on a broad basis within the framework of the *Patriotic*

People's Front. This meant applying the Leninist policy of alliances with due regard to the given situation. The People's Front gained strength sooner than expected and became a notable factor in the country's political development.

The main condition for strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat is to promote *socialist democracy* in all key public spheres. In our opinion, the decisive thing is not whether socialism is built under a one-party or a multi-party system. We see the important thing in ensuring as fully as possible working people's rule, the abolition of exploitation, the material and cultural advancement of the people and the socialist progress of the nation.

The political development of our system still proceeds on an inherited basis, but to a lesser degree than before. To a decisive extent, it continues on *its own basis*. To our people the key criteria are not those advocated by the enemies of socialism — allegedly in the interests of 'democracy,' or even 'socialism' — nor those based on various illusions of well-intentioned people, but those that stem from our own ideals, from realities, from the very content of the great historic task of building and defending the new society and of disseminating and promoting socialist ideas.

One of these criteria is respect for religious freedom, which is essential for the development of socialist concepts and political unity with those who disagree with us on certain issues but accept the Party's overall policy and socialist construction plans and are willing to help in carrying out these plans. Guaranteeing religious freedom makes for political unity with religious people and with churchmen who accept socialist construction. The Party respects their effort to harmonize religious concepts with the effort to build a socialist society. This enables churchmen, including leading ones, to cooperate with the Patriotic People's Front with a clear conscience.

The struggle for power does not end with the winning of power. It is followed by a struggle to *preserve* power, a struggle accompanied by tremendous work to transform society. In our country — and I think, elsewhere, too — this process included overcoming economic and cultural backwardness, which, naturally, was an important 'additional' task. The *nature of power* itself cannot but change as this process goes on.

In the West they like to call our one-party system 'totalitarian.' This is a total misunderstanding or total falsehood fully refuted by the development of public activity in our country, the numerous forms of cooperation between Communists and non-Communists, and the people's growing participation in the activities of government bodies, first of all local councils, and also non-governmental organizations, notably the trade unions. These helped to win and develop people's

power and now take part in shaping its character and in drafting and carrying out socialist construction plans. The trade unions have a say in government decision-making and in the distribution of consumption funds at national and local level. They participate in drafting cultural and socio-political plans and play a big role in putting them into effect. The unions work side by side with the Party, whose policy they fully accept, operating, however, as autonomous organizations. This is why they are in a position to give more effective support to both the Party and the government in accomplishing general and everyday tasks. Scientific associations, cultural and sports unions and various societies meeting the most diverse requirements of the population play a growing role in public life. The socialist state encourages their activity.

Speaking of the character of power, I would like to point out the changes that have occurred since the foundations of socialism were laid and small-scale farming switched completely to cooperative methods.

In the period before the foundations of socialism were laid, the alliance between the two principal working classes was a *popular-democratic alliance between the socialist working class and the small-peasantry*. With the peasant's adoption of cooperative farming, that is, with the socialist transformation of the countryside, this popular-democratic alliance became a *socialist alliance*, popular-democratic unity of the nation became *socialist unity of the nation*.

Prior to the reorganization of agriculture on socialist lines, we stressed that the leading class of the society building socialism — the working class — involves the small peasants and other allies into the management of society. After the peasants formed production cooperatives, a bigger task was envisaged, that of jointly shaping socialist society and, at the same time, *jointly continuing to develop socialist power*. Naturally, the working class retains its leading role, and its revolutionary party maintains its guiding role and responsibility. Their tasks grow but *working-class power becomes power of the whole people building socialism*, and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat *develops in the direction of becoming a state of the whole people*. This is a process leading to the formation of a developed socialist society, and the Hungarian People's Republic has already travelled a considerable part of this road.

Some aspects of scientific management of society in the USSR

Victor Afanasyev
Corresponding member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

The Soviet Union has everything needed to solve the most complex problems of communist construction — rich natural resources, a modern industry, a vast agricultural potential, a developed infrastructure, high-skilled and experienced personnel. The people's constructive effort is guided by the Communist Party. It draws up the scientifically-grounded policy and the course to be followed by the country. The course for the coming years is based on the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress.

Once a correct policy has been formulated, CC CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev said at the Congress, 'the decisive link becomes organization, in other words, the further improvement of economic management in the broadest sense of the term.'

The Communist Party and the Soviet government devote much energy and attention to the problems involved in efficient management. They have been the subject of discussion at many Central Committee plenums over the past year. And the decisions they adopted have brought practical results. For instance, a considerable improvement in management schemes for a number of industries and their closer combination with territorial management; more comprehensive character of plans and closer plan coordination, notably of their economic and social aspects; a better management structure; more industrial associations and agro-industrial complexes in agriculture; better training and retraining of managerial personnel; more worker participation in management.

But we cannot be content with what has already been achieved. To quote L.I. Brezhnev's report again, 'We must regard measures to improve economic management as a highly important factor in the successful fulfillment of the 10th five-year plan, a factor that can produce results in the near future.' Accordingly, the 25th CPSU Congress set the aim of raising economic management to the level of the new requirements, a task all the more important and realistic because we have accumulated a fund of experience in this field and the orientations for our advance have been more clearly delineated.

Socialist society is much more integrated than capitalist. This applies above all to the economy, in which all the means of production are public property, the natural resources, the achievements of technology, science and culture are under collective ownership and guidance. This applies also to the social sphere, for there are no antagonistic classes, no exploitation or competition. The fundamental interests of the individual and society, of the individual and the state, coincide. Lastly, this applies to ideology and politics, for the scientific world outlook, the Marxist-Leninist ideology, rules supreme throughout the country.

For the first time in history there is both the necessity and possibility of centralized planning and management of society as an integrated organism. And in this we have a key distinguishing feature — and also a key advantage — of socialist management. The Communist Party is organizing and directing the Soviet people's effort to make optimal use of these advantages.

In this context, it is fitting to recall that Lenin regarded the organization and management of socialist society as a key function of working-class power, of proletarian dictatorship, the essence of which, he emphasized, 'is not in force alone, or even mainly in force,' but rather in a 'form of the organization of labor superior to the preceding form' (Vol. 29, pp. 388 and 373).

Lenin considered the organization of a united, countrywide economic organism and its planned management one of the most difficult tasks of the socialist revolution. He wrote: 'The transformation of the state economic mechanism into a single huge machine, into an economic organism that will work in such a way as to enable hundreds of millions of people to be guided by a single plan — such was the enormous organizational problem that rested on our shoulders' (Vol. 27, p. 91).

Today, in conditions of developed socialism, social production in the USSR is a highly intricate system of branches, sub-branches and closely interconnected production units. And with the scientific and technological revolution the system undergoes constant development; it is also subject to external pressures and the influence of social, political and, lastly, natural factors. The management of this system, i.e., directing the functioning of all its elements and working out decisions, is anything but a simple problem. Its solution requires profound knowledge of the laws of social development and a knowledge, also, of the science and techniques of management.

Since the interests of the individual coincide, in the main, with the public interests, the latter do not dominate the individual as some blind and alien force. It can be put this way: each member of socialist society is interested in raising his prosperity, professional and cultural

standards. But that, too, is the aim of society, of the state which, in its economic development plans, provides for the growth of personal incomes and more education and health facilities. The plan indicates when one or another economic, cultural or welfare project will be completed, so that each member of society knows what he can look forward to, and this gives him confidence in the future.

The social, political and ideological unity of society makes for a common aim and for joint effort in achieving it. Consequently, general development regularities are manifested in the conscious and concerted effort of all members of society, whose relations with each other are based on cooperation and mutual assistance. Hence, socialism lends more weight to the subjective factor in regulating social processes, the role of science and its applications. From this follows another essential feature of socialist management: it deals not merely with individual elements involved in regulating social and economic processes, but with management as a whole, as conscious, scientific guidance of social development.

Socialist production and socialist society develop in accordance with a nationwide plan drawn up in consultation with the masses, by government leaders, scientists and specialists in many different fields on the basis of objective laws and using the latest scientific and research methods. That is the main distinction between socialist and capitalist management, for under capitalism nationwide planning is impossible because of the market anarchy and competition.

The 25th CPSU Congress defined the new five-year plan as a plan of efficiency and quality. And in this context, the Congress worked out measures to increase the plan's leverage in raising quality and effectiveness standards throughout the economy.

The goals facing management and, more especially planning, under the new five-year plan are optimal effectiveness of the national economy as a whole. This is especially necessary in view of the expansion and sophistication of the economy, where the ultimate results increasingly depend on innumerable intermediate elements, on an intricate system of intra-branch and inter-branch links. In this situation it is easy to miss the main thing, the end result, in the pursuit of intermediate results. Conversely, without paying due attention to some intermediate elements, the end result cannot be achieved. The end result is decisive in this interaction of the two, for it assures satisfaction both of public and personal requirements and attainment of the main goal of socialist production. In its directives for the current five-year plan (1976-80), the Congress called for fuller reflection in the plans of public requirements and their satisfaction with the least expenditure of labor, material and financial resources. This entails a streamlined system of balancing production costs, produc-

tion capacities and labor resources, with more attention to building up state reserves.

In recent years the USSR has attained higher technical levels, greater reliability and efficient operation of industrial equipment, higher quality and better appearance of consumer goods. But the quality of many goods falls short of the standards we need.

Of the many ways of improving quality, the 25th Congress focussed attention on the most effective one, a system of planning and accounting indicators to gauge quality standards. This is accompanied by a system of material and moral incentives organically tied with stringent sanctions against those responsible for poor quality, violation of plans and contract discipline. The Congress stressed the need to close all the loopholes that still allow slack executives to remain in the front ranks despite breaches of contract commitments and low-grade output and despite their poor utilization of reserves.

It also decided to review the relation between producer and consumer, giving the latter a bigger say in the kind of goods to be produced and in assessing their quality. Direct contacts between supplier and consumer and contractual relations have been tried and found effective.

Henceforth, fulfillment of contracts will be regarded as a major criterion in assessing the work of individual enterprises, industry associations and ministries.

The Congress dealt in detail with improving the organizational structure of management. The main organizational principle in a socialist country is, of course, democratic centralism. It allows for organic combination of centralized planning with broad democracy and relative independence of local management and for initiative by the masses.

There are two elements in applying that principle. First, further centralization, implying concentration of production to carry out gigantic projects requiring vast outlays, coordination of many territorial and branch agencies, etc. Second, a definite degree of decentralization, delegating decision-making to a much wider circle of organizations and executives. This is necessitated by the highly intricate nature of production and all other areas of the country's life and work, which makes it impossible for the center to hand down detailed instructions. Particularly at this time and in this situation there has to be more local initiative and more mass participation in management.

The 25th Congress called for promotion of both elements. Centralism helps to avoid unnecessary losses and expenditure, lags in solving major problems because of fragmentation and improper concentration and is a barrier to departmental and parochial tendencies. On the other hand, promoting the democratic principle stimulates local initia-

tive, relieves the upper echelons of management from petty matters and ensures speed and flexibility in decision-making.

Only by strengthening these two elements of democratic centralism can we achieve more effective and comprehensive decisions on nationwide problems and formulate uniform centralized programs covering all stages, from designing to practical implementation. And such programs hold a prominent place in Soviet economic development. A few examples: the West Siberian oil and gas complex, the program to boost agricultural output in the non-black soil region, and the Baikal-Amur railway. Among the priority programs outlined at the Congress are the development of industries producing nuclear equipment, mechanization of hard manual work and organization of large territorial industrial complexes. In this connection, the Congress decided to set up a system of managing groups of kindred industries (for instance, fuel and power, transport, etc.).

Of special importance in drafting and operating a comprehensive program, as in economic management generally, is national allocation of rights and duties, the appointment of special agencies and individuals who bear full responsibility for the project, and coordinate all efforts for its completion. The Congress devoted much attention to this organizational aspect, too.

Experience has shown that the big production associations are the best and most rational form of production concentration and specialization and, at the same time, the optimal organizational structure for raising economic effectiveness and combining the achievements of the technological revolution with the advantages of socialism.

At the beginning of this year there were 2,300 such associations in the USSR, accounting for about one-fourth of total industrial output. More than 20 ministries are organizing such associations with a two-tier or three-tier management structure. Their organization will be completed in the current five-year plan, with continued progress in industrial concentration and specialization and in improving and simplifying the management structure.

The process has been extended to agriculture. In June the CPSU Central Committee adopted a decision, 'On the Further Development of Specialization and Concentration of Agriculture on the Basis of Inter-Farm Cooperation and Agro-Industrial Integration.' It provides for the organization of production units in which collective and state farms cooperate, and also agro-industrial complexes to process and market farm produce.

In recent years the people have had greater opportunities to exercise their rights as collective owners of the means of production. Take, for instance, such an important management function as planning. At present only seven indicators are planned (output volume,

list of basic goods, total profit, etc.). All the rest come within the competence of the given enterprise.

Planning procedures have changed, too, with more accent on local initiative. The ministry hands down pilot indicators which are discussed by the work collective, and practically every worker and engineer takes part in the debate. Untapped reserves are explored and a 'counter-plan' is formulated and discussed — this time together with the central planners — and a variant acceptable to all concerned is adopted. That is the final plan.

Much of the profit is at the disposal of the factory collective: some is ploughed back into production, some used for material incentives in the form of bonuses, etc., some used for cultural and welfare facilities (in addition to centralized appropriations). These funds, as mentioned above, are entirely at the disposal of the factory collective.

Factories and industrial associations have the right to enter into direct contractual relations with other industrial or trading enterprises to improve the supply of raw and other materials, spare parts, find a better market for their goods, etc.

The standing production conferences are an important form of worker participation in management. There are now about 170,000 such conferences involving some six million people, of whom more than 60 per cent are from the shop floor. These conferences make recommendations on all matters pertaining to production, from planning to marketing, and experience has shown that about 80 per cent of their recommendations are put into practice.

The 25th Congress outlined the ways and means of perfecting management not only of the economy, but also of the sum-total of social relations — perfection of socialist statehood, further extension of socialist democracy, strengthening the legal basis of political and social life, and delegating more responsibility to public organizations.

Central to the Soviet system of management of society is the Communist Party. The principles governing its activity in conditions of developed socialism were clearly expounded in the Central Committee report to the 25th Congress.

Socialism is a class society and its management necessarily acquires a political, class character. The management of society, or of any particular area of social life, requires a political approach — determination of the political content and political implications of every undertaking.

The Party gives comprehensive political guidance to socialist society, the state, public organizations and the creativity of the people. It concerts their efforts, coordinates their activity, directing it to a single goal. It does this through its organizations at all levels, through its

members working in industry, construction, science, on the collective and state farms.

In guiding society, the Party does not substitute for the economic and public organizations, but stimulates their initiative to obtain more effective results. It encourages them to assume full responsibility for their particular branch of work. The Party does not dictate, but acts through methods of persuasion, leaning on its vast authority, experience, example, the support of the people. It stimulates the initiative and facilitates the work of all government bodies and public organizations.

Naturally, the Party is responsible to the people in every area of public life, but exerts its influence through specific methods and forms, above all through correct selection and appointment of personnel, seeing to it that they follow the line of the Party and the state, and through organizational and ideological work among the masses.

The Congress devoted much attention to improving legislation and consolidating socialist law and order. And it was noted with satisfaction that legal regulations have been adjusted to the new level to which Soviet society has risen. Instructions have been issued to the competent authorities further to improve labor and administrative laws. Much has also been done to improve the legal regulation of economic activity, so as more effectively to secure improvement of quality and strengthen economic discipline. The Central Committee report also indicated the main orientations in preparing the draft of a new Constitution.

The Congress analyzed the ways and means of improving the work of the Soviets and other organs of the socialist state, the trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organizations, the mass media and propaganda — in short, all elements in the management of socialist society.

The Party's concern for improving the work of Party organizations at all levels is clearly expressed in the Central Committee decisions on the work of the Party organization of Georgia, the Party training system, and other decisions in pursuance of the policy approved by the 25th Congress.

No matter how perfect are the forms, methods and means of management, success depends entirely on people, on those who manage and those who are managed. This means there must be active participation in management by the people, whose knowledge, experience and ability are the decisive ultimate factor in fulfilling our plans. It is only natural, therefore, that one of the main aims of the current, 10th five-year plan, is extension of socialist democracy, more public activity and initiative by the people, their bigger share in managing production, development of socialist emulation and the movement for

a communist attitude to one's work, dissemination of the experience of front-rankers. Addressing the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, L.I. Brezhnev said: 'The successes of our social development are possible only as a result of the people's free and conscious creative work, of their increasingly active exercise of their civil rights, of their increasingly active participation in shaping all sides of public life. Therefore, our further advance in building communism will inevitably mean the further advance of socialist democracy. This is our Party's principled policy, and our day-to-day reality.'

An important role in organizing the creative activity of the masses and directing it to fulfillment of the tasks set by the Congress, is played by leading executives, who have been entrusted with immense resources and much authority in organizing the labor effort of millions. Socialist enterprise, effective use of the latest scientific and technological achievements, efficient organization and management, exploring and using latent production reserves, careful account of changing requirements, ability to take decisions from Party positions, with full knowledge of all aspects of the work assigned to him, ability to organize and educate the collective — these, the Congress noted, are essential qualities of the Soviet executive.

Management has two functions, organizational-technical and socio-economic. The organizational-technical function is more or less securely tied to technology, which dictates the pattern of interaction of man and machine. The socio-economic function is determined by the character of the social system and its production aims. The first function can, in a way, be similar in countries of mutually-opposed economic social systems, providing they are at approximately one and the same level of economic development. This enables the socialist countries to draw on international management experience. Lenin noted in this context: 'The possibility of building socialism depends exactly upon our success in combining the Soviet power and the Soviet organization of administration with the up-to-date achievements of capitalism' (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 259).

As for the socio-economic function of management, there can be no similarity between the two systems, for here management is essentially of a class nature. Under capitalism its sole aim is to benefit the ruling exploiter class. In socialist society, the point and purpose of management is expressed in the Party's slogan: 'Everything for man, everything for the benefit of man.'

exchange of views

Détente and the revolutionary process

INTERNATIONAL THEORETICAL CONFERENCE

Interaction of the three revolutionary currents in conditions of détente was the subject of an international theoretical conference sponsored by this journal and the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and held in Tihany Hungary, in early May. It was attended by representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties and Marxist scholars from 45 countries: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, FRG, GDR, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Senegal, South Africa, Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Uruguay, USA and Venezuela.

The conference analyzed from Marxist-Leninist positions a wide range of problems relating to further activization of the struggle for peace, extension of détente, social progress, and against imperialism. Attention was focused on the following problems: the place and role of détente and peaceful coexistence in the world revolutionary process; the relation of détente to class struggle; strengthening of the basis for unity of the revolutionary forces; proletarian internationalism in the anti-imperialist movement of today. The conference discussed also a number of other major theoretical problems. There was an exchange of information on the political situation in the countries represented, with speakers giving their views on internal and international developments.

The debate reflected the views of its participants, chiefly on general theoretical questions. A fuller account of the conference will be put out by Peace and Socialism Publishers in English, French, German, Russian and Spanish.

Decisive factor of world politics

The conference was greeted on behalf of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party by its CC Secretary *Imre Györi*. The Hungarian Communists, he said, attach special importance to this conference, which, in an open and comradely exchange of views, will examine the pressing problems of our common struggle. Our Party is deeply interested in promoting the worldwide struggle for socialism, national independence, social progress and peace.

Under the leadership of their Party, the Hungarian people are enthusiastically working to reach the goals set by the Party's 11th Congress in building a developed socialist society. The political foundation of the Hungarian state, which in its class content is a proletarian dictatorship, is the alliance of the working class and peasantry. The entire people exercise power, and socialist democracy is continuously being extended. Much has been accomplished in this respect. The building of a developed socialist society is the aim of our entire people, of our national labor effort.

The Hungarian Communists are imbued with a feeling of deep responsibility to our working class and people and also to the international communist and workers' movement. We know that, in attaining our goals, we are helping to strengthen the socialist community, which is of decisive importance in changing the world balance of forces.

Unity and cooperation of the three main revolutionary forces of our era is a crucial factor of world politics. Their joint actions on the international scene have created more favorable conditions for the cause of peace and progress. This is evidenced by the extension of peaceful coexistence and détente and by the steady improvement in the international conditions for our joint struggle and activity.

Cohesion of the communist movement is the core of unity of the main revolutionary forces. True to its internationalist duty, our Party is doing everything within its power to strengthen this unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Our movement has no organizational center. The worldwide class struggle is now being waged in a complex situation. The communist movement is spreading and this imposes greater responsibility on the parties and enhances the importance of proletarian internationalism.

In these conditions it is only natural that the fraternal Parties should, through bilateral and multilateral discussions, analyze the international situation, exchange revolutionary experience, generalize it and work out optimal methods of joint struggle. Such cooperation helps the ideological and educational work of our Parties and makes for more effective participation in the ideological struggle

of the two social systems. This is a prime task of our time, for the ideological struggle now acquires special importance. Our most potent weapon in this struggle is Marxism-Leninism.

Our Party has consistently combated both right and 'left' opportunism. It rejects all manifestations of nationalism and anti-Sovietism. It is conducting a consistent ideological and political struggle against Maoism which, having broken with scientific communism and proletarian internationalism, is obstructing closer unity of the communist movement and hampering the achievement of our international goals.

Our Party attaches much importance to closer cooperation of the socialist countries. Its main source is their dynamic development, which was so clearly demonstrated at the recent Party congresses. The congresses set inspiring goals, and their attainment will contribute to social and national progress, higher living standards and extension of socialist democracy.

The 25th CPSU Congress and its decisions are of particular importance to Hungarian Communists. For this was a historic congress: it conceptualized the practical experience in building communism and creatively developed Marxism-Leninism. It formulated the Communist position on the main problems of our time, and elaborated the Peace Program, which accords with the interests of our Party and people and with our foreign-policy aims. The tasks the congress set in communist construction add up to a realistic, substantiated and inspiring program. This supreme forum of Soviet Communists was a demonstration of internationalist solidarity with all the forces fighting for socialism, social progress, democracy and national independence. The Hungarian Communists wholeheartedly wish the Soviet Communists and Soviet people successful implementation of the 25th Congress decisions, which will benefit both the Soviet people and the progress of mankind.

Détente is spreading, the speaker said, and relations between states with different social systems are strongly influenced by the policy of peaceful coexistence. The new international climate creates better conditions for the peaceful constructive effort of the peoples of the socialist countries, for the workers' struggle in capitalist countries and for liberation movements.

The development of the world revolutionary process furnishes irrefutable evidence that our policy of peaceful coexistence is a class, revolutionary policy. For détente has helped to strengthen and extend the positions of socialism, the national-liberation movement, which is refashioning the political map of the world, the struggle of the workers in capitalist countries against oppression by the monopolies and the exploiter classes, and the spread of the revolutionary, democratic, anti-imperialist movement.

Comrade Györi drew attention to the impressive achievements of the fraternal parties of the capitalist countries in the battle against monopoly domination and in uniting the progressive, democratic, left forces. They are increasing their influence as the militant vanguard of the masses in the battle for democratic change and better conditions. We highly appreciate the tireless activity of fraternal Parties in the capitalist countries in disseminating socialist ideas, their struggle for a fundamental, democratic restructuring of society and its advance to socialism. We declare our determined solidarity with this struggle and sincerely wish the fraternal Parties every success in upholding the interests of the working class and all working people, in furthering our common cause.

Our Party is in full solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their fight against imperialism and to strengthen their freedom and independence. We support the revolutionary movement in developing countries and all who want unity with the socialist countries.

The changes in the international alignment of forces are the result of joint struggle by the peoples of the socialist countries, the international working class and the national-liberation movement. Cooperation, cohesion and unity of these three revolutionary currents are the earnest of continued success.

In conclusion, Comrade Györi expressed the hope that the conference would proceed in an atmosphere of democracy, so characteristic of meetings of representatives of fraternal Parties, in an atmosphere of comradely exchange of views and experience.

Main trend in international relations

In analyzing the present international situation as the background to the revolutionary process, conference speakers emphasized that détente is now the main trend in international relations. What we have, essentially, is the beginning of a restructuring of the whole system of relations between states in conformity with the principles of peaceful coexistence, on the basis of the changed balance of forces in favor of peace, socialism and national liberation.

Détente, it was noted in the debate, is not a transitory, but a historically law-governed development based on the long-term factors that determine the course of social progress in our age. *Janos Berecz,* head of the international department, CC Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, *Jose Lava,* CC member CP Philippines, and *Betty Sinclair,* National Executive member, CP Ireland, examined the stages leading up to détente. They drew attention to the link between the process of revolutionary change and acceptance of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Another speaker, *Samuel Melendrez,* CC member, Mexican Communist Party, analyzed the evolution of détente. He singled out two factors that made the change in international relations necessary. The growing economic and military strength of the socialist community and socialism's ability to solve basic social problems so altered the alignment of world forces that the aggressive elements of imperialism do not venture to use force in the confrontation of the two social systems. The other factor is the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries united in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. It was this policy, supported by all the revolutionary and democratic forces of the world, that paved the way to détente.

The growing might of the socialist community and its international policy helped to bring on the final collapse of the colonial system under the blows of the liberation movement and enhanced the importance of the non-aligned movement and its political and diplomatic initiative which, in turn, contributed to the acceptance of peaceful coexistence.

Gyula Bognar, editor-in-chief of the Hungarian journal *Külpolitika,* said that détente is a fundamentally new development. True, it is based primarily on the changed balance of forces between capitalism and socialism, but other objectice processes, too, necessitated the shift from cold war to détente. For example, the change in military technology. What we have, in effect, is a new situation in which the devastating consequences of the employment of modern weapons have to be taken into account not only by those against whom they would be used, but also by those who would use them. Disarmament, therefore, is the only solution. Among the objective processes contributing to détente, the speaker singled out internationalization of the productive forces. This encourages peaceful relations and to a certain degree also a common interest in environmental protection.

Objective processes, the speaker emphasized, could lead to détente only through operation of the subjective factor: without political struggle détente would have been impossible. This was realized in the socialist countries much earlier than in the capitalist, and the struggle for détente became part of the strategic concept of socialism. It has proved effective and does not require revision, whereas the foreign policy doctrines of imperialism have proved insolvent.

Dwelling on the subjective factor in détente, *Otto Sanchez,* alternate member, Guatemalan Party of Labor, noted that progress in détente is the result of correct application of the socialist countries' peaceful coexistence policy. *Joakoub Garro,* CC member, Syrian Communist Party, characterized détente as the result of multiform collective efforts by all the contingents of the world revolutionary

movement led by the socialist world system and its main, decisive force, the Soviet Union. Détente is a victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence, the principles of which were formulated by Lenin. The effort to bring them to reality, begun by the young Soviet state in extremely difficult conditions, is now being continued by the socialist community. The worldwide support of the consistent policy of peaceful coexistence carried out by the USSR and other members of the socialist community, *Baldomero Gonzalez,* alternate CC member, People's Party of Panama, said, has prevented reaction, the forces of aggression and war, from nullifying the positive changes in international relations. The importance of the socialist countries' policy and actions for peace, *Timur Timofeyev,* Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said, increases with every passing year. They have many social and political aspects and have become an effective factor in initiating new forms of international intercourse, are contributing to social progress and international consolidation of the revolutionary and democratic forces.

Much has been done to make détente a reality, said *Sarada Mitra,* National Council Member, CP India. Many problems fraught with a menace to world peace have now been resolved. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference provides the foundation for shaping a new pattern of international relations. But détente is not an exclusively European development. Relaxation of tension and normalization of relations between the socialist and capitalist countries is creating a new world climate and is exerting a strong influence on all nations, big and small, and on all regions of the world. The positive influence of détente was vividly demonstrated at the concluding stage of the Indochina people's victorious struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression. The peace policy of the USSR and the entire socialist community has stimulated the mass struggle for just, democratic principles in international relations.

Several speakers analyzed the successes of détente in various regions, the possibility of extending détente and the difficulties this encounters. *Mitra* and *Badamyn Lhamsuren,* CC members, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, spoke of the prospects for a collective security system in Asia. *Luis Padilla,* CC member, CP Bolivia, and *Milton Paredes,* CC member, CP Honduras, singled out the factors that are contributing to détente in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Panagos Koutoulas,* representative of the CP Greece, discussed opportunities for extending détente in the Balkans. The need to concentrate efforts on eliminating all seats of war and assuring a durable and just settlement in the Middle East was the subject of contributions by *Zahi Karkabi,* CC secretariat, CP Israel, and *Naim Ashhab,* CC member, Jordanian CP. *Christoforas Ioannidis,* member, CC Ideo-

logical Bureau, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, spoke of the significance of the Helsinki Final Act for the patriotic struggle of the Cypriot people. *Lava* analyzed the positive changes in Southeast Asia.

Experience has shown, *Bjoeren Groen,* alternate member, CC CP Denmark, said, that the fight for peace and against imperialism is the more successful, the closer the interaction of the three revolutionary currents. The record of the past few years can be tersely summarized as follows: the action program worked out by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and the Peace Program advanced by the 24th CPSU Congress have, in the main, been carried out. These facts are cogent proof of the vast potentialities of the international revolutionary movement. The results already achieved enable us to set new tasks in the fight for peace, and for making détente irreversible.

Referring to the contribution all the peace forces have made to détente, *Koutoulas* emphasized the importance of the Peace Program and the peace policy of the socialist states, which has met with mass support throughout the world. But we should not, he said, underestimate the role of the working class in the capitalist countries and of other anti-imperialist forces. We all know that they play an increasing part in the struggle and are helping to overcome the many difficulties and obstacles created by the reactionary forces.

The shift to détente should be seen against the background of sharp struggle, and the struggle will not abate as we forge ahead, because the opponents of détente have not abandoned their attempts to torpedo it. The political realism displayed by some influential circles of the big bourgeoisie, *Sergio Sierra,* CC member, CP Uruguay, emphasized, does not mean that the contradicions have vanished, or that the capitalist states, including those represented at Helsinki, have ceased their maneuvers against détente.

Groen noted that many of the agreements normalizing international relations do not suit the more aggressive and reactionary circles in the Common Market countries and the U.S. In fact, the Helsinki Conference has been followed by an intensified campaign against its decisions. At first the propaganda line was that détente benefits only the socialist countries. That argument proved ineffectual: even the opponents of détente realized that it was tantamount to saying that peace and elimination of the thermonuclear menace were in the interests only of socialism.

In this context, many speakers remarked on the change in the thrust and tone of bourgeois propaganda. Now the accent is on the allegation that the agreements have lost all meaning, are not 'binding,' do not prevent the 'aggressive plans' of the USSR and the socialist

community, do not curb its drive for 'hegemony.' In short, there is a return to the shopworn cold-war propaganda figments which, the conference stressed, should be rebutted in order to advance détente.

Several speakers, *Jon Bloomfield*, National Student Organizer, CP Great Britain, *John Pittman*, member of Political Bureau, CPUSA, and *Ellen Weber*, Board member, German CP, drew attention to the growing activity of détente opponents and the danger it holds out to peace. There were still great obstacles to international security and cooperation.

The development and consolidation of détente, *Ellen Weber* said, call for unrelaxed vigilance and struggle. We must constantly compel the imperialists to abide by the principles of peaceful coexistence. The FRG is continuing the arms drive to the detriment of its genuine interests. Big capital and reaction are trying to block disarmament and revive the cold war. Reactionary elements in the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union, and also the Free Democrat and Social-Democrat parties, are campaigning against the treaties with the socialist countries, are trying to blackmail the GDR and have raised a hue and cry about the 'danger' from the East.

These and other facts indicate that we cannot rely on automatic consolidation of what has been achieved, for we are faced by an imperialist enemy who has not abandoned his aggressive intentions against the socialist countries. West German big capital has not reconciled itself to its defeat in World War II — it still hopes, even at this late hour, to revise its results.

Reviewing the situation, the speaker emphasized that though détente continues, it is encountering much stronger resistance. If we are to maintain the positions we have won and extend détente, we must set new goals. The German Communist Party followed the work of the 25th CPSU Congress with close attention and welcomes its program of further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for the freedom and independence of the peoples. Military détente is now a most important concrete and common political goal.

The enemies of détente, *Karkabi* said, include the Israeli rulers. They fear relaxation of international tension and any improvement in relations between the West and the Soviet Union. In their judgment, strained Soviet-American relations increase opportunities for hardening the occupation of the Arab territories, because the Washington policy-makers would, in these circumstances, have to rely to a greater degree on Zionist support in the fight against Arab anti-imperialist movements, against the USSR and other socialist countries. Continuation of the Israeli occupation of Arab territories and Israel's refusal to acknowledge the rights of the Arab Palestinian people, threaten a new war in the Middle East that would endanger world peace.

Discussing the reasons for the attacks on détente, *Berecz* drew attention to the following: the growing understanding in bourgeois circles that the world revolutionary process is closely linked with détente finds expression in the renewed attacks on détente by international imperialism. The failure of the blockade of Cuba and the steady growth of its international prestige, the triumph of the revolutionary forces in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the defeat of the intervention in Angola, the upsurge of the workers' movement in capitalist countries, the enhanced influence of the Communist Parties, and the continued growth of the strength and influence of the socialist world system — all these factors have brought home to the imperialists the close connection between détente and the class struggle. And the imperialists want to make détente — an objective trend in international affairs — serve their class interests and, when this suits their purpose, hamper its extension. We should expect more attacks on détente in the future.

Erwin Zücker-Schilling, representative of the CP Austria, spoke of the contradictions in the Social-Democratic attitude toward détente. On the one hand, Socialist International leaders, including Bruno Kreisky, Chairman of the Austrian Socialist Party, admit that there is no alternative to détente, inasmuch as the West cannot gain military, material and technological superiority over the USSR and its allies. On the other hand, Kreisky and his ilk would very much like to undermine the basis that made détente possible, namely, the increased strength of the Soviet Union and the socialist community.

'Dissociation from the Soviet Union of its allies,' 'renunciation of loyalty to the USSR,' 'abandonment of the principles that make up Marxism-Leninism' — these are only part of a longer list of what Kreisky wants the Communist parties to do. And compliance with these suggestions would determine the Social-Democrats' attitude to one or another Communist Party. These plans to split the world communist movement and set the Communist Parties in capitalist countries against the socialist community are absolutely incompatible with professions of loyalty to détente. Enduring peace can come only as the result of the policy oriented on cooperation with the anti-imperialist and socialist forces.

The attempts by the enemies of détente to turn back the clock and split the peace forces stand no chance of success. But neither should we be blind to the fact that any policy aimed at weakening the unity of the peace forces, both on a national and an international scale, can only play into the hands of those who are out to create dangerous situations.

In analyzing the realities of the world we live in, said *Petru Panzaru*, director, Rumanian Institute of Political Sciences and Research

into the National Question, it is important to bear in mind that long years of the imperialist policy of diktat and colonial domination have left unsolved many complex and sensitive questions of international relations. Attempts to solve them by force can only breed new conflicts, create more strain and imperil world peace and security. If we want to eliminate the consequences of this old policy and find correct settlements for international disputes, we must act in a spirit of heightened responsibility and seek solutions through direct negotiations between the countries concerned on the basis of respect for the sovereignty of every nation, the freedom and independence of every people. Only in this way can international issues be resolved in the interests of every country and people, in the interests of progress and peace.

Events in recent years have convincingly confirmed the realistic possibility of finding peaceful solutions for the most tangled international problems. Now, after the successful conclusion of the Helsinki Conference, there has to be concrete action to translate its principles and commitments into practice.

The struggle for peace and disarmament, *Melendrez* declared, for liquidation of military blocs and prevention of fresh military conflicts remains a priority task for all the revolutionary and democratic forces. For if we are to advance further on the road of social progress, we must rule out world war as a means of resolving conflicts that carry over from the time when imperialism ruled supreme.

The development and extension of détente, the prevention of world war, speakers emphasized, is a cardinal aspect of the interaction of the three revolutionary currents. That the struggle of the Communists and of all working people for enduring peace, against the most aggressive, reactionary circles of monopoly capital is of a class nature need hardly be stressed. However, the importance of détente in the class confrontation is not confined to that alone, for détente offers fresh opportunities to every contingent of the world revolutionary movement and for their joint action against imperialism, for peace and social progress.

New opportunities for the anti-imperialist offensive

The problems of the interconnection between the revolutionary process and détente held a prominent place in the discussion. The following questions were taken up: How does détente react on the class struggle nationally and internationally? Is détente compatible with international solidarity and the struggle within the various countries for a change of the socio-political status quo? What role does détente play in forging unity of the popular forces ranged against imperialism? How does it influence relations between developing and imperialist

countries, and the national-liberation movement? What forms of interaction of the three revolutionary currents does it bring to the fore?

The state of international relations, *Berecz* remarked, can accelerate or decelerate the world revolutionary process. Détente, a favorable external condition, helps to form the objective and subjective factors for our advance. In particular, it affords favorable conditions for the upbuilding of the countries of the socialist community, the decisive force of the world revolutionary process.

There is hardly need to stress the importance of the work of the Communist Parties, the socialist countries, the national-liberation movements and all progressive forces in expanding the struggle for peace and coexistence, international cooperation and liquidation of military blocs, *Gastone Gensini,* Central Control Commission member, Italian CP, said in his contribution. For this is also a struggle against the imperialist policy of interference in the affairs of other countries and against neo-colonialism. It helps us win new democratic and socialist gains, positions from which we can strengthen the independence and equality of all peoples, find a way out of the crisis that has gripped the capitalist world, guarantee the continued economic and political development of all countries, including the socialist, carry forward the struggle against the last survivals of fascism in Europe and the world, and create new conditions for cooperation between all peoples and nations.

Imperialism's henchmen, *Ioannidis* said, have tried, and failed, to present détente as something that narrows the horizon of the international and national class struggle, hampers international solidarity of the socialist countries and other revolutionary forces and impedes the national-liberation movement. Experience has shown that peaceful coexistence helps each of the three revolutionary currents and intensifies their interaction in accelerating social progress.

There can be no doubt, *Aulis Leppanen,* representative of the CP Finland, said, that détente accords with the peoples' desire for enduring peace and provides the preconditions for expanding and intensifying the working-class struggle in capitalist countries. The reactionaries are finding it harder to use 'emergency measures,' curtail democratic rights, harass working-class organizations and employ violence against the working people. The general political situation is developing favorably for the interests of the working class. Of course, the opportunities détente offers for extending the class confrontation have still to be translated into reality.

The capitalist world is in the throes of the greatest recession since the crisis of the 1930s. In past crisis periods the working class had to sacrifice some of its gains and retreat to defensive positions. Today, in Finland, for example, the situation is in many respects

different: though the crisis has come as a hard blow to the working class, there has been no abatement in the scale and intensity of the class struggle.

The Portuguese revolution was performed in a new international climate, in the climate of détente, *Silas Siqeira,* member, international department, CC Portuguese CP, told the conference. At the Brussels Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Capitalist Europe, our Party emphasized the close interconnection between the progress of détente in Europe and the world and the struggle against fascism, colonialism and Portuguese imperialism. In January 1974, Comrade Cunhal declared that the collapse of the fascist dictatorship in Portugal could change the political map of capitalist Europe. In April of that year the fascist dictatorship, which had misruled the country for 48 years, was overthrown.

The fight for peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries is one of the forms of the class struggle and it can force the Portuguese reactionaries to retreat. European security and cooperation are incompatible with a return to fascism in Portugal, or with the policy of outside interference systematically pursued by the imperialist powers with the help of the West European Social-Democrat leaders.

The experiences of the labor and democratic movement, *Mel Doig,* member of the Central Executive Committee, CP Canada, said, demonstrate that its ability to safeguard the interests of the working people is inseparable from the state of relations between socialist and capitalist countries. For Canada, détente presents the people with the possibility of pursuing a truly independent foreign policy without having to give way to U.S. imperialist pressures. The Communist Party of Canada sees its responsibility as that of correctly combining the struggle for détente with the struggle for social progress. Comrade Kashtan told a recent meeting of our Central Committee that our Party is faced with the twofold task of supporting those realistic positions of the Trudeau government which strengthen the process of détente, developing at all times maximum pressure on the government to compel it to continue along the road of détente, disarmament and cooperation with the socialist countries. At the same time, our Party must oppose government policies which are directed at upholding and defending the interests of monopoly capital. This struggle requires considerable flexibility and persistence.

There are those who would have the Soviet Union and other socialist countries pay for détente with concessions. The imperialists insist on complementing political détente by ideological détente. But as long as there are antagonistic classes and mutually-opposed social systems, the class struggle and ideological confrontation will continue. The only form of struggle we rule out is military conflicts.

Our enemies, especially after Helsinki, said *Girgin Girginov*, Deputy Director, Institute of Social Theories, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, advocate de-ideologization. 'Good relations' between countries, they argue, call for ideological coexistence based on the principles of 'non-interference, tolerance and compromise.' This is a reecho of the convergence theory, of its latest variant, 'peaceful inclusion' of the socialist states in the Western orbit. Nor are we dealing merely with theoretical disquisitions: 'ideological peace' is being put forward as a prior condition of European security and cooperation. What is meant, of course, is not an end to the ideological struggle, but ideological disarmament of the socialist countries.

We accept and promote détente, but we certainly do not accept ideological disarmament. We are convinced that our ideas will triumph, but that requires constant perfection of our ideological weapon. The ideological struggle is becoming more complex and sharper, and the outlook is not for ideological détente.

Replying to a question by *Satiadjaja Sudiman*, member of the leadership, CP Indonesia, the speaker said that aggravation of the ideological struggle is not due to the present state of international relations or to détente, but to the objective laws of the class struggle. It is being aggravated primarily because ideology now holds so important a place in the class struggle and because our enemies are using ideological means to achieve what they failed to achieve through war, cold and hot.

In working for the maximum cohesion of all the anti-monopoly forces centered around the industrial working class, *Bloomfield* said, our Party is pursuing a strategy which we first outlined in 1951 in the *British Road to Socialism*. The fulfillment of this strategy in the last quarter of a century has not been an easy task. The launching of the cold war by the major imperialist forces did not only destroy all hopes of postwar economic cooperation, but instituted a period of dangerous international tensions and high military expenditure. Since the policy gained the support of the right-wing Social-Democratic forces in capitalist Europe, it resulted in divisions in the working-class movement, increased isolation of Communist Parties and significant ideological hostility to socialism. To an extent it can be argued that it froze the working-class struggle.

The inauguration of détente is also of tremendous significance because it helps to overcome the serious disunity within the working-class movement created by the cold war. Already we have seen in different countries in the last few years a new degree of unity being forged between Communists and other political parties and among trade union centers representing different political trends. We have consistently argued in our program that it is unity in action that

is central. The new international setting helps to undermine the spreading of anti-communist hostility. There are thus considerable possibilities for the advance of our strategy for socialism in Britain. At the same time, such development would ensure that Britain plays a positive role in securing détente and extending its scope. The complementarity of the two processes is clear.

The peoples of Africa welcomed the Final Act of Helsinki as a great victory for peace, *Lasisi Osunde* (Nigeria) said in his contribution to the debate. However, we should be mindful of the fact that relaxation of international tension refers only to relations between states belonging to mutually-opposed social systems. A clear analysis of all the aspects of the dialectical interconnection between détente and the class struggle helps to repulse attempts to create the notion that normalization of international relations is tantamount to perpetuating the present socio-economic and political status quo. Such theories are designed to turn détente against the revolutionary and national-liberation movements.

Support of lawful governments fighting domestic reaction aided by foreign intervention is not a violation of détente. A typical example is Angola, where the national government and the patriotic forces were compelled to take up arms in defense of the country's independence and territorial integrity against aggression by the South African racists and against the pro-imperialist disruptive groups supported by Washington and Peking. The aid of the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries to the patriotic forces of Angola has shown that the imperialists' interpretation of détente is wholly unfounded.

America's military, political and moral defeat in Vietnam, *Damian Pretel*, CC member, CP Spain, said, is added proof that peaceful coexistence does not, and cannot, imply retention of the status quo. For détente is a specific form of the class struggle between the two world systems, the capitalist and the socialist, and their relations cannot be based on concord.

Referring to the question of recognition of Europe's postwar frontiers, *Gensini* remarked that the Helsinki agreements treat the territorial status quo as an essential condition for the preservation of peace, but international peace does not mean a socio-political status quo.

Citing the political situation in their respective countries, many speakers pointed to the mounting popular struggle generated by the détente policy of the socialist community. *Ellen Weber*, *Koutoulas*, *Betty Sinclair*, *Lava* and *Leppanen* noted that attempts to exploit détente to dull social antagonisms and divert the workers from the class struggle had failed dismally. Instead, there was growing isolation of the imperialist elements who are trying to find a way out of the crisis by a shift to the right and by boosting militarization. There are

now broader vistas for the revolutionary restructuring of society through world peace, not through war.

The marked change in the class confrontation in the non-socialist world, speakers noted, is evidenced in particular, by the fact that détente is removing a number of obstacles to an open confrontation of the working class and all popular forces against the monopolies on vital national issues. Replying to a question by *Bloomfield* on how détente creates better conditions for popular unity against capitalism, *Michele Rossi,* the Italian CP member of the *WMR* Editorial Board, said: a broad anti-fascist coalition was formed in Italy during the Resistance. Churchill's Fulton speech in 1947 was the start of the cold war. The split on the international level was duplicated on the national level, and there was division within the anti-fascist coalition. Détente and peaceful coexistence removed this cause of the split and made for closer identity of views and united action on the problems facing Italy. And so, the reasons that caused the split now operate in favor of unity. This, of course, should not be taken to mean that all workers, all the democratic popular forces agree with every aspect of the Italian government's foreign policy. There are differences, some of them fairly wide.

Though détente applies primarily to relations between countries with differing social systems, *Mitra* said, it is exerting a strong influence also on relations between imperialist and developing countries. For the peoples of the national-liberation zone détente is a factor impeding direct imperialist aggression or the export of counter-revolution. It helps to extend the anti-imperialist struggle to the economic sphere. It helps the peoples exercise their right to be masters of their natural wealth. New opportunities thus emerge for eliminating imperialist diktat in economic relations between developing and developed capitalist countries, and for basing these relations on justice and equality. There are also wider opportunities for interaction of socialism and the national-liberation movement in different fields. Détente does not preclude socialism's right to support the national-liberation struggle by military and other means.

Replying to a question by *Pittman* on the specific influence of the world revolutionary process on India, *Mitra* stressed that interaction of socialism and the national-liberation movement was a major factor in the recent changes in India. In all critical situations, when India was faced with threats by imperialism, including U.S. imperialism, it was the Soviet Union that firmly stood by her side. If we take economic independence, it was largely due to Soviet assistance that India was able to build up a state-owned heavy industry. The benefits of interaction of socialism and the Indian progressive movement are not confined to the anti-imperialist struggle, but extend to cardinal

questions of social development. Most of India's national leaders did not come from the working class, but they have been obliged to accept the socialist orientation, and in no small share this is due to the influence of the Soviet example. Our experience shows that the example of existing socialism helps to accelerate our progress.

The end of the cold war, *Renate Wünsche,* department head, GDR Institute of International Relations, said, was one of the prerequisites for bringing to the fore the developing countries' fight for economic independence. They have the support of the socialist community, with which they share an identity of interests on many problems. There is now a closer tie between the economic and political aspects of the anti-imperialist struggle. Peaceful coexistence releases new forces: the developing countries are now making a bigger contribution to a healthier international climate. Further consolidation of the sovereignty of Asian, African and Latin American countries in the confrontation with imperialism has considerably enhanced their international prestige and authority.

The main aspect of the present confrontation with imperialism in Latin America, *Jeronimo Carrera,* member CC, CP Venezuela, said, is the fight to dismantle the power of the U.S. monopolies, which have been robbing us of our wealth, plunging our peoples into poverty. The priority aim is repossession of our natural wealth. In recent years nationalization in dependent countries has become practically universal, affecting, in varying degree, the assets of international monopoly capital. In the past all nationalization, regardless of whether it implied confiscation or compensation, was immediately denounced as an act hostile to the imperialist powers. Now, the word 'nationalization' no longer frightens the bourgeoisie: capitalism has learned to live with nationalization, just as it learned to accept agrarian reform, and use it in its own interests.

This change of front is the result of the changed relation of world forces to the disadvantage of imperialism. Détente prevents it from acting in the old way and resorting to violence, at least to the same extent as before. But that does not mean that the imperialists are surrendering their privileges. There are other factors that keep our countries in a state of dependency.

Another speaker, *Lava,* said that the experience of neo-colonialism has proved that our country, the Philippines, cannot rely on the foreign monopolies and the capitalist market to resolve its multiplying problems. The belief is gaining ground, even in ruling circles, that genuine national security can come only from an independent and peaceful policy geared to national development, a policy that envisages mutually advantageous cooperation with all countries in the present setting of détente. Our Communist Party has taken a positive

attitude to President Marcos' appeal for national unity and an independent development policy based on the use of our own resources and on friendly mutually advantageous relations with all countries.

There should be no doubt that economic cooperation with the socialist world, *Sudiman* said in the debate, helps the young states wipe out social and economic backwardness, break out of imperialist subjection and become truly sovereign and progressive countries. But there is the question of whether or not economic and trade relations with the socialist countries help to bolster, economically, reactionary regimes, such as that in Indonesia. In answering that question we have first to take into account the following: such economic ties help to prevent complete economic subjection to imperialism, and, at the same time, enable the patriotic forces to advance a positive alternative.

The breach of the imperialist blockade against Cuba, the failure of the 1962-64 OAS illegal anti-Cuba resolutions which envisaged economic and political sanctions, should be seen as a triumph for peaceful coexistence in the Western hemisphere, *Paredes* said. The whole system of U.S.-Latin American relations is now in a state of crisis. Many governments are forming regional organizations to defend their economies against imperialist encroachment. The urge to use the favorable foreign-policy conditions resulting from détente to pursue a sovereign policy is now the central trend in inter-American relations, and it is steadily gaining momentum.

Wider contacts between Latin American countries and the Soviet Union and other socialist states, *Sanchez* said, not only substantially improve the international situation in our region, but also provide valuable support for our peoples' fight for independence and freedom, democracy and progress, against the domination of foreign monopolies and local oligarchies, and bring new forces into this struggle.

For the dependent and underdeveloped countries multilateral equal cooperation is an effective weapon against backwardness and imperialist exploitation, and accelerates their advance to full independence. The positive changes on the international scene, *Melendrez* said, have prompted the Mexican government to change its policy. True, the change has been bolder in foreign than in domestic affairs. Full use is not being made of opportunities to achieve our two main goals, viz., economic independence and an end to North American political pressure.

Détente, *Gonzalez* said, has made it possible for the Panamanian government more effectively to press its demand for a return of the Canal Zone and dismantling of foreign bases. At the same time, the government has dealt a telling blow to the U.S. banana monopoly,

which has ruthlessly exploited our natural resources and labor power. With the new relation of class forces in the world, *Carrera* remarked, the people of so small a country as Panama can advance demands which not so long ago, in the cold war days, would have stood no chance of success.

The new alignment of international forces, *Hugo Fazio,* representative of the CP Chile, said, is having a positive influence in Latin America. The revolutionary process in Chile which aimed at abolishing, by new means, dependence on imperialism, and the financial and landed oligarchy, was possible only because of the new international situation. And though the revolution has suffered a temporary defeat, Chile's experience has shown that there are new ways of implementing revolutionary transformations.

From the standpoint of their basic aims, vital interests and interaction, *Bognar* said, each of the three currents of the world revolutionary process stands to gain less from cold-war confrontations and, of course, military conflicts. But détente has not deprived imperialism of the ability to do harm: clashes in the class struggle will not always automatically end in victory for the forces of progress, though the ultimate result is beyond doubt.

The misgivings about the consequences of détente for the cause of the revolution and national liberation, *Garro* said, have, in the main, given way to an understanding of its real importance in the context of the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle. It is becoming increasingly clear that the fight to extend the scope of détente and the fight for social and national liberation are, in effect, two battlefronts of a single, ever-widening revolutionary offensive. Peace and social progress are interconnected aims. That thought was amplified by *Sierra:* both for a working class in power and for a working class fighting for power, détente and revolutionary change are not parallel but interconnected elements of one and the same strategy.

The debate showed that détente is attended by a higher level of the peoples' struggle against their common enemy, imperialism. This leads to a change in the socio-political status quo; the far-reaching revolutionary changes of the past few years are evidence of that. Détente and peaceful coexistence create an international climate conducive to social progress. This makes for much wider interaction of all the contingents of the world anti-imperialist movement, and helps to strengthen the three revolutionary currents.

On forms of the liberation struggle

The relation between détente and forms of the liberation struggle was discussed by many speakers, who took as their starting point Lenin's

ideas about the dialectical interconnection of revolution and the fight for peaceful coexistence and a democratic and just peace.

To gauge the success of détente in the light of Lenin's understanding of peaceful coexistence, *Amath Dansoko,* Political Bureau member, CC African Party of Independence of Senegal, said, it is useful to recall the difficulties the international Communist movement had to cope with and the persistent and principled struggle waged by the Communist Parties, notably the CPSU.

The formulation of our policy of implementing détente signified the failure of all Maoist attempts to impose militarist metaphysics on the world communist movement. One example is the Maoist pamphlet, *Once more on Comrade Togliatti's differences with us.* In the 60s the Maoist theorists theorized that after hundreds of millions had been annihilated in a nuclear war, the peoples would quickly build a thousand times better civilization. This was not mere rhetoric. The world Communist movement had to work out its strategy on the most crucial question of all — war and peace. The Maoists have not changed their attitude since then. Their representatives have declared at the United Nations that every generation must go through the crucible of war.

Peaceful coexistence is an important element of the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution. By its policy of détente the communist movement has given answers to the vital problems of the historic situation we now face and has creatively developed Lenin's teaching. Our policy, as pointed out by many speakers, provides a wider field for the activities of the revolutionary forces. The very fact that we were able to impose this form of struggle on the imperialist powers is added proof of the leading role of the proletariat and the socialist community in the social evolution of our epoch. This form of struggle is all the more important for the future world revolution, because for imperialism the arms drive is not only a means of preparing for war, but also a means of retarding the process of building socialism and communism.

We all agree, said *John Poll,* representative of the South African Communist Party, that détente is out of the question in the field of ideology and the class struggle. But is it right to think that détente can be extended to that sphere of international life which is concerned with the relationship between the oppressor and oppressed nations, between the national-liberation movement and the imperialist countries? The liberation movements in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa had for years conducted a non-violent mass struggle, but bitter experience forced them to take the path of armed revolutionary struggle. And there is no more just war than that of a degraded,

humiliated, racially oppressed people fighting for national independence, freedom and peace.

For the developing countries, *Gonzalez* said, détente is the only alternative to the cold war the imperialists have been waging to maintain themselves in power. By promoting détente these countries can use its benefits to end imperialist exploitation and oppression. This, of course, does not preclude — in fact presupposes — internal revolutionary changes within the country.

The peace we are working for, said *Garro,* has nothing in common with colonialist peace, with peace at the expense of the peoples and their independence. What we want is a democratic and just peace.

Peaceful coexistence of states with opposite social systems corresponds to the fundamental interests of the national-liberation movement; it does not imply renunciation by that movement of the right to armed struggle. It will be recalled that in defending peace and striving for the extension of détente, the socialist countries render assistance, including military, to the peoples' national-liberation struggle. But the national-liberation movement itself should, I think, always take into account the international situation: it is essential and possible to strengthen universal peace while continuing the struggle for national and social liberation and making skillful use of the great diversity of its forms, The guarantee against mistakes is constant coordination and cooperation between the forces of this and other revolutionary currents.

How would it work out, for instance, if every contingent of the national-liberation movement undertook this or that important step with an eye only to the internal situation and ignored the interests of universal peace in this nuclear age? The participants in the world revolutionary movement should, in my opinion, be able to see not only their own rights and the duties of others. They should also keep well in mind their own duties in relation to the world revolutionary process as a whole.

A revolution that would end in a world thermonuclear war, *Berecz* said, does not make sense, nor does a peace that would keep alive exploitation and oppression. Both run counter to the requirements of social development. The need to combine the fight for socialism and social progress with the fight for peace and détente was emphasized by the 11th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party in these words: 'Our key task in foreign policy has always been the provision of external conditions favoring our work in building socialism, the defense and strengthening of the positions of social progress, national independence and world peace.'

The socialist countries are, at one and the same time, participants in the world revolutionary process and the creators of the inter-

national situation. The revolutionary mission of the socialist world system is to achieve these three interconnected goals: successful building of a developed socialist society and communism; stable international conditions; support of the revolutionary forces.

The socialist community countries can, through their foreign policy and revolutionary contacts, actively influence the international situation. The socialist countries cannot take rash risks in their foreign policy. The aim of the socialist revolution is to refashion the world in the interests of the working class and, in the final analysis, of all mankind. Socialist revolution is essentially creative: it abolishes the obsolescent exploiting system. Consequently, any action which appears revolutionary but leads to thermonuclear war is sheer madness. Such actions are contrary to Marxism, which has always rejected the prodding of revolution from without by war.

Groen said that détente had accelerated differentiation in the imperialist and monopolistic circles, thereby stimulating in some of these circles a material interest in peace and the development of international cooperation; it had also isolated the most aggressive elements. One should not, however, overestimate the importance of this.

One of the new and difficult problems derived from détente was that in certain broad sections there might be illusions that the aggressive nature of imperialism had been finally curbed. These illusions could lead, on the one hand, to a weakening of vigilance and, on the other, encourage divisive forces in the anti-imperialist movement. These illusions could, for instance, give rise to underestimation of the significance of the struggle for stabilizing international conditions. The Communist Party of Denmark stresses that despite advances in the struggle for peace the peoples should not close their eyes to the belligerent nature and aggressive aspirations of imperialism. Imperialism's intentions have not changed; all that has changed is its ability to put them into practice.

Speaking of the general trend toward changes in the forms of the class struggle implied by affirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations, *Bognar* remarked that the effect of détente was to strengthen the positions of those who believed in waging the international class struggle by peaceful means and to restrict the freedom of action of supporters of armed confrontation. It would be closing one's eyes to reality to absolutize détente as the only admissible aspect of the class struggle and rule out the possibility of other ways and means of struggle.

It was stressed at the conference that while eliminating such phenomena of the class contradictions between the two systems as military-political confrontation, and preventing conflicts and con-

troversies between states from being solved by means of war, by the use of force or the threat of force, détente does not tie down the initiative of the revolutionary forces in mastering all means and forms of class struggle and making use of them according to specific conditions with a view to strengthening peace and proletarian internationalism.

Basis for alliance and class differentiation

In the national-liberation zone, it was noted, a new problem has arisen that must be considered when dealing with the interaction of the main currents of the world revolutionary process. This problem is connected with the differentiation of class forces in the developing countries in relation to the choice of paths of social development and imperialism's attempt to exploit this process for splitting the liberation movement.

The current struggle in the developing countries over paths of development, said *Garro,* is tending toward the choice of the socialist orientation or strengthening of that orientation. This tendency gives the national-liberation movement a deeper social content, and strengthens the material and political foundations of its alliance with the socialist system, and the alliance of all currents of the revolutionary movement. But the opposite tendencies should also be taken into consideration.

For example, to undermine the foundations of the progressive regimes imperialism tries to build up the local parasitic and bureaucratic bourgeoisie. This gives rise to illusions that there can be a change in the fundamental essence of imperialism's, particularly U.S. imperialism's, political line, that its mediation in this or that struggle would be desirable and could produce positive results. *Mitra* continued this thought by saying that imperialism is trying to get together with the property-owning classes of the young states and reshape their foreign and home policies in its own interests. It is trying to disrupt the alliance of the national-liberation movements with other revolutionary currents by exploiting the existing non-identity of their specific aims.

The national-liberation movement in its present phase is aiming at political and economic independence, which corresponds to the interest of various social strata, including some sections of the national bourgeoisie, whereas the mission of the international proletariat is socialism. Socialism's support to the national-liberation movement springs from proletarian internationalism, whereas the national-liberation movement's relations with socialism are based on anti-imperialist alliance.

The bourgeois circles are speculating on the fact that socialism is

not yet in a position to render all the vast economic assistance the developing countries require. They use this argument to justify the involvement of the international monopolies in the economies of the young states.

Imperialist politicians, primarily the ruling circles of the United States, said *Ilona Babirak,* lecturer at the Hungarian Higher Political School, are endeavoring to set up 'base countries' in the developing world that could represent and promote their aims. After Brazil such attempts have been launched, for example, in relation to Iran, Indonesia and Egypt. This is one of the ways in which imperialism strives to check the anti-imperialist and revolutionary processes throughout the developing world.

The reactionary forces in the developing countries, said *Renate Wünsche,* are trying to exploit for their own selfish purposes the positions these countries have won in the world. While talking about the 'end of the bi-polar world,' they make deals with U.S. imperialism and other imperialist countries. But the danger of debilitating the anti-imperialist content of the developing countries' national policy cannot, in our view, cast doubt on the growing international role of these countries or their contribution to the struggle for peace and national independence.

The speaker went on to stress that in the present phase connected with the socio-political differentiation in the national-liberation and anti-imperialist movement certain qualitatively new social processes can be observed. It is becoming quite obvious, for example, that in terms of time and content the struggle for economic independence and the freedom to choose one's social orientation are united in a single process.

Taking into account new phenomena and trends, *Georges Batal,* CC member, CP of the Lebanon, suggested it was time to abandon past generalizations, in which, in the period of struggle for political independence, all the colonial and dependent countries and nationalist trends were in some degree regarded as belonging to the worldwide national-liberation movement.

Now, decades after the attainment of independence, the national-liberation movement has acquired a new content — the merging of the objectives of national liberation with those of economic upbuilding, with the drive for economic independence and social progesss.

In countries that have won political independence differences are growing in the levels and character of political, economic and social development, the alignment of classes and social strata and the roles they play. The question of roads of social development is hotly contended. It is still difficult to say which road many of these countries will take. It would be wrong, the speaker said, to assume, for

example, that economic and social progress and the development of the productive forces in these countries will be linked solely with the socialist refashioning of society.

This puts in doubt, Batal continued, some concepts dealing with the transient phenomena in the national-liberation movement, for example, the assumption of power by the petty bourgeoisie. The significance of reforms and changes in the structure of certain countries has been exaggerated; so too has the significance of these changes for future development. Despite all these reforms and changes, not one of these countries has left the capitalist system, not one of them has shaken off its dependence on the world capitalist market. Experience has shown that the mere replacement of individuals heading the national government leaves things just as they were and dashes the hopes that were placed in these leadership changes. It should be remembered that there may be a difference between the regime and the social forces fighting for the consolidation of political and economic independence and for social progress.

One cannot agree, *Dansoko* remarked, with those who deny the existence of a whole current in the world revolutionary process known as the national-liberation movement. All the formerly colonial and dependent countries, irrespective of their level of development, hold a special position in the capitalist world system. The political line adopted by the governments of some of the developing countries does not in any sense invalidate the existence of the national-liberation movement. There are, of course, bound to be different trends within this movement, and frequent contradictions. Some of them are striving to solve the basic conflict with imperialism on the revolutionary plane, others embark on the reformist road. The differentiation and class struggle going on there is specifically connected with the question of the choice of road. But in our view, there still exists a zone whose peoples are in a special relation to imperialism.

Since the October Revolution of 1917 the national-liberation movement has acquired the specific feature that it is no longer developing along the lines of bourgeois revolution, but has become a component of the worldwide social revolution. This, of course, is still a long way from being a genuine proletarian movement. But the collapse of the colonial system and the emergence of the national states has given hundreds of millions a more active part in the battles between the forces of reaction and progress.

No one denies the existence of a definite current in the world revolutionary process, namely, the national-liberation movement, *Batal* explained. But is the definition formulated when these countries were still fighting for independence true today? In those days it was a very broad movement embracing the oppressed peoples of

three continents, and countries that were under colonial rule or depended on the metropolis. But since the achievement of independence the economic and socio-political development of these countries has become differentiated. There have emerged regimes that are not anti-imperialist and no longer participate in the national-liberation movement. In short, the content of the national-liberation movement has changed. So such generalizations as 'national-liberation zone' are, in my view, no longer valid today. After all, this is not a geographical but a class concept with an anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonialist content. (Incidentally, some countries which formerly did not belong to this zone are now launching an anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation.)

What it boils down to, said *Timofeyev*, is that experience prompts us to take a more and more discriminating approach when analyzing the position in one or another current of the world revolutionary process. At one time the group of Latin American countries, for example, was assigned to the Third World. One must be careful, however, not to underrate the anti-imperialist potential of the contemporary national-liberation movement as a whole.

Entering the discussion, *Ashhab* said that a process of differentiation is indeed taking place in the countries we describe as developing. But here were are faced with the problem of the criteria that should be used to decide whether this or that country had accomplished the tasks of national-liberation revolution. Where are these criteria to be sought? In the nature of the ruling circles, progressive or reactionary? Or in the objective fact that the country is exploited by imperialism and has not, consequently, solved the fundamental problems of the national-liberation revolution? Let us take Saudi Arabia, for example. Can it be stated that this country, despite its huge income from oil production, despite its deals with imperialism, is no longer being robbed by the foreign monopolies, that it has already achieved the basic objectives of the national-liberation revolution? In my view, imperialism will never allow such countries to become developed capitalist states in the literal sense of the term. In the general context of historical development the formation of capitalist states of this kind is now a thing of the past. In the present epoch the developing countries can free themselves completely of imperialist dependence and become economically independent and developed countries only by taking the socialist road.

As was noted at the conference, the solution to the problem of the interaction of the main currents of the world revolutionary process involves taking into account the actual dynamics of the contradictions and differences that can be observed within the national-liberation zone. But acknowledgment of the real nature of these contradictions

does not imply that the bedrock of unity of the world revolutionary process in the anti-imperialist struggle no longer exists.

Can the armed forces remain neutral?

A number of speakers examined the role of the military in the class struggle, the strategy of counteracting military-fascist regimes and reactionary coups, and the possibility of alliance with the progressive section of the armed forces.

In present-day conditions, said *Sierra,* a new international problem has emerged. Following close on the heels of imperialism's counter-offensive in Latin America is fascism, which has seized power in a number of countries. The détente calls for the immediate isolation and defeat of these centers of fascism. The maneuvers to build up an anti-communist bloc of fascist dictatorships in the southern part of Latin America present a grave danger. Continental armed forces under the aegis of the United States are being set up with the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries on the pretext of combating 'subversive elements.' Pinochet, Geisel, Banzer and Stroessner are all operating in this direction. U.S. imperialism has assigned the role of sub-regional policeman for its aggressive plans to Brazil,' whose expansionism, threats and incessant provocations against neighboring countries are creating friction and an atmosphere of tension in this area. One should also note the close ties between the dictators and the Vorster racist regime.

The solidarity movement with the people of Chile has helped to isolate the Pinochet junta. There is also a growing campaign for solidarity with the struggle of the Uruguayan people. What is necessary, however, is to unite all mankind against the fascist danger. This is not just a matter of moral duty, but also of self-defense and contributing to the fight against the common enemy — imperialism. The struggle to save the lives and freedom of Luis Corvalan, Jaime Perez, Jose Luis Massera, Antonio Maidana, Miguel Angel Soler, Luis Sanchez Sancho and many other comrades from Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua and other countries accords with the elementary demands of both proletarian internationalism and international democratic solidarity.

Fascism in Latin America is reaction's reply to the development of the revolutionary process. The presence of fascism means that new tactics have to be worked out. In Uruguay, which today is a country occupied by its own armed forces and U.S imperialism, the Communist Party advocates the setting up of the broadest possible front aimed at smashing the fascist regime. The tasks involved in creating such a front and international solidarity are posed by the Communists

in a new way for they merge with the tasks of the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

The appearance of fascist regimes in individual countries, including those of Latin America, said *Fazio,* does not invalidate the fact that relaxation of international tension has become the main trend in recent years. But in some cases there has been backtracking. Imperialism constantly resorts to gross interference, in various forms, in the internal life of other countries, practises methods of neo-colonialist domination, tries to start local wars and directs its main effort toward blocking progressive changes. The imposition of fascist regimes on dependent countries is an essential part of its strategy. By this means imperialism and the local oligarchies seek to tie down and debilitate the forces of revolution.

Fascism in Chile aroused the indignation of the whole world. The present campaign of solidarity with the people of Chile was evoked by world support of the Chilean revolution and by the cruelty of the repressive measures taken by the dictatorship. Another decisive factor was the readiness of the broadest circles in all parts of the world to prevent the spread of fascism to other countries. The establishing of fascist regimes, like the one in Chile, runs counter to the basic trends of international development. This is the main reason for their undoubted isolation. Détente improves the external preconditions for the abolition of such regimes and, conversely, their abolition is necessary for the deepening of détente.

The right-wing coups, said *Francisco Pereira,* CC member Brazilian Communist Party, are the extreme measure to which Yankee imperialism and the local oligarchies resort in order to inhibit progressive and revolutionary processes in Latin America. The fact that these coups often lead to the setting up of fascist-type dictatorships testifies to the intensity of the class contradictions in the countries of this area and of the contradictions between each of these countries and U.S. imperialism.

Our experience, however, shows that right-wing military coups are not inevitable. It is not by accident and certainly not due to opportunism that certain Latin American armies adopt progressive and even revolutionary positions, entering into combat with imperialism and the local oligarchies. Progressive, revolutionary potentials are maturing in the continent's armed forces. In the absence of stable traditions of democratic freedoms and the relative weakness of the proletariat the progress of the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle in a number of Latin American countries cannot, in our view, be consolidated without the firm support of the army.

The Brazilian military are not a uniform reactionary mass. Nor is there a reactionary majority or a democratic minority in the army.

True, political processes in the armed forces are giving rise to opposite trends which, in the main, reflect the interests of the camps, progressive and reactionary, into which Brazilian society is split. The supporters of these trends, however, constitute only a minority of the Brazilian military. The majority, as a rule, refrain from active participation in politics.

The situation in the army is constantly changing and these changes are not always for the better. The reactionary circles strive to drag the army into their anti-democratic trends and they are successful when the progressive forces make tactical blunders or remain passive. Our duty is to do everything we can to consolidate the positions of the progressive-minded military, to help them win the battle for political control of military institutions. In the conditions of Latin America the idea that militarism cannot be defeated and eradicated otherwise than by means of a victorious struggle of one section of the national army against another is higly relevant.

Alberto Kohen, alternate CC member, CP Argentina, agreed that the armed forces should not be regarded as something homogeneous and reactionary. At the same time the lessons of the class struggle indicate that one cannot count on the neutrality of the armed forces in political and social conflicts. The Communists of Argentina, having given positive approval to the fact that the military junta in March 1976 had renounced a Pinochet-type solution, warned that both within and without the armed forces there are fascist and pro-imperialist elements that want to drown in blood the powerful and heroic movement of Argentina's working class and people. The basic objective shared by Communists and other progressive, democratic forces in Argentina is to prevent the process begun after the coup from being directed by advocates of a fascist regime. This would be our contribution to détente and the fight against imperialist plans in the South Atlantic.

Hugo Capurro, representative of the Peruvian Communist Party, spoke of the military's participation in the struggle for revolutionary changes in his country. He drew attention to the importance of studying the role and place of progressive military circles in the interaction of the three revolutionary currents and in the anti-imperialist struggle. Having analyzed the ideology of Peru's armed forces, the speaker showed that it has travelled a winding road from conceptions of the defense of the national sovereignty to an understanding of the necessity for national development with an anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic orientation. General Juan Velasco Alvarado, expressing the opinion of Peru's armed forces, proclaimed that inasmuch as imperialism brings with it foreign domination of the economy and political life of a given country, the struggle for

sovereignty necessarily implies a struggle against imperialism. Such is, in effect, the position of Peru's revolutionary government headed by General Francisco Morales Bermudez.

The military who rule Peru are not Marxists, but they are leading the revolution. This assertion is not concession on our part, but acknowledgment of the actual situation. Is it right to speak of opportunism when alliance with the progressive military accords with our fundamental positions? Examining the progressive trends in the armed forces, their objective and subjective aspects, the speaker stressed that one cannot explain many of the positive processes taking place in Latin America with participation of the military as merely a lucky coincidence. In present-day conditions the apolitical attitude of the army is becoming a thing of the past.

Against the ideology of disintegration and split

The conference paid considerable attention to the question of trends in the ideological struggle in the period of détente involving the further unity of the three basic currents of the world revolutionary process.

As was noted by *Waleri Namiotkiewicz,* Department Head, Polish Institute of the Main Problems of Marxism-Leninism, the ideological activity and pressure of imperialism and also the forces allied with it to check and split the world revolutionary process indicate that imperialism has a special mechanism for disintegrating the revolutionary forces. The developed ideological structure of capitalist society, he emphasized, offers opportunities for constantly improving this mechanism, the methods of ideological subversion and adapting them to changing conditions. Several speakers noted that the main role in imperialism's activity aimed at disintegrating the world revolutionary process is assigned to anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Anti-Sovietism today, said *Girginov,* is the kernel of anti-communism, although bourgeois propaganda has lately sought to separate anti-Sovietism from anti-communism, alleging that one can be an opponent of the Soviet Union without being anti-communist. Characteristically all anti-Soviet attempts are in some way connected with nationalism, they are either based on nationalistic ideas or lead to nationalistic positions and actions.

Anti-Sovietism is a clear symptom of the class fears that overcome the defenders of imperialism when faced by the fortress and mighty bastions of socialism, democracy and peace; it indicates a fear of existing socialism. In present-day conditions, when the attitude to the USSR is becoming the main focus of the ideological combat, we believe that it is highly important to go on strengthening and improving our joint efforts against any manifestations of anti-Sovietism. Now

more than at any other time underestimation of the danger of anti-Sovietism and tolerating it weakens the positions of the anti-imperialist forces.

A fundamental criterion in any endeavor to ensure the creative development of unity of the three revolutionary currents, *Poll* emphasized, is the relentless struggle against anti-communism and its twin, anti-Sovietism. The anti-communist and anti-Soviet offensive in the capitalist world is directed not only at Communists but at all democratic and peace-loving forces. It is a fact, *Koutoulas* also emphasized, that the intensification of anti-Soviet propaganda is tied in with attempts by reaction to prevent and stifle the process of détente. The bourgeois mass media make every effort to falsify the decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU and emasculate their peaceful and, at the same time, revolutionary content.

Just as the persecution of Communists on a national scale, said *Groen,* is directed against unity of action and broad popular movement, so is anti-Sovietism designed to isolate the individual links of the world revolutionary process, to separate the peace forces. The basic function of anti-Sovietism, stated *Alvaro Mosquera,* CC member, CP Colombia, is to deprive the revolutionary and peace-loving forces of their main international bastion and then try to crush them piecemeal.

Anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist ideology, including anti-Sovietism, said *Milan Matous,* deputy director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CC CPCz, does not always attack from openly hostile class positions; it is often concealed under 'progressive' and even 'socialist' phrase-mongering. It combines the crude methods of 'psychological warfare' with bourgeois-liberal and reformist arguments.

Anti-Soviet propaganda concentrates on concocted tales about the 'violation' of democratic freedoms and civil rights in the socialist countries. There is nothing accidental about this. The more significant the economic and social achievements of the socialist countries, the more striking is the contrast between them and capitalist reality, the unemployment and inflation. The deeper the crisis of bourgeois democracy, the more effort does bourgeois propaganda exert to create the impression that actually existing socialism contradicts democracy, that in the socialist countries the basic civil rights and human freedoms are violated. It rants about 'goulash socialism' and economic 'sugaring of the pill,' alleging that the Czechoslovak people, for example, have had to pay for a higher standard of life with loss of freedom and cultural decline.

Our most effective weapon in the fight against bourgeois ideology, against anti-Sovietism and anti-communism and the false propaganda that forms its most essential part, the most effective weapon of

socialist ideology, is the truth about contemporary world development, the truth about the Soviet Union, about the countries where socialism actually exists, about the socialist way of life. As Comrade Leonid Brezhnev noted at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, the truth about socialism is a powerful weapon in the ideological struggle. Spreading the truth about actually existing socialism is part and parcel of the struggle against anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

As was noted by *Laszlo Nagy,* deputy director of the Hungarian Institute of Social Sciences, it is important to prevent the ideological struggle from being diverted into a secondary channel. The basic question must be constantly posed: 'Which social system is better, the capitalist or the socialist?' And we must show the advantages of socialism.

While they seek to chastise the socialist countries and foist upon them 'lessons' on democracy, the bourgeoisie prepare the people to accept undemocratic laws and practices within their own countries, said *Betty Sinclair.* The Communist Party of Ireland regards it as a duty to bring home to the people the great advantages of socialism.

In the context of détente, remarked *Groen,* new possibilities are revealed for effectively combating anti-Sovietism and convincing people in the capitalist countries that the people's future lies with socialism. As the international climate improves it becomes more difficult to spread lies about the socialist countries. The example of existing socialism stands in the way of the efforts of the bourgeois propagandists to present the crisis of capitalism and the evils which this system brings upon the peoples as something natural, inherent and inevitable. Against the mounting attack on democratic rights and freedoms in the capitalist countries socialism puts forward the increasingly broad participation of the masses in government, the guarantee of individual democratic rights; in contrast to the cultural decay of bourgeois society it presents the progress achieved by its own culture; against capital's attack on the working people's living standard it presents the planned development of production and all-round improvement of their well-being.

Maoism is an essential part of the mechanism designed to disintegrate the revolutionary forces, *Namiotkiewicz* emphasized. Springing from a profound subjectivist deformation of Marxism-Leninism in the Chinese working-class movement and subsequently degenerating into a doctrine antagonistic to Marxist-Leninist theory and to socialism, Maoism represents a doubly dangerous trend. It seeks, on the one hand, to undermine the socialist world system and split the ranks of the international communist movement, and, on the other, to tear apart the links binding the socialist world system, the national-liberation movements, and the developing countries. The

policy of the Maoist group is aimed at isolating the main contingents which, being the basic components of the world revolutionary process, are integrated into an organic whole.

The problem of the attitude to be adopted to Maoism has long since passed the limits of a discussion between Communists. Since the Maoist leadership is pursuing an extremely anti-Soviet and anti-socialist policy, the question can no longer be reduced to a difference of opinion, and even the greatest tolerance on our part will not get us anywhere. A principled struggle against Maoism, the PUWP believes, is an essential condition for the further successful development of the world revolutionary process.

The objective role of Maoism as the handmaid of imperialism and a force hostile to the three fundamental currents of the world revolutionary process was revealed by the conference participants with extensive factual material. As was shown in the speeches by *Janos Perecz* and *Karoly Lipkovics,* Hungarian member of the *WMR* Editorial Board, the great-power, chauvinist policy of the PRC leaders hinders realization of the historical role of the socialist world system. Their activity, masked by pseudo-revolutionary slogans, offers imperialism additional scope for maneuver. The Chinese Maoist leadership, said *Matous,* has become the direct ally of anti-communism in slander and ideological sabotage against the countries of the socialist community. For example, an analysis of the Maoists' activity against Czechoslovakia shows that they copy the arguments and methods of imperialist propaganda.

A. Kohen showed that the Maoists merge with the ideologists of imperialism in their efforts to prevent the peoples and governments of the Latin American countries from building up ties with the USSR and other countries of the socialist community. The Maoists have lent their support to the story about a threat of 'Soviet penetration of Latin America.' The policy of the Maoists, who rant about the 'new division of the world' between 'the two superpowers' and expose the expansionist plans of the Soviet Union that they themselves conjure up out of their own imagination is well in line with the reactionary objectives of imperialism, said *Fazio.* What is more, as can be seen from the collusion between Peking and the fascist junta in Chile, among other things, the Maoists are providing extensive support for imperialism's plans and operations.

In the past, *Lava* observed, Maoist ideology had a considerable influence on the course of the liberation struggle in the countries of Southeast Asia. By their attempts to isolate this region from the communist movement and the socialist community, the Maoists did grave harm to the forces of national liberation. Now the national-liberation movement is making a successful stand against the Maoists'

efforts to impose their hegemony. But the fight against Maoism is not over yet. In point of fact, as was emphasized by *Koutoulas* and *Ashhab*, Maoism remains a serious and dangerous ideological and political opponent of the national-liberation movement, trying, as it does, to oppose this movement to the socialist community on the grounds of détente, which is portrayed as a shady deal between the 'superpowers' at the expense of the national and state interests of the developing countries.

The present link-up between Peking and imperialism against détente and international security, said *B. Lhamsuren*, is based on the expansionist plans and the desire for hegemony that the Maoists have for long harbored in relation to the Asian countries. The reorganization of international relations on the principles of renouncing the use of force to solve international disputes, respect for sovereignty and inviolability of frontiers, and non-interference in internal affairs, does not fall into line with Peking's plans. On the contrary, the Chinese leadership favors a build-up of international tension in the hope that their great-power schemes can be carried out in this situation. Their propaganda of 'hegemony of the superpowers' is merely camouflage for their actual intention of establishing their own domination in Asia. There can be no two opinions about the fact that the Asian peoples' urge to strengthen peace and security on a collective basis can be realized only by offering a firm rebuff to the Maoists' policy.

It was noted in a number of speeches that centrifugal trends inject into the world revolutionary process the ideology of reformism and revisionism. In this connection *Kohen* drew attention to the need of stepping up the struggle against Trotskyism. At present, said *Mosquera*, there is a fashion for anti-communist and anti-Soviet 'theories' that acclaim 'pluralism.' The essence of these 'theories' is that their authors break up the world revolutionary process into national parts, thus writing off the general nature of its laws and making an absolute of the national factor. They reject the leading role of the Marxist party, which in their view, must represent a pluralistic model of multi-factionalism, of 'peaceful coexistence' between mutually exclusive ideological principles, without any 'official party philosophy' (dialectical and historial materialism), and even with a reconciliation with religion.

Commenting further on the causes of the bourgeois ideologists' intensified attack on the communist world outlook, the speaker stressed that in the context of détente the global strategy of imperialism is undergoing a certain reorientation. It now resorts increasingly to the tactics of the Trojan horse, of 'creeping counter-revolution,' in the hope of undermining socialism and the Communist parties 'from within,' by means of 'ideological erosion.'

For the revolution to be victorious there must be an organic merging of scientific socialism with the mass working-class movement. If it becomes a prisoner of bourgeois ideology the working class might for long be deprived of the possibility to use its tremendous revolutionary potential, as the experience of Social Democracy and all reformism has shown. There can be no interaction of the three basic revolutionary currents of today on the platform of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Hopes of the Communist Parties 'retreating' from Marxism-Leninism, *Mel Doig* remarked, have become more active of late. A characteristic statement has been made by one Social-Democratic theoretician, who says that the Communists are distinguished from the Social Democrats by 'only' three things: proletarian internationalism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and democratic centralism. The implication of this statement is that if the Marxist-Leninist parties would 'only' renounce these principles, that would be enough for the Social Democrats to cooperate with them. Because then, supposedly, there would be no disagreements and the Communist Parties would no longer be 'isolated.' Inasmuch as the right-wing Social Democrat leaders are still apparently expecting us to do this, I should like to say that our Party, for example, has no intention of renouncing these fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles.

Rodny Öhman, representative of the Left Party — Communists of Sweden, discussed the splitting role of reformism in the working-class movement. Reformists today, she observed, have produced a new version of 'Swedish socialism.' It has been discussed by the representatives of two million workers who belong to the Central Association of Trade Unions of Sweden. This version maintains that the road to socialism lies in giving the blue-collar and white-collar workers of the country's most profitable enterprises the opportunity to take over the controlling interest in these firms in the course of 25-35 years. The idea is that this will occur as a result of regular contributions from wages and salaries to a special fund. This kind of illusion about the transition to socialism deepens the split in the working-class movement. Such illusions are particularly dangerous because they are spread in the mass organizations of the working people where the Social Democrats organized discussions of their 'radical' proposals that, in fact, demonstrate the obedience of the leadership of the Social Democratic Party and the government to the imperialist bourgeoisie.

With the turn toward détente, several speakers noted, there has been intensified ideological struggle over the problems connected with the defense of the fundamental principles of the interaction of the three currents of the world revolutionary process. There is an increased need to expose the propaganda efforts of the bourgeoisie, the

reformists, the rightist and leftist opportunists, and all opponents of unity. Marxist-Leninist theory has growing significance as a factor in raising the level of solidarity of all the revolutionary forces.

The vital core of interaction

The question of proletarian internationalism figured prominently in the discussion. Has its content changed in present-day conditions? What are its criteria and demands? How is proletarian internationalism related to the international solidarity of the broad popular forces taking part in the anti-imperialist movement, to the solidarity of those opposed to war? How can the responsibility of Communists for the fate of the revolutionary movement in their own countries be combined with their internationalist duty? These were some of the problems posed by the participants in the conference.

The favorite line in the macro-sociological and geopolitical schemes advocated by bourgeois reformists and 'left' opportunists, said *Timofeyev,* is 'criticism' of the Marxist-Leninist conception of the interaction of the fundamental currents of the world revolutionary process. An artificial antithesis is created between general-democratic and class-proletarian elements, between the international and national elements in proletarian internationalism. The basic aim of this 'criticism' is to drain the international solidarity of the working people of its class essence, to belittle the leading role of the international working class, its main achievement and creation — world socialism. Various doctrines of 'supra-class internationalism' have appeared.

The role of the international political aspects of the class struggle is enhanced in the context of détente. All the main protagonists in the world class conflict are striving to consolidate their own and allied social forces on an international basis so as to exert a stronger influence on the development of world events on the basis of their political orientation. The course of the international class struggle largely depends on whose socio-political and ideological influence gains the upper hand.

One cannot underestimate the drive for international union on the part of the forces of imperialist reaction. Stimulated by the mounting crisis of capitalism, this drive is expressed in the imperialists' launching of international anti-communism campaigns, in measures to intensify imperialist integration, in attempts by the industrially developed capitalist countries to build a common front for coordinated action against the anti-imperialist policy of the countries who have won their freedom. Specifically, there have been increased efforts to find a common platform for assisting organized opposition to the policy of the developing countries on questions of international economic relations, efforts to discover an 'institutional structure' for the relation-

ships between the industrial West and the developing countries.

The attraction of ever wider masses into the anti-imperialist struggle gives a fresh boost to the development of proletarian internationalism and the solidarity of all progressive forces and opens up new opportunities for enlarging the international role of the working class. Presenting at its 25th Congress the Program for Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples, and working consistently for its realization, the CPSU attaches great importance to strengthening the international solidarity of the working people. In no way does proletarian internationalism 'isolate' Communists from other peace-loving and progressive forces; on the contrary, it tends to unite them.

The present century has seen an enrichment of the content of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the international unity of working people; moreover its revolutionary class essence, expressed in the slogan 'Workers of All Countries, Unite!,' has been retained. The formation of the socialist world system has called into being a historically new form of international solidarity — socialist internationalism, which implies not only the unity of the working class and its parties, but also the all-round solidarity of the peoples, and governments of the socialist countries. Socialist solidarity is inseparable from proletarian internationalism as a whole; it is one of its organic parts, its continuation and development.

The development of cooperation between the basic currents of the revolutionary movement has deepened the previous forms of international solidarity of the working people and given rise to new ones. The Marxist-Leninist conception of internationalism now includes the idea of unity of action of the revolutionary movements with the democratic forces in the capitalist countries.

The postwar internationalization of capital, said *Pittman,* has further developed the objective and subjective bases of proletarian internationalism. Conditions of the working class of the different capitalist countries, and the conditions of working class emancipation and their aims and goals in these countries have grown considerably similar in substance.

Today the cohesion of all currents and forces of the world liberation movement is dictated by the still formidable resources and continuing maneuvers of imperialism to change the balance of world forces and regain its position of dominance. United States' imperialism is still the source of the main danger of a new world war, the main bastion of counter-revolution, the main instigator of the reactionary forces of neo-fascism and racism, nationalism and opportunism, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. The CPUSA considers it mandatory to contend against these manifestations of U.S. imperialist strategy,

and to uphold and strive to realize the international solidarity of all the forces striving for peace, democracy and socialism.

It is the steady growth and consolidation of the economic, political and social might of socialism and the aid it renders the international working-class movement and national-liberation movement that do most to establish and maintain the favorable balance of world forces. It is the ever-growing economic dynamism of existing real socialism, in the new conditions of intensified monopoly competition in the capitalist world, that is impelling the dominant sections of U.S. monopoly capital, independently of their will and in most cases against it, to strengthen the foundation of détente by broadening economic, cultural and scientific cooperation with existing socialism. Thus the influence exerted by world socialism — this main current of the world revolutionary process — weakens the domestic as well as the international positions of U.S. imperialism and strengthens the anti-monopoly, anti-militarist and anti-imperialist tendencies that are materializing in the anti-monopoly coalition.

The solidarity actions and the examples set by other contingents of the movement are strengthening the progressive sentiments among U.S. working people. Increasing numbers of U.S. workers are studying the role of trade unions in the socialist countries and are drawing conclusions from the strategy and tactics of the workers of Portugal, Greece, France, Italy, Britain and Canada. As for the influence of the movement for national liberation and national independence, it would be difficult to overestimate its effect in weakening U.S. imperialist positions, and in accelerating the development of the progressive alignment of forces in our country. But the greatest impetus to anti-militarist and anti-imperialist tendencies in the USA was given by the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Their defeat of U.S. imperialist aggression was a catalyst for this revolutionary current on a global scale.

The Italian Communists, said *Gensini,* stress the importance of unity among the broadest political and social forces in Europe, following the line adopted by the 1974 Brussels Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of the West European capitalist countries. But, of course, the problem of building alliances and unity between different social, political and cultural forces presents itself today on a broader scale and gives rise to new problems, including those implied in the concept of internationalism itself. Comrade Enrico Berlinguer in his speech at the 25th Congress of the CPSU said: 'in present-day conditions the ideas and possibilities of internationalism are viable and effective as never before.' But viable and effective in what sense? We believe that it is viable as the solidarity action of the Communist Parties, of political and democratic forces, of large masses of men,

women and young people with the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence.

The international aspect of solidarity is very important, but it is insufficient. In the crisis situation of the capitalist world many socio-political forces have adopted different positions in relation to the communist movement and the Communist Parties from what they did before. The unitary processes between Communists and Socialists in some European countries are of major significance. In the specific conditions of Italy these processes lead to cooperation and alliance with the Catholic, Social-Democratic and Republican forces, and even with the Demochristians, in the struggle against fascism. The great tasks to be accomplished in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism in every country of Europe and the world must not be regarded as a field of activity for only one political and ideological movement or class.

There is yet another aspect of internationalism — the specific, independent contribution that can and should be made by each Party to the general struggle, to the international cause, bearing in mind the characteristic features of each country. This, in our view, is the basic element of the present period. The contribution to the general struggle and also to the development of our theory can become more effective the more the relations between the Communist Parties are developed in a spirit of friendship and solidarity, in the course of the open comparison of differing experience.

Are proletarian internationalism and democratic internationalism the same thing, asked *Sierra*. In my opinion, he said, it is a departure from class positions to dissolve the first in the second, just as the dissolving of a Marxist-Leninst party in an alliance of revolutionary progressive forces is such a departure.

I did not speak of proletarian internationalism or democratic internationalism, *Gensini* replied, because I do not accept either formulation. I was talking simply about internationalism, the new internationalism. Today, considering the great diversity of situations, a diversity that did not exist before, we have accepted on the basis of Togliatti's analysis the formulation of unity founded on diversity. Today the unity of the Communist Parties can develop if their different characteristic features are taken into consideration.

In my view, the unity of the Communist Parties should be broader, taking into account the new forces entering the struggle against imperialism, fascism, the struggle to build a new society, and also taking into account the scale of the national-liberation movement. This poses the objective of solidarity with embattled peoples and also the problem of bringing together and comparing standpoints, of achieving concord with the many forces of the socialist, social-democratic and

Christian type, including the Catholics, who can unite and form an alliance in the course of the struggle. Italian experience in this respect is of exceptional importance. It is rich with demonstrations of solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Indochina and the people of Angola. This is not a question of departure from Marxism-Leninism but of its development and making an original contribution to it.

I would like to draw attention, *Timofeyev* remarked, to some of Gramsci's observations on the methodological approach to proletarian internationalism and how it should be understood. In his article on 'Internationalism and National Policy' Gramsci stresses the following idea. The class with an international character, that is, the working class, leads the social strata with a narrow national character (the intellectuals, for example), and often those with an even more restricted character, the particularist, municipalist strata (the peasants). In Gramsci's view, the international, that is, the working class, should lead the national forces and develop them in accordance with the international prospects and the demands of international development. Referring to the activity of the Bolshevik Party between 1902 and 1917, Gramsci emphasized that one of its characteristic features was the purification of internationalism of all vague elements so as to give it real political substance.

In the legacy of the outstanding figures in the communist movement, including that of Gramsci, one can find many important methodological ideas. Of course, every Party must itself decide how to use this or that element of a legacy today in its conception of internationalism, but Marxist thought is international.

As historical experience shows, said *Ellen Weber*, proletarian internationalism is the most effective weapon in the struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie. Big capital dreams of splitting the Communist and Workers' Parties, of splitting our movement. We, the members of the German Communist Party, are striving for unity. The lessons of the international working-class movement tell us that our opponent — the imperialists organized on an international scale — can be defeated if we oppose them with a united front. In its ideological and practical activity our Party constantly tries to show the tremendous potential that is latent in proletarian internationalism and pays much attention to strengthening mutal cooperation.

Our experience has shown, said *Koutoulas*, that the main, leading force in the anti-imperialist struggle is the working class, which can under the leadership of the Party unite all forces. This is also true on the global scale, where an important precondition for rallying all the revolutionary forces is solidarity and mutual assistance of the Communist Parties on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

The solidarity of all the social movements and forces fighting for

democracy, peace, and progress, for deep-going social changes, said *Panzaru*, depends increasingly on how the inter-relationship between the national and the international is realized in practice. In their efforts to stop the revolutionary process in which the social, the class struggle interlocks with the national struggle, the monopolist circles have produced the thesis that the nation and national independence are obsolete social categories and try to persuade the peoples to abandon their sovereignty or at least to concede a considerable part of it, to place their fate and future in the hands of supranational organizations, which are nothing but a new form of the policy of domination and oppression.

The steady progress in developing the new type of international relations differing radically from the relations that existed for a long time in societies based on exploitation is not a particular or passing desire of this or that state but an imperative of today. The working class, having become the leading class of society, is duty bound to defend its country's freedom and the people's independence and sovereignty. It must do everything for the progress and well-being of the nation and assure the establishment of a new social order according to the country's historical conditions and the people's will. All this is essential if the working class is to fully carry out its international tasks and duties.

Our epoch, said *Zücker-Schilling*, is characterized by a high degree of internationalization of national sources of social conflict. As soon as working-class action becomes strong it is directly or indirectly threatened by imperialist interference. This threat can be averted only by the closest possible unity of the nation's progressive forces and organized international cooperation of the anti-imperialist forces.

This internationalism is more than a safeguard against interference in the domestic affairs of a nation. It guarantees the autonomy of a progressive national movement and its achievement of national interests and goals. Every departure from proletarian internationalism weakens the national movement.

Our Party, said *Pretel*, stands for consistent application of the principles of peaceful coexistence which Lenin worked out in carrying forward the theory of the possibility of the revolution winning in one country. Favorable changes have helped to create a new situation showing a marked leftward trend, and we cannot speak of them without stressing the role of socialism and the Soviet Union. This makes for new gains in the revolutionary struggle for freedom and growing democracy in Spain and other West European countries.

National problems have assumed new dimensions. Attempts to solve the totality of a country's problems do not necessarily mean adopting a 'nationalist position.' Indeed, they imply that the Com-

munist Party can face the people as a genuinely national force equal to reacting to every social problem and advancing constructive and specific programs and alternatives. The Communist Party of Spain has maintained that if it confined itself merely to defending the foreign policy of the socialist countries and the Soviet Union, regarding this as its fundamental task, it would now be no more than a small group of propagandists capable only of making high-sounding statements and manifestos, but with no real strength. It would have been unable to promote a broad mass movement of the most diverse forces ranging from Communists to Christian Democrats.

The CPS has always thought highly of the outstanding achievements of socialism since the Great October Revolution of 1917. There are 14 socialist states in the world today. We consider that as long as unity among all the Parties of the socialist countries is lacking, there will be serious difficulties in strengthening the interaction of the three main revolutionary forces and in forming a world anti-imperialist front. As for problems of internationalism and international solidarity, most of them will persist and will, moreover, be serious.

If the three revolutionary streams are to interact more effectively, it is of fundamental importance for them to give up the old content of proletarian internationalism, defined when there was only one socialist country in the world. Now as never before, the content of proletarian internationalism consists in accomplishing the revolution in every country.

In Spanish conditions, a new, socialist regime will not be merely a regime of the traditional working class. It may be something broader and richer, and that will not distort its socialist essence. In fact, it will find more precise expression and will be even stronger. We must not use old yardsticks and must adapt our thinking to present and future requirements. We should, for example, take account of the negative implications of the term 'dictatorship' in a country ruled for 40 years by a fascist dictatorship. We agree with Santiago Carrillo, who said 'No dictatorship,' not even the dictatorship of the proletariat. The CPS follows the dialectical materialist axiom that practice is always much richer than any theory. Every theoretical discussion isolated from practice leads directly to scholasticism, which, like revisionism and reformism, is an evil not to be ignored.

Pretel's statements gave rise to a number of remarks and questions. First of all, participants called attention to his words about the tasks of the Party and the foreign policy of socialist countries. *Ashhab* asked whether there really exists a contradiction between the development of the class struggle in a country and solidarity with the foreign policy of socialist countries, whether a Party can do one thing without simultaneously doing the other. From what the speaker said,

limiting a Party's task to defense of the foreign policy of the socialist countries and the Soviet Union could reduce it to a small isolated group. That is what prompted my question. Must a party really criticize the foreign policy of socialism to become a mass party, asked *Garro*. Many Communist Parties wield considerable influence in their countries while consistently supporting Soviet foreign policy and the Peace Program.

Another group of questions concerned evaluation of the policy of the Maoist leadership, which many speakers had dealt with before. Noting that the Parties of the 14 socialist countries mentioned by the speaker evidently include the Communist Party of China, *Barna Talas*, Deputy Director of the Hungarian Institute of International Relations, and *Ashhab* asked on what ideological and political basis unity with the CPC leadership was possible since it adheres to a Maoist platform, backs imperialist, fascist and reactionary forces in many countries, including Spain. We have never been beguiled, nor will we ever be, said *Mel Doig*, by suggestions for unity with those who bitterly oppose the Peace Program, whose implementation has in cold fact saved mankind from a nuclear holocaust. Maosim has shown itself to be a dangerous anti-communist, anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist force, an ally of world reaction. Its complete degradation should serve as a serious lesson.

A third group of questions bore on the theoretical conception of the essence of the state. *Rudolf Wettengel*, Editorial Board member representing the SUPG, asked the speaker to specify, in connection with the issue of the dictatorship of the proletariat whether the working class and its allies would have to resort to revolutionary violence in order to deal with the reactionary and still fascist state apparatus of Spain. *Sierra* said he would not like to interfere with the search for new forms and names that the leading role and the power of the working class could assume depending on circumstances. He asked how denying all dictatorship, the dictatorship of the proletariat included, could be reconciled with the fact that every state composed of antagonistic classes is, in effect, a dictatorship of a definite class.

I didn't say a word about the Communist Party of China, *Pretel* replied. Condemnation is a wrong method in the international communist movement. How can we accept it if we adhere to the principles of equality, mutual respect, sovereignty and independence? In regard to China's establishing diplomatic relations with fascist Spain, the CPS has already openly stated its opinion. But we don't think criticism and condemnation are one and the same thing. As for the alleged contradiction between Soviet foreign policy and the class struggle in the international arena and in each country, I said nothing about that, either.

Of course, *Ashhab* said in that connection, our Spanish comrade has a right not to answer the question.

It goes without saying, *Pretel* continued, that the state apparatus must be transformed. This is elementary to every Communist. As for the more or less forcible forms to be used, a political revolution is a forcible revolution and abolishing a regime even by democratic means implies the use of force. What the results will be — whether or not they will be socialist — does not depend on how much violence is used. The Spanish people were the first to take up arms against fascism, nor have they in any way given up the finest traditions of their revolutionary struggle.

Do we depart from the Marxist-Leninist view that in an antagonistic society every state is a class dictatorship? No, and our documents show that we don't. On the basis of class analysis, we point to the distinctive features of the state under the Spanish fascist regime today and frame our policy accordingly.

Lastly, I would like to clarify that passage in my contribution concerning proletarian internationalism. To begin with, eliminating fascism in Spain, which poses a threat to European security and — let me stress it — to security elsewhere, would be an internationalist contribution to détente, an act of solidarity. To unfold this struggle, the CPS calls for the unity of all forces. Secondly, to promote the revolution in other countries, we must use today's new opportunities to ensure, first of all, that the revolutionary struggle advances along with the masses. We do not regard the democratic revolutionary struggle for social progress in our country as something unrelated to the need to strengthen socialism, one of the fundamental, decisive revolutionary forces of today. The objective criterion, which is very important in estimating the activity of a Party, is suggested by the actual progress of the revolutionary struggle for democracy and socialism.

Proletarian internationalism, *Siqueira* said, remains the foundation of the communist movement. It is in line with our class, scientific criteria, which cannot change on crossing into this or that country. As we know, petty-bourgeois internationalism implies a purely formal national equality, whereas proletarian internationalism combines the interests of each revolutionary contingent with those of the entire movement. This combination, or when necessary, this subordination of the particular to the general, creates complicated and delicate problems of political relations. But they cannot be avoided, because it is proletarian internationalism that constitutes the primary distinction between the communist movement and other revolutionary, national-liberation and social movements.

The Portuguese Communist Party has always adhered to proletarian internationalism. This also applies to our attitude toward the socialist countries, toward the Soviet Union, which has been making tremendous contributions to our common cause throughout the history of the working-class movement. It may well be that our internationalist position will cost us some votes, but we distinguish between political strength and 'electoral' strength, which is gauged by the number of votes cast. Loyalty to proletarian internationalism is a source of our Party's political strength. Our principled stand enables us to carry on agitation among the masses all the more fruitfully and to bring them into the fight for democratic change paving the way for socialism.

Sometimes, said *Mosquera*, the internationalism proclaimed by Marx, Engels and Lenin is declared obsolete on the grounds that historical conditions have changed. Actually, however, these changed historical conditions demand not the renunciation but the strengthening of internationalism. To renounce it on any pretext would mean depriving the Communist Parties and the working-class movement of a powerful and well-tried weapon.

International reaction, said *Matous*, tries to smuggle national particularism into the communist movement and to weaken proletarian internationalism. There is nothing fundamentally new in that, for nationalism has always been the ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie, which uses it to mislead the working people and undermine the labor movement. With the rise of the socialist world system, the revisionists advanced the theory of 'national communism.' In Czechoslovakia the rightists in the late 60s advocated a nationalist conception of a specifically 'Czechoslovakia model' of socialism, which was essentially a program for the restoration of economic, political and ideological elements of capitalism.

After the October Revolution of 1917, said *Kohen*, the revolutionary and national-liberation movement can develop irreversibly only if it links its actions and perspectives with existing socialism. By the same token, minimizing the importance of existing socialism in any way is detrimental to the revolutionary process. The most significant contribution of existing socialism to our struggle for social and national emancipation is its growing strength, economic, social and cultural progress, the steady improvement of the people's living and cultural standards, for consolidation of socialist democracy. The force of example increasingly attracts the masses. Peaceful forms of the historic confrontation are being established on a world scale.

The Soviet Union and the socialist system are a dependable basis for the mutual solidarity of revolutionary forces. This is why the Communists of Argentina consider that the attitude to the Soviet

Union remains the touchstone of proletarian internationalism and a criterion of consistent anti-imperialist democracy. Of course, the principles of proletarian internationalism have a deeper and more definite class content than international democratic solidarity, and putting them into practice strengthens democratic, patriotic and anti-imperialist positions. The conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean stressed that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are a tower of strength for the Latin American peoples in their difficult struggles for complete liberation.

Proletarian internationalism, harmoniously blended with sincere patriotism, provides the greatest opportunities for success in revolutionary struggle. The democratic and anti-imperialist tasks in Latin America are inseparable from defense of the first socialist country in the Western Hemisphere, from extending the solidarity we show Cuba to the socialist community as a whole.

The general laws of the socialist revolution, *Berecz* said, now find more varied national manifestations. This, however, does not nullify the general laws: socialist revolution can win given leadership by a Marxist-Leninist party, working-class led alliance with other working people, and working people's rule which hitherto has discharged the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in one form or another, extending democracy to the whole people.

A basic law of transition to and building socialism, *Groen* said, is the unity of the struggle of the working class in its own country and existing socialism. Isolation of a working class fighting for power from the international working class and the socialist countries opens the way for imperialist subversion and sabotage.

The fight against monopoly capitalism, imperialist aggression and domination, *Poll* said, cannot be consummated in any part of the world without the closest cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. African countries have in the socialist world a reliable friend and a new source of credits, loans, machinery, manufactured goods and technical aid. This is most evident with regard to the socialist-oriented countries of Africa which are grappling with the most difficult and complex problems arising from the struggle for economic independence. Close links with socialist countries enable the revolutionary democratic states in Africa to abolish the unequal political and economic relations and give a tremendous boost to the struggle against imperialism, capitalism and neo-colonialism.

The accumulated experience and knowledge of the countries that have already built socialist society is indispensable for Communists fighting for the socialist transformation of their countries. To be sure, the forms of socialism are bound to vary from country to country. But no party or country can ignore the tried and tested general laws of

history. There can be no such thing as a socialist society based on anti-Sovietism, whether open or veiled.

Success in struggle, *Sudiman* said, depends largely on how the internal factor links up with international solidarity. Détente makes for broader and more effective interaction of these factors in the interest of victory. The experience of Indochina and Angola shows that the chances of victory are multiplied when the national struggle is complemented by support from the socialist system, national-liberation movements and the international communist and working-class movement. Conversely, reaction can gain the upper hand, as we know from the bitter experience of Indonesia in 1965, if the revolutionary forces due to the attitude of their leadership are isolated from the three revolutionary streams.

No country, *Padilla* said, is exempt from the dialectic of the contemporary revolutionary process. It is unthinkable that new socialist countries could emerge and develop without support from existing socialism. In this respect, Cuba is a national expression of world socialism on American soil.

World socialism and the international Communist and working-class movement stand out as the only exponents of proletarian internationalism today. Our closer links with other democratic and anti-imperialist forces, such as the middle strata of town and country, the armed forces and the Catholic Church, do not imply that proletarian internationalism is replaced by something else. Its nature has not changed. Now as before, it is the fundamental principle of the ideological, moral and political unity of the international communist and working-class movement.

The concept of proletarian internationalism has become wider and more varied. Lenin emphasized this when the Comintern expanded the *Communist Manifesto* slogan 'Workers of all countries, unite!' proclaimed by Marx and Engels to 'Workers of all countries and all oppressed peoples, unite!' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 453).

The unquestionable fact of the extension and diversification of the world revolutionary movement does not mean that proletarian internationalism has become a narrower and, indeed, inadequate concept. Proletarian internationalism cannot be dissolved in an amorphous idea lacking an explicit class, revolutionary content. The international working class and its political vanguard, the international communist movement, has not dissolved, will never dissolve, in a social-democratic type of movement lacking revolutionary energy and conviction.

Tadeusz Wrebiak, the PUWP representative on the journal, asked whether the proletarian internationalism of today carries forward the

proletarian internationalism of the past or has a different content running counter to its earlier content.

Proletarian internationalism today, *Padilla* replied, is a principle uniting both the working class of the capitalist countries, as in the past, and the working class in power in socialist countries. Thus there is the same continuity between the proletarian internationalism of the past and the present as between the working class which had no power and the working class in power in one part of the world, and fighting for power in the other.

The fact that non-proletarian strata have drawn nearer the working class and incline toward socialism has not deprived internationalism of its proletarian character, of its proletarian class political and ideological content.

The alliance between the working class and democratic progressive strata at international and national level is based on broader principles. But it is not this that constitutes the basis of the ideological, political and moral unity of the international communist movement. Proletarian internationalism is no obstacle to the policy of alliances. Indeed, it is the vital core of this policy, as present-day revolutionary processes show.

It is only natural, *Nagy* said, that as the world revolutionary movement develops, proletarian internationalism gains, and not loses, in content. However, it would be wrong to counterpose its present content to that it had in the past. Undoubtedly, proletarian internationalism orients the movement toward accomplishing the revolution in the given country. But along with this, it orientates the movement toward doing everything for the victory of the revolution in other countries as well — of a revolution of the same kind as we are fighting for in our own country — and doing nothing that could prevent victory. Hence the Communists' twofold responsibility to their own working class and people, on the one hand, and to the international communist and working-class movement, on the other. These two aspects should not be treated as opposites.

It would be correct to say that proletarian internationalism today means mutual aid, solidarity, cooperation and coordinated action of the revolutionary forces against the common enemy, imperialism, and unites the three tributaries of the world revolutionary stream. However, one cannot today understand the essence of proletarian internationalism without defining one's attitude toward the Soviet Union. We are certain there is no such thing as anti-Soviet internationalism, nor can there be. Proletarian internationalism is impossible without unity with the Soviet Union, without cooperation and solidarity with it.

Many participants pointed out that continued research into the

place and role of proletarian internationalism in the contemporary world revolutionary process is an important task of Marxist-Leninists of all countries.

K.I. Zarodov, Editor-in-Chief of *WMR*, spoke at the close of the discussion.

An imperative of our time

This conference, *Zarodov* said, has brought together Communists, Marxist scholars, full-fledged and active representatives of all three streams of the world revolutionary process. They contributed to the exchange of views their political experience and their intimate knowledge of the realities of our common struggle under different social systems and in different national situations.

The views stated here did not all coincide, in some cases the divergencies were considerable. But I would say there was unanimity on the main point. Détente is a reality having deep roots, and furthering it is a most important task of the revolutionary forces. It can be fulfilled only if the role and unity of all parts of the world revolutionary movement are increased.

It is not customary to sum up results at conferences of this nature. Besides, that would hardly be possible in view of the vastness of the subject. And then, many comrades raised questions going far beyond the problems suggested for discussion. Allow me, therefore, to make a few remarks suggested by our three days' work and bearing directly on the conference theme.

I realize beforehand that some comrades may disagree with me on one point or another, just as I could not accept some of the judgments and conclusions of other comrades. I ask you, therefore, to bear in mind that I lay no claim to evaluating either individual contributions or the discussion as a whole.

First of all, allow me to draw your attention to a group of problems concerning the interconnection of détente and revolutionary change.

Our ideological opponents try time and again to represent détente and actions aimed at the revolutionary transformation of the world as two different and, moreover, opposed and hence incompatible policies. Nor is that a mere ideological exercise on the part of bourgeois propagandists, as participants in the discussion pointed out. It is a formula which imperialism follows in its political practice.

In fact, didn't imperialist propaganda serve an ultimatum on the socialist countries after Helsinki? Didn't it urge them either to abandon their revolutionary gains and positions, or to stop hoping for progress in détente? And didn't it make the maintenance of détente conditional on abandoning the liberation fight of Angola's patriots and

on the socialist countries discontinuing their internationalist support for it?

We know how socialism replied: no departure from fundamental ideological positions, no retreat from positions won through social and national progress, and further vigorous efforts to consolidate and extend détente. That is what happened in practice. As for the theoretical aspect of the matter, we must say that that is the most correct and effective solution, for the connection between the trend toward peace and the gains of the revolutionary movement is inherent and indissoluble.

We are all agreed that détente is a fruit of intense struggle by all forces of the world revolutionary process, a fruit of years of hard work by the socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union, by the international working class and the peoples of the world. That is beyond question. But perhaps we should emphasize that the present turn in world politics is a most important advance toward the revolutionary transformation of the global system of international relations. It is a development that is central and not incidental to the world revolutionary process. And while it is right to say that détente was made possible by the alliance and interaction of the three revolutionary forces, it is equally true that détente makes possible further common gains for these forces, as well as new victories for each of them.

Bourgeois ideologists have lately been saying that there are signs of a certain 'coordinated division of labor' in the world revolutionary process. They allege that while the socialist countries follow détente, the working class of capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement are free to pursue their goals in disregard of the international situation. I need hardly say that this is a gross distortion of reality. There has never been such a 'distribution of duties' between revolutionary forces, nor can there ever be. The Communist Parties of capitalist countries and the national-liberation zone constantly point out that détente is part and parcel of their revolutionary effort. In turn, the fraternal parties of socialist countries strictly adhere to class principles in their foreign policy, which means that they fight for peace not from positions of pacifism or conciliation, but with due regard to the inevitability of revolutionary changes in the world, being always prepared to help in practice those who are fighting for these changes.

Many comrades demonstrated in the course of the discussion that détente does not alter the fundamental contradictions of our time.

What, then, are the new elements that détente adds to the world-wide struggle? One, I believe, is the changing relationship between the forms of struggle. It may be argued that form is secondary and

content is primary. That is often so. But let us examine this particular case.

The turn in international relations provides conditions preventing the fundamental contradiction of our time from taking the form of an explosive military and political confrontation. This is an immense gain for which great credit is due to the revolutionary forces, for the problem of war and peace is not merely one of choosing forms of struggle. Today it is a problem of the very existence of mankind. To approach the issue in any other way by searching for 'alternatives' to détente (as its opponents do in the United States, West Germany and other imperialist countries) means lying to the peoples and spreading illusions, which is unpardonable in view of the present level of military technology.

It follows that in this case, the very change of form of the world-wide class contest has far-reaching implications.

Furthermore, since the fundamental contradictions persist, they must find an outlet. And they do find it in political, economic and ideological struggles.

Take, for example, the economic sphere. I would repeat what I said on another occasion: elements of cooperation between countries with different social systems are developing. But it is cooperation between countries, between states, not between socialism and capitalism as mutually opposed systems.

To be sure, every state is both a representative and embodiment of a definite social system. In international practice relations between the two systems manifest themselves primarily as relations between states. But it often happens that what is inseparable in reality must be explicitly set apart in theory. In this instance, it is particularly important to realize that no agreements between states can either remove or change the nature of the fundamental class antagonism dividing socialism and capitalism. But the policy of states has an important bearing on the development trend of this fundamental contradiction of our time. To confuse concepts and argue that 'cooperation between the systems' is possible since states representing them are cooperating, would lead us away from fully grasping the revolutionary dialectic of Lenin's conception of peaceful coexistence. For Lenin saw peaceful coexistence of socialism and capitalism as but a form of class struggle between them.

Or take politics. The fact that a constructive dialogue is under way between countries with different social systems is a big and important advance. But mutually acceptable solutions are very hard to arrive at, as we all know. Nor could it be otherwise, for the struggle between socialism and capitalism is bound to extend to the conference table as well. Incidentally, many bourgeois politicians and ideologists realize

that in spite of détente the political and ideological conflict between the two systems persists, and entertain no illusions on that score.

I think it is fair to say that the very policy of détente does not exist as something universal, something common to countries with different social systems. There are two policies based on détente — socialist and bourgeois — and both have their class aims. The Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community, striving to promote détente, emphasize the need to achieve progress toward disarmament, toward reducing the armed forces confronting each other, that is, to complement political with military détente. The imperialist countries, however, insist that the destiny of political détente hinges on whether or not it will be complemented by ideological détente.

The class roots of these differences are evident. On the one hand, they lie in the intrinsic strength of the rising social system, socialism, in its thoroughly humanist nature. It is a system which does not need war to win the historical contest with capitalism. By contrast, the rulers of the doomed bourgeois society dread a world without arms, the prospect of being left without armed forces, which imperialist strategists still count on as a means of saving capitalism.

On the other hand, the bourgeoisie's demand for 'ideological détente' is both absurd and perfidious. It is absurd because no international agreement can end the ideological struggle, any more than it can remove class antagonisms. And it is perfidious because, by calling for 'ideological détente,' the bourgeoisie wants a free hand in socialist countries, the 'right' to carry out unhampered its long-standing plans of 'softening' socialism and disarming it ideologically and politically. With our class enemies, 'ideological détente' implies division of the international communist and working-class movement, of the alliance between socialism and the national-liberation forces.

Speakers here stressed the importance of the ideological struggle in the setting of détente. Allow me to add a few remarks about whether or not this struggle is intensifying now that the cold war is a thing of the past. I think that with military tensions lessening, every peaceful form of the worldwide class contest, political, economic and ideological, is gaining objectively in importance. Secondly, the conflict of ideas now goes much deeper. Simplistic formulas and arguments appealing to people's emotions rather than on their thinking are suitable in a 'psychological war.' But a more peaceful international atmosphere naturally necessitates a much larger ideological arsenal.

You will probably agree that we have all borne this in mind throughout the three days of our discussions. I feel confident that these discussions will help to sharpen our ideological weapon and will

contribute to the common cause of the worldwide ideological offensive of socialism, of the Communists.

Another group of problems I would like to touch on relates to the objective and subjective factors making for the unity of the three revolutionary streams.

Underlying this unity is the inherent community of interests of world socialism, the fighting working class and the national-liberation movement. This makes unity objectively necessary. But every social necessity manifests itself all the more effectively, the more deeply it is realized and the more fully it is reflected in political practice. This is why theoretical work by Marxist-Leninists in this field is so important. It explains why international, fraternal cooperation between the Communist Parties operating within all three revolutionary streams is so indispensable.

Having assumed global dimensions, the revolutionary process must, of course, reflect the immense diversity of conditions and forms of struggle that develop in various countries and regions of the world. Hence the variety of aspects that make it necessary to see both the similarity of the tasks of each of the three streams and differences within them. Thus, while the socialist countries show a common trend toward drawing closer together, they cannot be said to have attained the same development level. Some of their ruling parties at times take divergent stands on certain issues. Nor is the working class of the capitalist countries homogeneous. Its national contingents are at different levels of class consciousness, political maturity and organization. As the social content of national-liberation revolutions in the 'third world' deepens, we witness significant social and political differentiations, as was rightly pointed out here.

Undoubtedly, these are all objective realities to which we cannot shut our eyes. But does it follow that powerful revolutionary streams are about to overflow the banks and break up into shallow rivulets? It would be a sorry theoretician who drew such a conclusion, for he would be overlooking another, more important aspect of contemporary reality. For the main thing in the socialist world is the prevalent public form of ownership determining its unity, the cohesion of the fraternal Parties on the ideological and political principles of Marxism-Leninism. In the position of the working class of bourgeois countries the main thing is its common desire to end capitalist exploitation. For the countries and peoples of the national-liberation zone, the main thing today is their resolve to consolidate their sovereignty and achieve economic independence.

To see these fundamental principles of unity and translate them into slogans and political activity adding to the strength of each revolutionary stream is what Communists, Marxist-Leninists, con-

sider to be their task, and I believe this conference has said as much.

At this point, I must stress the importance of combating imperialist policy and propaganda designed to undermine the unity and co-operation of the revolutionary forces, first of all the importance of combating anti-Sovietism.

Bourgeois ideologists are at pains to instill the false idea that the working class, on winning power, abandons its class interests in favor of state, 'great power' interests, and that, consequently, the basis for its fraternal unity with the working people of capitalist countries is eroded. This concept invites a variety of logical inferences. One of them is that the revolutionary movement in the capitalist world can be made more 'effective' by 'moving it away,' 'dissociating' it, from existing socialism. Hence the appeal to criticize countries of the socialist community and join in ideological attacks on the Soviet Union. To those who rightly regard this kind of recipe as a gross violation of the standards of proletarian internationalism, the bourgeoisie offers the reassuring argument that they have no reason to worry about the Soviet Union because it is no longer alone as in bygone days, that it is unafraid of criticism, that criticism can do it no harm.

Certainly, comrades, neither the Soviet Union nor other countries of the socialist community are afraid of criticism. But really, that is not what bourgeois politicians and ideologists are concerned with. After all, they know full well that the revolutionary gains of the peoples of socialist countries are irreversible. They also admit that socialism cannot be crushed from without, by force of arms. And this explains a significant new ploy in anti-Sovietism. The main purpose of anti-Sovietism is to cause damage to the revolutionary working class, the general democratic movement in capitalist countries and the national-liberation forces. Its primary aim is to weaken the Communist Parties, whose influence in capitalist countries has grown considerably. Indeed, the number of Communists in the non-socialist part of the world has increased by almost one million in the past five years, 40 million people vote Communist, and Communists are in the forefront of all class struggles. This is why international class solidarity of the working class and its vanguard with the Soviet Union and the community of socialist countries is a requisite of further advances of the revolutionary forces, first of all in the non-socialist part of the globe. Of course, the socialist community, too, is interested in the strength of this international solidarity, for unity and cooperation with all left-wing, democratic, progressive forces naturally reinforce its international standing and make its foreign policy more effective.

Another point worth making is that our movement has never regarded political or class alliances as an end in itself. To the Com-

munists, common platforms and united action are a means of accomplishing definite revolutionary tasks. This is also true in the present case. The brother parties see to it that our common interest in expanding and strengthening the world front of anti-imperialist forces should never degenerate into ideological or political flabbiness.

In this connection, I must point to a problem created by the policy of China's Maoist leaders. There is no question that that policy seriously prejudices the unity of the world revolutionary forces. But when it is suggested that the situation can be set right by coming to terms with the Maoists we have reason to ask: Coming to terms on what? Would it be on backing the Pinochet clique? Or on torpedoing the Helsinki agreements? Or on world war propaganda? Yet this is the ideological and political merchandise Maoism offers all over the world. No, comrades, experience has shown that today it is only Peking itself that can remove the roadblocks hindering agreement and the restoration of unity. It is up to the Chinese side. The CPSU said at its 25th Congress that while refusing on principle to compromise with the reactionary chauvinist and anti-socialist position of Maoism, it is willing to respond should the Communist Party of China return to a policy based on Marxism-Leninism, on cooperation and solidarity with the socialist world.

A third problem I wish to comment on concerns the nature and content of proletarian internationalism.

We all know that the unity of revolutionary forces has been building up over a century and a half. It was initiated by the proletarian movement, by the working class responding to the call of Marx and Engels for international unity.

The composition of the world revolutionary movement has expanded to an unprecedented degree and undergone profound qualitative changes. First among them is the rise of the socialist world system, a solid community of contingents of the working class in power. The working class of capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement make common cause with the socialist countries. New political currents are joining the mainstream of world progress.

In the fact that increasingly broad strata of world society are joining the revolutionary forces we Communists see confirmation of the correctness of our internationalist policy and a portent of further gains in the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom and socialism.

However, it would be very wrong to conclude that the class lines in the world revolutionary process are being blurred by its unprecedented growth. Is it not true that this worldwide unification of advanced social forces is taking place around a definite guiding force? Is it not true that this immense anti-imperialist front includes a social

and political force that is gaining a leading role because of the objective conditions of the epoch? Colossal material resources are involved in the struggle. Imperialism has at its command enormous means provided by its highly developed economy and technology, including military technology. As we all know, the real counterweight to the power of imperialism is provided primarily by the combined might of the socialist community, that creation of the working class.

This indisputable fact alone is a forceful answer to the questions put earlier.

What are the conclusions? One is that, as the area of the world revolutionary process expands, the leading role of its contemporary class core, the working class in power, is becoming more and more evident. It is no accident that, noting the growing strength of the alliance of the three revolutionary streams, speakers at this conference stressed that our Communist slogan of unity, for peace, social progress and national liberation will be all the more effective, the deeper the interest of all members of this worldwide alliance in close cooperation with existing socialism, that great bulwark of the international working class.

Another conclusion concerns the relationship between the international solidarity of anti-imperialist forces and proletarian internationalism.

A passer-by who sees a fruit tree in bloom is likely merely to admire the beauty of its crown, whereas the gardener, however, sees to it that the roots and trunk are healthy and strong. With regard to uniting all participants in the world revolutionary process, we Communists are not passers-by but hard-working gardeners. In this case, that means being well aware that proletarian internationalism remains a source feeding the roots of the tree as well as its trunk, or the mainstay of what is now a widely ramified anti-imperialist world movement.

Proletarian internationalism is expressive of the fundamental, lasting interests of the working class of all countries. If we were to renounce this class position or dilute it by forming links of an interclass, general democratic nature, we would inevitably rob the international anti-imperialist struggle of clearcut revolutionary guidelines. We would have to draw the conclusion that international solidarity has its limits and that it was no use trying to organize widespread international support for revolutionaries who proceed from general democratic tasks to socialist change.

With such an approach to internationalism, we would have to be content with sporadic solidarity. We might arrive at the absurd formula, unacceptable to Communists, 'The worse, the better.' For we all know that many of the present and potential participants in the united

anti-imperialist front are roused to action only by the more flagrant crimes of imperialism. Does this imply, comrades, that we should behave as internationalists only in response to a fascist putsch or some act of imperialist aggression? I think this approach is entirely alien to our movement. The principle of our movement is different. It consists in upholding and fostering proletarian internationalism as a constant factor and the decisive force of world anti-imperialist unity in struggle against international capital, as a means of uniting the working-class movement and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The third and last conclusion concerns the relationship between the internal and international factors in the revolutionary process. We all know of the importance of revolutionary actions within national boundaries. We also know that the independence, sovereignty and equality of nations and Communist Parties alike and non-interference in their internal affairs are a law for Marxist-Leninists in their struggle for common goals. However, the revolutionary possibilities of every people are inseparably bound up with international conditions. And from this point of view, proletarian internationalism remains a powerful and indispensable weapon of revolutionaries. In fact, no serious politician would try to solve national problems without first taking stock of the alignment of international forces. And if he is a revolutionary politician he will not let passing circumstances dim his view to the broader, long-term perspective and to events in other countries.

To us, it is an axiom that every Communist Party is accountable primarily to the working class and other working people of its own country. Such responsibility, far from running counter to internationalism, serves as a solid basis for its manifestation because the interests of the working people of various countries do not clash, they are harmoniously interlocked.

It has been said here that gains made by revolutionaries in the sphere of national politics objectively raise the overall internationalist cause of revolutionary forces to a higher plane. Certainly. But there is another aspect to the matter. Would these gains have been possible if the revolutionary forces had acted separately? Surely it is the growing superiority of the forces of the world revolutionary movement and the growing power of socialism that have made the security of the peoples and the national sovereignty of dozens of new states a tangible and firm reality. It has enabled countries that until recently were colonies or semi-colonies to defy imperialism and exercise their legitimate right to use their national wealth as they see fit. This is the reason why the possibilites of accomplishing a social revolution by peaceful means have grown immeasurably.

One has only to ponder on these problems and others like it to come to the conclusion that the cohesion of the three streams of the world revolutionary process is an irreplaceable source of strength for every national contingent of revolutionaries and that proletarian internationalism, which inherently combines national independence and initiative with solidarity and mutual assistance, is as valid as ever.

In conclusion, *K.I. Zarodov* said:

Time does not stand still. The world has made great headway in the past few years. 'This is an epoch of radical social change.' said L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, at the 25th Party Congress. 'Socialism's positions are expanding and growing stronger. The victories of the national-liberation movement are opening up new horizons for countries that have won independence. The class struggle of the working people against monopoly oppression, against the exploiting order, is gaining in intensity. The scale of the revolutionary democratic, anti-imperialist movement is steadily growing. Taken as a whole, this signifies development of the world revolutionary process.'

This, then, is the situation in which the unity of revolutionary forces is developing today. If we had to single out the imperative of our time, which decisively conditions the content of this unity we could say with full justification that it is the practical worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism, the practical creation of a new world political, social and economic reality — one that cannot be brought about through inter-state agreements alone but is logically taking shape in both the international sphere and in national life as a result of the revolutionaries' joint struggle.

---

viewpoints

A new feature in bourgeois strategy and our experience

Taisto Sinisalo
Deputy Chairman, CP of Finland

At every stage of its development capitalism introduces new features in its economic and political domination to adapt to the changing internal and international conditions of its existence.

We are witnessing a significant process of social development in the capitalist world. The astounding progress of the scientific and technological revolution, the break-up of the old social structure, deep-going changes in the mass mentality and the widespread movement of social protest are all harbingers of inevitable and radical changes.

In fact, this is so obvious that even many leaders of the capitalist world are proclaiming their support of 'revolution.' John Rockefeller III has written a book, *The Second American Revolution*, in which he counsels against resisting the development of a new revolution in the United States. Nixon, in a message to Congress, suggested opening the way to 'peaceful revolution.' De Gaulle eloquently set out his variant of a 'revolution' for France. And the Gaullist Party congress in 1973 called for elucidation of the concept of 'humanist socialism.'

'Present-day imperialism, which is trying to adapt itself to the conditions of the struggle between the two systems and to the demands of the scientific and technological revolution, has some new features' the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted. 'Its state-monopoly character is becoming more pronounced. It resorts ever more extensively to such instruments as state-stimulated monopolistic concentration of production and capital, redistribution by the state of an increasing proportion of the national income, allocation of war contracts to the monopolies, government financing of industrial development and research programs, the drawing up of economic development programs on a countrywide scale, the policy of imperialist integration and new forms of capital export.'*

There is also the companion process of long-range all-embracing

**International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969.* Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 18.

and systematic regulation of social processes by state-monopoly capital. The combined power of monopoly and state directs all processes of capitalist exploitation.

In analyzing ruling-class tactics, Lenin noted that in all countries the bourgeoisie evolves and applies two basic methods to uphold its interests and maintain its domination: violence and adamant refusal to make any concessions to the working-class movement, on the one hand, and maneuvering, 'liberalism,' concessions, reforms, etc., on the other. And it is not unusual for the two methods to be applied in combination.

This dual tactic of the class enemy is characteristic of the present-day struggle.

The fundamental changes in the alignment of forces in favor of world socialism, the international workers' and national-liberation movement, have forced imperialism to change its strategy, for its frontal attack against supporters of social progress has met with formidable difficulties. The successes of socialism and the pressure of the workers' class struggle compel the monopolies to consent to slight wage rises, solve some welfare problems, replace crude, open forms of exploitation by more flexible and refined ones, and impose on the working class new forms of 'social partnership.' In short, keep the labor movement within the framework of its own 'rules of the game.'

The bourgeoisie of one country learns from others how to adapt to the new conditions. The Finnish bourgeoisie, for instance, draws on the international experience of the class struggle to modify its own policy in order not to be caught unprepared by the storm of social protest, as other countries have. One feature of this policy merits closer examination and the conclusions to be drawn from that can, I believe, be of definite value to the international working-class movement, its strategy and tactics.

Generally speaking, the Finnish bourgeoisie does not have the rich experience of fighting the working class as, say, its counterparts in the U.S., Britain, France and the FRG. But in Finland, too, there are far-seeing and knowledgeable bourgeois leaders. The ruling element has displayed a greater degree of foresight in its political strategy and, in certain respects, has set a model for other countries.

It is hard to say whether the theoretical sources of this strategy go back to the concepts enunciated by West German sociologist Ralf Dahrendorf, but the identity of some of the views and conclusions is obvious. In the early 60s Dahrendorf's views were the subject of controversy in bourgeois literature. At a time when capitalism was declared 'stabilized,' when classes, supposedly, had vanished and social peace prevailed, Dahrendorf declares: 'Like its precursor, advanced industrial society is a class society. Concept and theory of

class are still applicable.'* And he urges the bourgeoisie to reckon with the inevitability of class struggle and assess its positive role as the key motive force of social development. Disregarding the class struggle, in his view, makes for a myopic policy that, far from removing the class struggle, aggravates social antagonisms, thereby inhibiting the very possibility of evolution and opening the road to revolution.

Dahrendorf believes that complete elimination of class contradictions is neither possible nor desirable. He feels that all the problems facing society can be resolved through evolution, through a policy of regulating social conflicts. A necessary precondition for their effective regulation is institutionalization of all manifestations of social protest. The parties involved in the conflict should set up appropriate bodies to discuss and adjust contentious problems. And he explains: 'It seems evident that the very creation of parliamentary bodies of this kind involves a considerable reduction in the violence of group conflicts' (p. 228). But these bodies will be effective, he adds, only if both sides are convinced of the justice of their decisions. And in this context he emphasizes the need for stringent adherence to the principle of 'equality' of both sides. He addresses this demand primarily to the bourgeoisie, to the employers, who in any conflict with the workers are inclined to speak for 'total enterprise' (p. 252). One can appreciate the indignation of bourgeois sociologists.

For all its ostentatious impartiality, Dahrendorf's theory reveals a remarkable degree of class and political intuition. His message to the bourgeoisie is this: don't be misled by the seeming calm on the social front; begin preparing a major maneuver to contain the impending sharpening of the class struggle and neutralize social protest. It was only many years after his book appeared that bourgeois policy-makers who first rejected it were obliged to admit they had been wrong.

Dahrendorf reduces the whole problem to the existence of 'permanent minorities' in a country's political life. The allusion is to parties that poll a substantial vote but are not allowed a share in government. 'Unless such permanent minorities have alternative channels of expression, they will be increasingly alienated from "the system" that prevents them from getting "in" and increasingly irritated by the rules of the game according to which they have no right to demand a share in the exercise of authority. Such permanently excluded subjected groups are very likely to become more and more radicalized, to introduce an element of violence into political conflict and to aim at a sudden replacement of all incumbents of positions of

**Class and Class Conflict in an Industrial Society*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959, p. 246.

dominance — if not of the whole framework of political conflict that they blame for their ill fortunes' (pp. 309-10).

In other words, the more revolutionary a party is and the more it is inclined to promote and support the mass revolutionary struggle, the greater becomes the need to give it a share in government. That conclusion might seem surprising. Nonetheless, Dahrendorf has good reason to recommend his tactic to the bourgeoisie.

The political influence of working-class parties in Europe has so greatly increased since the Great October Socialist Revolution, that the bourgeoisie has found itself obliged to renounce the tactic of total hostility to these parties in favor of a divisive policy calculated to isolate the revolutionary trend and integrate the reformist trend into the capitalist system. And it worked. But with the revolutionary trend gaining strength in the labor movement in a number of countries, Dahrendorf urges the bourgeoisie to abandon its policy of total isolation of this trend and try a new tactic.

He does not prescribe any burdensome conditions for the 'permanent minority' parties, except the obligation to follow the rules of the game. But he lays great stress on 'institutionalizing conflicts,' a policy that, allegedly, makes it possible to carry out a revolution ... without revolution! He writes: 'First, ... whatever changes may occur, they do not affect the rules of the game agreed upon by both parties. Secondly, these rules of the game include for all parties the legitimate expectation of attaining power in the future. Finally, the larger part or the whole of the administrative staff provides, in all the democratic states of the post-capitalist period, an element of stability that survives every change. Thus, social structure and the political rules of the game combine to mitigate and smooth out the comparative suddenness of changes resulting from elections and help to preserve the gradual nature of social development arising from institutionalized conflict' (pp. 308-09).

Aware of the vast opportunities bourgeois parliamentary democracy offers in denying the masses direct participation in government, Dahrendorf supports also the establishment of 'economic and social democracy' patterned on 'political democracy.' He proposes devising a mechanism that would fulfill the functions now fulfilled by the workers' economic struggle and would thus make that struggle superfluous.

Institutionalization of social conflicts, Dahrendorf hopes, would transform capitalism into a 'pluralistic society' in which economic interests would be separated from political, and major aims would be so dissolved in the minor problems of the day-to-day struggle, that their class character would be totally submerged. This, plus con-

cessions on minor questions, would give the bourgeoisie tremendous political advantages.

But can the class struggle be institutionalized? Or is it all another capitalist utopia? As an ultimate goal it *is* a utopia, but one that opens the eyes of the bourgeoisie to the vast opportunities state-monopoly capitalism offers for socio-political maneuvering. Adroit use of even some of these opportunities, as the experience of Finland in the late 60s shows, creates considerable difficulties for the working-class struggle.

Leading Finnish bourgeois politicians were among the first to assess the efficacy of these ideas, and they lost no time in applying them in practice.

First, there was the ideological conditioning of the bourgeoisie itself to adopt the new political strategy. In June 1964 there was a private seminar in the small town of Iollas on home-policy strategy and the 'national mentality.' It was attended by leading sociologists and a number of politicians, and the majority favored the recommendations set out in the adjustment-of-conflicts theory.

In the main report, 'Basic Contradictions of Finnish Society,' adjustment of contradictions was defined as the priority task. And it was emphasized that keeping the Communists out of the government made solution of the problem more difficult, and indeed could have dangerous political repercussions. This thesis was, basically, approved. P. Burman, a right-wing Social Democrat, advised his bourgeois colleagues to reflect on the possibility of applying against the Communists the tactic of division and integration effectively employed against the Social Democrats after the October Revolution. Burman told the seminar that the 'young forces' now coming to the fore in the communist movement considered a clearcut policy of class struggle obsolete, inapplicable, even harmful to Finnish society. When this new trend prevails it could, possibly, influence the general alignment of forces and find national support, making it easier to integrate the Communist Party.

The seminar proceedings showed that the most diverse political groups of the Finnish bourgeoisie were prepared to change home policy and use the new conditions to consolidate their domination.

The Communists joined the government in 1966, for the first time since 1948. They did so in pursuance of their policy of forming the united front of the working class and other democratic forces against big capital and reaction, strengthening Finland's peace policy, improving the conditions of the workers, extending democratic rights and creating the preconditions for socialism.

However, our partners in government, the bourgeois Center Party and the Social Democrats, both closely linked with the existing sys-

tem, showed no interest in progressive policies. In fact, it was pretty clear that they were cooperating with the Communists in order to test the adjustment-of-conflicts theory. They tried to impose on the Communists 'rules of the game' that would tend to strengthen capitalism.

In inviting the Communists to share in government, the ruling element was, of course, looking out for its own interests. To reach the level of highly developed capitalist countries and adapt to capitalist integration, the Finnish monopolies had to overhaul the country's economic structure. Agriculture and lumbering were being industrialized, the woodworking industry reorganized, and new technology introduced in all industries to raise productivity and produce more for export. This was being financed by cutting down consumption and stepping up exploitation. The break-up of the rural social structure meant ruin for many small farmers and a mass exodus to the towns, with resultant aggravation of the unemployment problem.

It did not require much acumen to predict that this would inevitably aggravate social conflicts. But that is precisely why the ruling element was so anxious to bring the two labor parties into the government so as to hold back, or at least control, the mass struggle.

The Finnish ruling circles preferred inviting the Communists to join the government on their own terms rather than wait for the day when the Communists would themselves enter the government and with the support of the masses would start demanding their own conditions. An SDPF leader — M. Koivisto — said it was preferable to bring in the Communists 'before the government would be forced to decide on the issue of how to deal with Communist-organized demonstrations which are aimed at changing the government and whose final goals are not clear.' 'Our country's democratic system,' wrote Koivisto, 'will in no way be weakened, on the contrary it will be strengthened by our display of trust in our extreme left and by giving it a share in the management of affairs as the free-thinking bourgeoisie did in relation to us (Social Democrats) at the close of the 1930s without any harm to itself.'

The Center Party found it a simple matter to adapt to the new course. Supporting the idea of good relations with the Soviet Union in the postwar period, it had many points of contact with the Communist Party on foreign policy issues. Its leaders were not particularly concerned over possible ideological influence resulting from cooperation with the Communists, they relied on the wide ideological gap separating the two parties. Nor did they anticipate any particular political difficulties. The adjustment-of-conflict theory was in keeping with their own philosophy.

For the Social Democrats, however, there was an element of risk in

cooperating with the Communists which depended on whether or not this cooperation could be made to serve the interests of the class collaboration policy. In parliament and in the government the Social Democrat leaders, supported by the other bourgeois parties, could count on imposing a policy on the Communists which would not go beyond the framework of class cooperation. But, the situation could become very different at the mass-struggle level, where the Communists had many more opportunities to influence the course of this cooperation.

There were also serious ideological problems for the Social Democrats. These problems remained in the background as long as the differences concerned only practical matters. That being so, the Social-Democratic leaders could confine themselves to rather primitive anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. But on political issues, ideology plays a much bigger part in the effort to gain influence over the masses. It was precisely on the ideological front that the Social-Democratic leaders were unsure of themselves. They feared they could not 'protect' the masses from the ideological influence of a revolutionary party, once they were deprived of such customary methods as anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

The party leadership was forced to accept this risk, for continuation of the old anti-communist and anti-Soviet policy had come up against serious obstacles. The party was losing votes in parliamentary and presidential elections. The left wing was gaining strength and demanding an end to the bankrupt policy of the right-wing leadership. Influenced by the Communist effort for working-class unity, there was a growing sentiment for a radical change of attitude toward the CPF. At the 1963 SDPF Congress the right-wing leadership was defeated. Centrist leader Paasio was elected Party Chairman and called for 'two steps to the left.'

In foreign policy this was expressed in rejection of the rabid anti-Sovietism of former years and support for the Paasikivi-Kekkonen course. The change in foreign policy tactics was a rather simple and painless matter.

In domestic affairs, the Paasio line meant a change in political course and ideological work in order to assure the SDPF a key role in implementing the adjustment-of-conflicts strategy.

The transition by the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats from primitive anti-communism to more subtle tactics required serious improvement of our ideological and theoretical work. However convincing our theoretical criticism of reformist recommendations, they can be refuted only by experience. Accordingly, we concentrated on concrete issues of social development based on a Marxist-Leninist

analysis of recent processes in capitalism and the class struggle and its lessons.

Communist participation in the government in 1966-70 was a severe test of the Party's policy and ideology, and we cannot say we passed it on all points.

The special Party Congress (February 1970) voted that Communist participation in government won the working people many positive gains, but government policy was not directed against big capital and therefore did not significantly help implementation of the Party's general line. Following the 'rules of the game,' Communists in government and parliament were obliged to give way to the united front of the Social Democrat and bourgeois parties. The Congress resolution said: 'In parliament and in the government there were unnecessary concessions to the other government parties, with no adequate explanation of the negative aspects of their policy ... The special position of the Communists and People's Democrats on certain negative decisions was not adequately brought to the knowledge of the masses, with the result that our policy was equated with that of the government as a whole.'

Employing its new tactics, the Finnish bourgeoisie was able to exploit the mounting popular discontent to weaken support for the left and centrist forces and strengthen the position of the right forces. This told on the results of the 1970 parliamentary elections: all government parties lost votes, but the Communists were the biggest losers, polling 14 per cent less than in previous elections.

The political aims the bourgeoisie associated with its new tactics were largely achieved. The purpose was to put all the blame for unpopular policies on the Communists, and thereby disorient the Party and weaken its revolutionary potential.

What can one say about these calculations?

The Finnish working-class movement has no reason to regret its class enemy's change of tactics. On the contrary, the change from frontal attack to maneuvering, to combining pressure with concessions and compromise, can rightly be assessed as the result of the successes of the revolutionary movement and the changed world balance of forces in favor of socialism.

The bourgeoisie could have counted on the success of its new tactics only if their political motivations were not exposed, if the Communists proved incapable of countering these tactics with their own, more effective, tactics and organization. But the subtle stratagems of the bourgeoisie no longer hold any secrets for us Communists.

The CPF counters them with its own strategy and tactics based on principled defense of the workers' interests and conforming to the

aspirations of the vast majority of our people. Accordingly, the Party is concentrating on forming a united front of worker and democratic forces against big capital. This is reflected in our proposals for a cooperative program of the democratic forces adopted by the 17th Communist Party Congress in May 1975.

Myths and realities of the 'white revolution'

Hamid Safari
Member of Executive Bureau,
People's Party of Iran,
PPI representative
on the journal

The evolution of social and political thought in Iran should be seen against the background of accelerated capitalist development attended by the rapid growth of the working class and of the role it plays. The ideological struggle is becoming sharper and the liberating ideas of Marxism-Leninism are steadily gaining ground. Their dissemination, begun in the opening years of the century, was greatly stimulated by the organization in 1920 of the Communist Party, the predecessor of the People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) founded in October 1941.

The government's political and ideological measures are directed against all the progressive forces, but the main target is Tudeh and its ideology. It is no accident that the first anti-communist law adopted in 1931, which provided for 10 years imprisonment for membership of the Communist Party, was replaced, nearly 45 years later, in 1975, by a more draconic law establishing mandatory life imprisonment for Party membership or communist propaganda.

Our Party has to conduct its ideological struggle in the harsh conditions of clandestinity. But it can draw on the rich experience of the international communist movement, especially its political and ideological struggle against all the diverse forms of bourgeois ideology. To bring that experience to the masses, the Communists have found ways and means of popularizing Marxist literature. The works of Lenin are being published in relatively large editions, also training aids, Party policy statements, etc. Work has begun on a translation of *Capital*, with the first volume already available. Marxist literature enjoys a growing demand among the working people.

Our Party program contains this clause: 'Iranian society requires fundamental change, a revolution extending to all spheres of life, one that will change life in the interests of the people. . . . At the present stage of Iran's development this would be a national-democratic revolution dedicated to the following aims: abolition of imperialist monopoly control of our natural resources and the economy, complete economic and political independence, an end to all pre-capitalist survivals, and adoption of the socialist road.' What alternative does the ruling element offer to these progressive ideas and demands advanced by our Party?

First, there is the so-called 'white revolution.' Addressing an economic conference in Teheran on February 27, 1967, the Shah declared that Iran was going through a 'bloodless white revolution' and its reforms marked a turning point in the country's history.

What are these reforms? The 14 laws promulgated between January 1963 and November 1975, envisage (1) land reform; (2) nationalization of forests; (3) sale of government enterprises, with the money used to finance the land reform; (4) a new election procedure; (5) worker participation in company profits; (6) organization of an 'education corps' to wipe out illiteracy; (7) organization of a 'modernization corps' to encourage more efficient farming methods; (8) organization of a 'health corps'; (9) establishment of so-called 'justice centers' in rural communities to deal with minor conflicts and complaints; (10) nationalization of water resources; (11) national reconstruction; (12) an 'administrative revolution'; (13) the sale of company shares to workers and other employees; (14) measures to combat inflation and rising prices.

A decree of the Shah issued in November 1975 calls for formulating a general philosophy of the 14 principles of the revolution performed by the Shah and the people to produce an integral ideology and mentality based on scientific dialectics and thus disclose and demonstrate the logic of the changes in Iran's political, spiritual and cultural life. The ideologists of the 'white revolution' promise the people a great civilization, an ideal society founded on supreme social justice. And a massive mind-conditioning operation is under way to instill the idea that there is no exploitation in Iran, no antagonistic classes, only equal social groups cooperating for common national aims. The ruling element contends that the 'white revolution' reforms are the answer to Iran's development requirements, and that implementation of these 'miracle-working' reforms (sometimes referred to as 'permanent revolution') will, within a reasonably short time, bring Iran the promised 'great civilization.'

How realistic are these grandiose plans? A simple enumeration of the reforms and their underlying principles will show that they are the

result of pressure by the working masses and of objective development requirements. The government is pursuing far-reaching aims. It wants to implant and consolidate bourgeois forms in the social system, create stable conditions for the smooth evolution of capitalism, submerge social contradictions and, lastly, keep the masses under its ideological and political control. Referring to bourgeois reforms, Lenin remarked that the bourgeoisie cannot get along without the masses, and 'it is *impossible* to gain the following of the masses without a widely ramified, systematically managed, well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, juggling with fashionable and popular catchwords, and promising all manner of reforms and blessings to the workers right and left — as long as they renounce the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 117).

The most vivid example of such 'juggling' in Iran is the laws providing for worker participation in company profits and the sale of company shares to the workers.

The first law is obviously meant to secure more efficient production without additional investment. Accordingly, collective agreements obligate the workers to economize on raw and auxiliary materials and power, make better use of machinery and raise productivity through speed-up techniques. Naturally, this means more profit for the employer; for the worker it means a meager addition to his wages.

In their persistent attempts to compel the working class to renounce the revolutionary struggle, the 'white revolution' ideologists have been lavish in their promises of 'prosperity' resulting from ownership of company shares; the worker, they argue, thus becomes a partner of private enterprise. The law on workers' shares is being described as 'extension of industrial ownership.' It applies only to companies with assets of more than $1.5 million and an annual turnover of more than $3.5 million. And there are many reservations: the law comes into effect only five years after a company begins production, and workers are entitled to buy shares only after three years of employment at the given factory. More, no worker can buy more than four shares, and the law does not provide for worker representation in management. In other words, employers are always assured of at least a 51 per cent interest, and so the existing system of labor-capital relations is maintained intact.

These and other reservations make it perfectly clear that the workers (even if they can afford to buy shares) cannot exert the slightest influence on financial and production matters. The working class remains a class of wage laborers, with the only difference that, having acquired a few shares (the authors of the plan believe) they will help the capitalist boost profits and productivity.

Consequently, the 'extension of industrial ownership' is being carried out in the interests of the bourgeoisie, especially its dominant section.[1] Enterprises that can no longer afford heavy capital investment merge with other companies. Another method is to sell stock to the population. One of the country's biggest industrialists and a leading figure in the Teheran Chamber of Commerce, Khosrovshahi, told a group of bankers that concentration and centralization of capital and production were inevitable, and, in this context, the land reform law, worker participation in profits and 'extension of industrial ownership' were part of the government's long-range 'global growth strategy.' 'The professors who defend capitalism,' Lenin wrote, 'chatter about the increase in the number of property owners when they see the growth in the number of small shareholders. What actually happens is that the power (and the income) of the millionaire magnates *over* the capital of the "small fry" is increased' (Vol. 19, p. 204).

The whole concept of 'extension of industrial ownership' is meant — and this its authors admit — as an ideological move against the labor movement. The *Teheran Economist*, (Jan. 31, 1976) remarked that the scheme is premised on the belief that if the workers become shareholders, the class struggle, the result of private property of the means of production, will disappear.

Another component of 'white revolution' ideology is 'independent nationalism,' a development of the early 60s. Its underlying idea is that all Iranians are part of a single national community. In a society torn by social and class antagonisms, this type of propaganda can have only one purpose, i.e., depress the working people's class and political consciousness. But 'independent nationalism' has its reverse side, Pan-Iranism, the ideology of the ruling classes. Both are based on great-power chauvinism and the idea that religion and the regime are the determinants of the nation.

'Independent nationalism,' meant as a counterweight to the internationalism of the People's Party, is based entirely on anti-communism. Its exponents contend that our Party's ideology is imported, alien to Iran, its uniqueness, national interests and independence. The People's Party is accused of national nihilism and its members and supporters of anti-patriotism because, allegedly, they place the international above the national. The fact, however, is that the Communists never contrast one to the other. On the contrary, they organically combine the two in all their activity.

In March 1975, all existing parties were virtually dissolved and replaced by a single political organization, the Iranian Renaissance Party.[2] It artificially divides the Iranians into two categories: those loyal to the monarchy and the Constitution and the 'white revolution,'

and those who have no faith in these institutions. The former are invited to join the new party, the latter — and they include members and supporters of our Party and other illegal organizations — should, in the government's view, be kept behind bars. Even the slightest protest against the regime is denounced as instigated by world communism.

Our Party categorically rejects 'independent nationalism' and all its reactionary implications. Our aims, and our struggle to achieve them, organically combine the national and international. The half century history of the Iranian Communist movement furnishes conclusive proof that the Communists are the most consistent and staunch defenders of the people's interests.

Hosrov Ruzbeh, a member of our Central Committee, tried by a military tribunal and executed on May 10, 1959, told the tribunal: 'My hostility to capitalism does not imply hostility to the integrity and independence of Iran. On the contrary, I am against capitalism because, apart from the calamities it has brought Iran, it has impaired its independence and integrity, and the freedom and prosperity of the Iranian people. My abhorrence of capitalism does not mean that I am against national sovereignty. On the contrary, I am combating capitalism in order to establish and consolidate our national sovereignty.'

Regime spokesmen have deliberately and persistently raised doubts about the national, patriotic character and independence of the People's Party. They have deliberately falsified the nature of our international links with the communist and workers' movement and our position in defending the socialist world system — all in a vain attempt to prove that we are not an independent party.

But it is generally known that our contacts with fraternal parties are based on equality and independence. That is the rule throughout the world communist and workers' movement, in sharp contrast to relations between bourgeois parties, which are based on domination of the strong.

The international importance of Marxism-Leninism lies in applying its common principles to the concrete conditions of the given country. This applies to such a cardinal principle as proletarian internationalism.[3]

It is up to each Party to draw on the experience of other parties and on that of the international communist and workers' movement. Our Party will continue to draw on the revolutionary experience of other Communist parties, especially the CPSU.

The theoretical and political activity of the CPSU has shown the Communists, and not only them, the reality of an existing socialist society. In his *'Left-Wing' Communism — an Infantile Disorder,*

Lenin wrote: 'We now possess quite considerable international experience, which shows very definitely that certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international' (Vol. 31, p. 21).

Our Party's activity embodies the unity of international and national tasks. That is why it believes that solidarity with the Soviet Union is an indispensable condition for the success of the anti-imperialist struggle for democracy and progress. Our Party program says: 'The Soviet Union is the most reliable and powerful bulwark of all the revolutionary and progressive forces of the world. The character of relations with the Soviet Union, therefore, determines the destinies of socialism and the world revolutionary movement; it is a key element of proletarian internationalism and a test of the sincerity and firmness of anti-imperialist liberation movements and of persistency in promoting peace.'

It is the sacred duty of every Iranian Communist to defend and popularize the achievements of the socialist community, that greatest gain of the world proletariat, and give every support to Communist and Workers' Parties in the capitalist world. We consider this internationalism in practice. 'Our Party,' its program emphasizes, 'is a loyal member of the great family of the world communist movement, shares in formulating its overall policy, and is guided by that policy in all its actions. It fights for the unity of the international communist movement, for a principled policy that rules out deviations from Marxism-Leninism, whether "left" or right, and combats dogmatism and revisionism, divisionism, factionalism and separatism in the revolutionary movement. It also categorically rejects bourgeois nationalism, nationalist and chauvinist narrow-mindedness.' Such is the reply of the People's Party to 'independent nationalism' and its attacks on our ideology.

The changing alignment of forces in favor of progress and democracy has markedly enhanced the popularity of scientific communism among diverse strata of Iranian society. This is helped by two factors: the deepening general crisis of capitalism, and the superiority of the socialist system, as convincingly demonstrated in peaceful competition with capitalism.

The reactionaries are accordingly modifying their anti-communist tactics. In the past these were based almost entirely on violence, and though that has by no means been abandoned, there is more emphasis on what might be called 'theoretical' anti-communism. Foreign anti-communist literature is being translated and circulated alongside a home-grown crop.

Both are based on falsification of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, distortion of the record of our Party and of the

international communist and workers' movement. Marxism-Leninism is denounced as allegedly unsuitable to Iran, and passages from Marxist-Leninist writings are torn out of context and presented in a distorted and vulgarized form.

In fact, statements are attributed to Marx and Engels which they never made. The main practitioners of this type of 'polemics' are F. Hayem-Magami, author of the book, *The Marxists*, and H. Hashemi Guchani, author of *A History of Socialism. The Life and Work of Marx and Engels*.

Magami presents Marx as a utopian socialist who condemned the 'degrading and destructive influence of 19th century capitalism,' dreamt of social justice and individual freedom. But, Magami says, that dream proved a utopia, for individual freedom, he alleges, does not exist in the countries guided by Marxism. And this is written in a country where the ruling clique has been waging a continuous and relentless struggle against the progressive and democratic forces with no respect for, or even tolerance of, individual freedom. But that does not seem to bother Magami. He is at pains to prove that socialist revolution accorded only with the specific conditions of the 19th century whereas today, with technological progress having changed the course of society, there is no exploitation or class injustice and, hence, no need for a revolution.

Hashemi Guchani follows the same line of reasoning. He, too, denies the need for socialist revolution, arguing that technological progress increases incomes and assures a welfare state.

Engels once wrote that: 'It was precisely Marx who had first discovered the great law of motion of history, the law according to which all historical struggles, whether they proceeded in the political, religious, philosophical or some other ideological domain, are in fact only a more or less clear expression of the struggle of social classes. . . .'[4] Guchani 'refutes' that, also Marx's thoughts on the laws governing social development and the class struggle, by referring to the fact that history knows of conflicts and wars which were of a purely religious or national character. He makes much of the existence of primitive, classless communities, and draws the conclusion that the Marxists contradict their own theory of class struggle. Unscrupulously falsifying the Marxist view on historical development, Guchani says that Marxism thought up and imposed on society the concept of exploiting classes, whereas, contrary to Marxism, society, in Iran as elsewhere, stands above classes.

These Iranian critics of Marxism deliberately disregard the interconnection between cause and effect in social processes. Nor is that surprising. For behind ideological struggle there is the struggle of class interests. At this stage of development, the Iranian ruling class

wants to befuddle the consciousness of the masses by instilling the idea of 'social peace' between the antagonistic classes. Recognition of the class nature of society would mean recognition of the class struggle, which in capitalist society leads to socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship. That the ruling faction fears more than anything else. Hence, all the attempts to prove that the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship does not accord with the requirements of our time.

The ideological struggle in Iran is further complicated by the subversive activities of the Maoists, who have become allies of the reactionary forces fighting the Iranian People's Party and the international communist movement. Our Party program exposes the anti-Marxist, deviationist and subversive policy of the Maoists, 'which is already causing grave damage and is hampering maximum use of realistic opportunities to force imperialism and reaction to retreat. Maoism has frankly adopted a cold-war attitude and is building up tension, supporting imperialist groupings and military pacts, and encouraging the reactionary policies of anti-communist regimes such as those in Iran and Chile, is openly coming out against revolutionary, anti-imperialist movements and states, and has proclaimed the Soviet Union enemy number one, thereby working hand in glove with the enemies of peace, democracy and socialism.'

Iranian opponents of Marxism-Leninism, from 'left' extremists and anarchists to bourgeois ideologists, borrow from Maoism whatever suits their purpose. They are especially gratified by the fact that the Peking traitors to the great cause of the working class and socialism have made the Soviet Union, the leading force of the socialist community, the main target of their ideological and political subversion.

The People's Party of Iran combats every variety of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. It exposes the Iranian apologists of imperialism and Maoism. And though they have built up a tremendous propaganda machine, the 'white revolution' ideologists are making no headway. The people are coming to see its reactionary substance and are turning away from it — witness the steep rise of the strike movement. As the crisis of the regime deepens, more and more factors emerge to activize the work of the progressive and democratic forces. No amount of oppression can destroy the inspiring ideas of Marxism-Leninism in Iran. For no other ideology, despite the wishful thinking of the ruling elements, provides a true explanation of what is happening in Iran. Only Marxism-Leninism gives the working class and the people a theoretical and ideological weapon in the fight to refashion life. With that in mind, our Party is extending its mass work to bring to the people the ideology of the working class.

1. According to unofficial data, 45 families control 85 per cent of companies with assets of more than 10 million reals each; 1 real = $1.33 (1973 exchange rate).

2. Two landlord-bourgeois parties — Mardom (People) and Irane Novin (New Iran) — were founded in the late 50s and early 60s to give the regime a better image.

3. In this context I would like to touch on Comrade Rossi's article, 'The Party of the people in the battle for socialism,' in the July issue. In it he argues that the expression 'proletarian internationalism' is a restricted one and no longer accords with present-day conditions. I cannot agree with that, and would like to put forward my view, just as Comrade Rossi has put forward his.

Comrade Rossi is right, I think, when he says that, in our day, being an internationalist implies working for détente, security and cooperation against reactionary and fascist regimes, supporting national-liberation movements, facilitating closer understanding among all the left forces, strengthening the international anti-imperialist front and involving the widest possible spectrum of social forces in the fight for these aims. But does being an internationalist no longer imply fighting for the common interests of the working class, which remains the central figure in our era, and for the demands it advances in its confrontation with the multinational monopolies? The main social contradiction of capitalist society, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, remains and by virtue of its role in production and society, the working class is the core which attracts a wide spectrum of anti-imperialist forces. In discharging its historic mission and defending its class interests, the working class objectively and subjectively defends the interests of all working people, the genuine interests of the nation. By virtue of this, it most consistently and in the best possible way expresses through its struggle also the common interest of the broad sections of the people in achieving the democratic aims which imperialism is so anxious to prevent. And, what is no less important, it seeks to achieve these aims both on a national and international scale, for capital is an international phenomenon, and a successful struggle against it requires the joint action of the workers of all countries.

Hence, expansion of the social base of internationalism does not vitiate its main content, which is proletarian internationalism. In fact, no one has ever claimed that proletarian internationalism implies merely limited solidarity with the working class of one or another country. Take the civil war in Spain: international proletarian solidarity was in support of all the democratic forces. Or take support of democracy in Chile or in my own country, Iran. Is it confined to the working class alone? Is it not support for people of widely different convictions, but united in their desire for change in their own country and the world?

Of course, support of the progressive revolutionary forces in various countries comes not only from the working class. For example, international solidarity with the embattled people of Vietnam was expressed by men and women throughout the world, by a very wide spectrum of public forces. The most active and consistent support, however, came from the working class, led by the Marxist-Leninist parties. No doubt, the struggle of the Vietnamese people themselves played a decisive role in their victory. But was not an important contribution made by the support of the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, where the working class stands at the helm of state power? Lastly, was it not the ruling working class (above all of the USSR and Cuba) that was the main source of assistance to Angola? Our Angolan comrades have time and again emphasized that they have felt the full benefit of proletarian internationalism.

Perhaps not all the principles that go into the concept of proletarian internationalism are shared by some of the forces involved in solidarity campaigns. But that does not justify writing off proletarian internationalism. By the same token, not everyone involved in the international democratic movement is likely to accept all the principles formulated by Comrade Rossi.

An examination of all these factors leads one to conclude that it is hardly correct to maintain that proletarian internationalism no longer accords with the concrete conditions of today. Certainly, it acquires new features, manifests itself in new forms,

is richer in content. But its essence remains unchanged. More, I am deeply convinced that proletarian internationalism is a powerful weapon against world imperialism. The effort to consolidate proletarian internationalism will make for closer interaction of the fraternal Parties, the effectiveness of their action in world affairs. That is the guarantee of the success of our common cause.

4. Preface to the third German edition of Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.

Love of freedom cannot be killed

CHILEAN ANTI-FASCISTS SPEAK. PAGES FROM THE BOOK OF COURAGE

The tragedy of Chile has been going on for three long years. The people's freedom and dignity have been trampled under by the jackboot of the fascist junta. But all these 1,100 days Chile's patriots have been waging a stubborn struggle against the inhuman regime of the puppets of imperialism and the financial oligarchy.

Leninist internationalists highly prize the eyewitness accounts of participants in revolutionary struggles. With the aim of making them available to the reading public, the editors of *World Marxist Review* organized a meeting of its correspondents with a group of Chilean anti-fascists. Below follows a recapitulation of the interviews.

'This is fascism!'

'For Maya!

'Some day she will know how much I love her, and I shall teach her to shoot at imperialism and reaction with the charge of faith, with the rifle of hope, and also with a Kalashnikov submachine gun.

From grandfather-President Dr. Chicho.'

Chicho was what Salvador Allende was fondly called. Unaware of what lay in store for his country and himself, he looks from the photograph. The submachine gun in his hands seems out of place and not at all frightening. Allende was not fated to teach his granddaughter her first lessons in revolutionary struggle. Soon after the picture was taken he was forced to take up the Kalashni-

kov submachine gun, a gift of his friend Fidel Castro, and with a handful of faithful followers go into his last battle with fascism.

The photograph with the President's autograph is cherished, among other mementos, by Osvaldo Puccio, Allende's secretary, fellow Party member and loyal follower.

On September 11, *Osvaldo Puccio* relates, I was in the La Moneda presidential palace together with Salvador Allende. The junta chiefs sent a message to Allende through his aide, Colonel Badiola. 'Please inform President Allende on behalf of my General Pinochet,' the colonel told me over the telephone, 'that the general heads the government junta.' Badiola, the President's Army aide-de-camp, had betrayed Allende a quarter of an hour before that telephone call. 'My General Pinochet,' Badiola continued, 'demands the immediate resignation of President Allende and his arrival at the Defense Ministry for negotiations.' 'Tell him this,' Allende said (and I repeat his answer verbatim). 'Firstly, the popularly elected President of Chile does not resign; secondly, the residence of the President of Chile is at the La Moneda Palace; thirdly, if he wants me to come to the Defense Ministry, let the son of a bitch call for me in person . . .'

I often think that fate has been very good to me, because I had the honor of being next to Allende, of working with him, of getting to know him closer, and in some ways being part of his life. Friends of Chile all over the world know that when that remarkable man was offered a plane to leave the country (and thus save his life), he replied with an abrupt refusal. His response to Pinochet's offer was, 'Let him stick his plane up his ass! I am the President of Chile, and no plane may take off without my permission.'

I was not destined to die together with the President. Fifteen minutes before his heroic death Allende sent me, together with two comrades, to the rebels in an effort to induce them to stop bombing and strafing buildings surrounding the Palace and put an end to the senseless massacre of peaceful inhabitants. I would like to cite one more detail. Together with me at the Palace was my elder son Osvaldo. Fully aware of the fate that awaited the last defenders of La Moneda, Allende several times insisted that my son leave the Palace, saying that it was his duty to care for his mother. My son replied that his younger brothers were with their mother. The President then ordered Osvaldo to guard our group going to the Defense Ministry. To me he said that I should by no means let my son return to the Palace.

I recall Salvador Allende's words, said over the body of Major Arturo Araya, his Naval aide, murdered by reactionaries shortly before the coup ... I remember the President in a white smock,

working together with the hospital doctors to breathe life into the mutilated body. Their efforts were in vain. Allende walked out of the room. I closed the eyes of the man who had been my friend, and followed the President. Allende was sitting at a table, and I could see how deeply he had been shaken by what had happened. Suddenly he stood up, returned to the surgery and called the doctors — five or six young army physicians: 'Colleagues, come here!' He pointed at the lifeless body. 'Look, this is fascism!' After the coup I was brought to that same hospital as a prisoner. My wounded comrades were being tortured there for hours.

I was in Germany in the late 30s and early 40s. I can say confidently that fascism in Chile is a blood brother of German fascism. The man who arrested me said, 'Hands up, uncle!' He was the son of a cousin of mine. The class interests which fascism defends gain the upper hand not only over family ties: they make people neglect all the much-vaunted values of bourgeois democracy. With my own eyes I saw people I thought I knew turn into wild animals. Whenever the bourgeoisie feels that its privileges are threatened it immediately forgets its high-sounding words about respect of the family, friendship, spiritual values. Fascism, always and everywhere, is fascism, with the only difference that in Chile it speaks Spanish.

Why they murdered my comrades

'Case No. 1645-73

'Verdict No. 1007

'Concepcion, 18.10.1973

'Under martial law ... (a) the accused Danilo Conzalez Mardones, Bernabe Cabrera Neira, Isidoro Carrillo Torneria and Vladimir Aranedo Contreras are sentenced to death as guilty of the following crimes: organization of combat groups armed with bombs; the manufacture, storage and illegal transportation of explosives and explosive devices ...'

The fascists murdered my comrades at dawn on October 22, relates *Norma Hidalgo,* member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile. The first firing squad assigned to carry out the sentence refused to shoot. It was replaced, and the soldiers were threatened that they would be shot themselves if they too refused. 'You are not to blame, we know who our real murderers are,' Isidoro Carrillo called out to the soldiers. 'They are those who stand behind your backs, those who ordered you to kill us. Shoot! The people also know this!' ... Before dying Vladimir and Isidoro shouted: 'Long live Communism!' At his last meeting with his eldest son, Isidoro said, 'Dear Fyodor, you must be prepared to care for your brothers and

help your mother. You must know that my greatest experience in life was the Communist Party, I owe it everything. Work together with the Party and always have faith in it!'

The fascists accused my comrades of complicity in the notorious 'plan Zeta,' of conspiring to kill people in our area. I was also arrested, and accused of helping to finance the plan with municipal funds of the town of Coronel of which I was mayor. This was a fascist lie to justify in some way the physical extermination of people enjoying the greatest confidence of the workers.

In 1970, Isidoro Carrillo Torneria, member of our Party's Central Committee, was appointed General Manager of the Lota Schwager coal mines. I remember the tears in the eyes of old miners when President Allende announced this from the platform in the Town Square. The people carried red banners and sang songs. Their joy that day is comparable only with the pain the workers felt when they heard of the murder of Isidoro and his comrades. The miners, working under the supervision of armed guards, paid homage to the Communist heroes by observing several minutes of silence.

It was under Isidoro's management that worker councils were set up at the mine and output began to rise. Women received job opportunities at a factory organized at the mine to manufacture overalls and gloves. Parks and rest homes that had belonged to the family of the former mine owner Cousino, became the property of the workers.

With the support of the Popular Unity Government we at the municipality level began to tackle many of the social problems of the mining region which had formerly been virtually forgotten. No previous government, for example, ever did a thing to ensure regular fresh water supplies for the population. We piped water into the miners' homes. Thanks to the municipality the streets of my town, where for more than a hundred years people used to wade through mud in the rainy season, were paved. Our municipality began building clinics, schools, sports grounds and homes for the miners. We opened workers' clubs. That was where municipal funds went, not for bombs, as the fascists claimed. That is what they murdered my comrades for!

In those terrible days I could see for myself that fascism is capable of any crime in its efforts to strangle our ideas and defend the privileges of the monopoly bourgeoisie. And one more thing I realized those days: the readiness of people of labor to risk their very lives to help our Party . . . I shall never forget how, early in the morning of September 11, the leaders of our district Party organization met with the miners. They told them that the fascists' goal was to take away

the working people's gains and that all honest Chileans should be ready to continue the struggle. The miners listened attentively ...

Worker of the underground

According to numerous eyewitnesses, the Chilean fascists are hardly inferior to their European predecessors, the Hitler fascists, in the cruelty of torture. But the fiercest terror is unable to break the courage of the participants in the anti-fascist struggle. Among those to join it from the very first days was Communist Rosa Barrera.

On the eve of the coup, *Rosa Barrera* relates, I worked in our Central Committee's International Commission. After September 11, I left my office, removing the most important papers, and began to await instructions from the Party. My work at the Central Committee was of a purely internal nature and I felt sure my name was not known to the police. I was more concerned about my husband, a journalist. However, five days after the coup I was arrested. Fortunately the police had nothing incriminating against me. In those days a detainee could be set free after interrogation, or could be destroyed. I was freed.

I again began to seek contacts with the Party. My wish was to begin underground work as quickly as possible. But when I met with a comrade from the Party leadership he said, 'You can't be of any use right now because of your arrest. Stay at home and lead a normal, unostentatious life, the Party will eventually get in touch with you.' Great was my joy when I learned that I was entrusted with work in one of the Party's underground publications. I constantly had to get in touch with people, organize interviews and meetings, find premises for them. We were especially concerned with launching our *Information Bulletin* for abroad as quickly as possible. We also helped our comrades leave the country.

The Party bulletin began coming out and was sent abroad. The first groups of people who had found refuge in embassies began to leave the country. We regularly met with representatives of other Popular Unity parties and discussed questions of international activity. There were four of us, we had much work, but I was the only one responsible for direct liaison between the Party leadership and the comrade in charge of our work. This imposed a tremendous responsibility on me. I had to travel about the city a lot. It had become virtually a war zone, but I was not very frightened, although I always reckoned with the possibility that one day I might leave home and never return to my husband and children.

Superficially, I continued to lead the ordinary life of a housewife. Twice a week I taught French to students of the school where my daughter studied. My husband lost his job at the radio station and sold toys, footballs and wine to make a living for us. My daughter was 12 and my son 10 at that time. The children knew that their parents were Communists, but they never asked us anything and never expressed surprise at my occasional absences lasting several days, or my returning home late ...

Month after month Rosa lived a life full of suspense and dangers, sometimes carrying out apparently incredible assignments. Like most Party comrades, she had to learn the ABC of clandestine work as she went. There were mistakes, of course, but she was happy to be working for the Party.

... I was arrested at one of our hideouts. At that moment the world seemed to collapse about me. It had so happened that shortly before that a comrade of our group responsible for keeping Party documents had fallen ill and the documents were hidden at my home. Concerned with their fate, I had earlier asked my daughter to destroy them in an emergency. I thought of many things during those first hours after my arrest. Would my daughter be able to carry out my instructions? What would happen to her, to my son, and to my husband?

Several hours later I was taken to the Air Force Academy, which remains a torture center to this day. On the following day I was driven to my home. The characters in mufti accompanying me had found nothing of consequence when they searched our apartment. My husband had been arrested the same day as I. When we both failed to return my daughter had burned the documents and scattered the ashes. I hugged her farewell and managed to whisper, 'Tell them.' I hoped she would guess whom I had in mind. And she justified my hopes. This helped us avoid other failures.

At the very first interrogation I was told that all was up for me, that I would spend 20 years in jail, that the Party would forget me, but if I agreed to talk I would be set free. Soon they got down to business. Before a torture session they say, 'Close your eyes.' Then they cover them with adhesive tape and bandage them. Your hands are handcuffed behind your back. They strip you naked and start torturing, aiming their blows mainly at the stomach and breast. I was expecting a baby. After the first few blows I began to bleed, but they continued the torture. During the first 48 hours they made me stand without food, water or sleep. Toward the end I felt I could no longer remain on my feet. But at that moment the torturers decided to have a rest. Suddenly I heard someone say softly: 'Senora, ask permission to go

to the toilet.' My first impulse was to refuse. But the voice repeated insistently, 'Senora, ask them.' On the way the man placed a wet handkerchief in my hand so that I could wipe off the blood. 'Don't let them think you are afraid,' he said. The unknown soldier's act told me a lot.

During the torture one feels nothing but torture. The nightmare lasted 14 days . . .

One day Rosa was unable to get up as the right side of her body was paralyzed. She was placed in the Academy hospital, where the doctors established that she had lost her baby. An operation was needed but Rosa had lost so much blood that the doctors would not undertake it. When, after several days, Rosa revived somewhat, she was transferred back to the Academy basement under an assumed name. She was blindfolded again, and the bandages were not removed for four months. Rosa learned to live like a blind person. It was only at the Tres Alamos Camp that she saw the light of day . . . After her return to the basement the torture method was changed in an attempt to break her psychologically. Thus, in her presence orders were issued to arrest her children, of whom she had known nothing, just as she had known nothing of her husband's fate.

I must say that during torture there may suddenly appear an overwhelming desire to talk so as to reduce the pain in some way. There were moments when I felt like this, but I forced myself to think what would happen if I talked. Many of my comrades would die. I would, perhaps, feel less pain, but what would happen to my conscience? How would I be able to live, to face my children, my husband? I knew that the price of silence would be high, that I would perhaps never see my family again. But I told myself that fascism was not eternal and that if I ever met my children, husband, Party comrades, I would be able to hold my head high and tell them: 'They got nothing from me' . . .

Comrades-in-arms, brothers

There is an exercise book with various entries that the inmates of Dawson concentration camp presented as a collective gift to Osvaldo Puccio Jr., on his twenty-first birthday. 'To my great friend and brother who has grown stronger in a period of passing hardships of the fight for life,' says an entry by A. Sule, Chairman of the Radical Party. Another entry reads: 'Long live 21-year-old Puccio Jr.! Sincerely, Luis Corvalan.'

'Friend,' 'comrade,' 'brother' is what the young hero is called by

Popular Unity leaders, Communists and Socialists, leaders of the Left Christian Movement and the Worker-Peasant MAPU Party, Radicals, non-party people and independents. Exhibits of the future museum of the Chilean revolution are bound to include the exercise book as a relic of anti-fascist brotherhood.

Prison and camp, said *Osvaldo Puccio* Sr., have endowed us with an excellent quality — strength — in spite of the horrors of life there. We have come to realize the strength of cohesion, the strength of solidarity. This has helped us to hold out . . .

Behind the junta's prison bars, *Rosa Barrera* said, differences of view recede into the background. What stands out is unity of something that already bears fruit all over the country . . . In October 1974 the regime murdered Miguel Enriquez, a MIR leader. That day an officer came into our cell. He knew there had been a young man from MIR in the cell next to ours, behind the wooden partition. 'You should feel happy,' the officer said in a loud voice, 'because Miguel Enriquez is dead. After all, you Communists never liked him. That means we did you a good turn.' 'You don't know the Communists,' I told him. 'We cannot rejoice because you've killed Miguel Enriguez even though we always insisted that MIR was playing an erroneous and fatal role in the process the country was going through. Enriquez has fallen in a cause he considered just. We respect him for that. He's certain to be remembered by the people as a victim of the fight against you.' That evening the officer deprived us of our meal. But he was unable to sow discord among the prisoners . . . Communists in prison constantly talk with fellow-inmates from MIR to persuade them that they are wrong on many things. An aim which Communists are pursuing in fascist captivity is to unite the prisoners.

Samuel Riquelme, the son of a miner and a peasant, member of the CC CPC, joined in a strike at the age of 13. That was in 1936, when he says he chose communism.

Under the Popular Unity government, for almost a year, he was Deputy Director General of the Department of Investigation of the Ministry of the Interior. He fought day and night, never sparing himself, against conspirators and terrorists, black-marketeers abetted by reaction, drug traffickers. He saw his task as a Communist in having the police, which had so recently faithfully served reaction and was staffed by virtually the same people, do its constitutional duty of protecting the people's government. The junta promised a reward of 500,000 escudos to anyone who would reveal Riquelme's whereabouts.

Riquelme spent almost two years in a Santiago prison, at the

National Stadium and Chile Stadium and in the Tres Alamos Puchuncavi and Ritoque concentration camps. His body bears the marks of the most atrocious tortures. But like Rosa and thousands of other Communists and anti-fascists, he could proudly tell his comrades: 'This mouth has said nothing.'

I would like to explain the meaning of the struggle going on in prison, *S. Riquelme* said. The fascists want to crush Chile's patriots at all costs, to break them morally and physically. This is why Communists help as best they can comrades who arrive in prison or camp in a poor physical condition and occasionally also in a state of depression. We must raise their morale.

The junta's captives demand more and more emphatically that political prisoners be respected as persons. They fight for better food, for medical aid to those who have undergone brutal tortures, for elementary sanitation. They show their jailers that the prisoners are human beings and not the band of common criminals the junta makes them out to be.

On May 1, 1975, I was in Ritoque camp along with Luis Corvalan and other Popular Unity leaders. In spite of the threats of massive repression, we celebrated the revolutionary holiday in one of Chile's biggest prison camps. We did it in as dignified a manner as we could under the circumstances.

Prison authorities often give in to the political prisoners' demands. While keeping up a reign of massive terror, the junta dreads the people, the mounting intensity of their struggle, the growing international solidarity with Chilean patriots. In marking May Day in Ritoque, we knew that it was being observed all over the country, that anti-fascist unity was also gathering strength, beyond the camp's barbed wire.

'We will come back, Motherland'

'Dear Comrade,

'. . . I liked your letter very much because it shows a clear and correct understanding of the duty we Communists must fulfill. Thank you very much for your advice — it helped me greatly. I study in this wonderful fraternal country, Cuba. Everything is all right. As a participant in socialist emulation, I exceeded my commitments and was recognized as a model pupil . . .'

These lines are quoted from a letter written by Fyodor, the son of Isidoro Carrillo, a Communist miner shot by the fascists, to a friend living in the GDR.

Confinement in a junta place of detention puts the greatest physical and moral strain on every patriot. But even life in exile, far

from one's kin, requires militancy and complete self-denial even when one's needs are seen to, as in the case of Chilean political emigres in socialist countries. There is an anti-fascist front in emigration as well.

Samuel Riquelme treasures Luis Corvalan's parting words.

'You'll probably go to a socialist country,' Luis Corvalan said among other things, *S. Riquelme* reminisced. 'Be sure to convey the opinion of our Party leadership to the Chilean comrades working there . . . We must look into the work Communists are doing over there. Just what is it? Do they make proper use of opportunities? They must not for one moment forget that the day of return will come. And to bring it nearer and eliminate the fascist junta as soon as possible, we must promote unity with the Socialist Party and build up the people's anti-fascist unity. It is also important to see to the training of specialists who could serve their country on returning. We must take care of the young Chileans who have gone abroad, of children. We must do all we can for them not to forget their country. After all, the day will come when the Party and the revolution will demand that they join effectively in struggle . . .

'We must analyze again and again all that happened. We must get to the roots of our principle mistakes. In essence, it was the fact that we didn't take proper account of Lenin's statement that every Communist, revolutionary party must be prepared for the most diverse conditions of class struggle, for a rapid change of form. This is why we must ensure that our cadres steadfastly raise the standard of their ideological and political training . . .'

We emigres are part of the people, said *N. Hidalgo*. We have a common goal, which is to overthrow the fascist junta. Every Chilean must contribute his share to the attainment of this goal. I am convinced that Chilean revolutionaries can learn a lot from the working class and its parties operating in capitalist countries. As for those who are living in socialist countries, they can see for themselves that socialism as a reality is not a gift from heaven but the fruit of hard work by the people under the leadership of Communist and Workers' parties. It is our duty to make a deep study of the immense experiences of socialist construction and its laws so as to use this knowledge in the specific conditions of Chile. We must also fully master the Leninist conception of proletarian internationalism, we must learn it ourselves and teach it to our children. It is our duty, if only because we have never realized as strongly as in these days of tragedy for our country, what militant proletarian internationalism and fraternal international solidarity mean.

I see the duty of all my compatriots who are unfortunately far from

their country, *O. Puccio*, a Socialist, continued, in helping in every way those who are fighting fascism back home. I think this help could be very considerable if we achieved unity and made the anti-fascist front as broad as possible. President Allende said that we must call into our ranks all who are willing to fight against fascism and to discard all pettiness and sectarianism. The example of Allende, Corvalan and other anti-fascist heroes should teach us to overcome all difficulties and resist the danger of self-isolation . . .

Only mass struggle will bring victory

The Communist Party is alive and fighting and this is an indisputable reality in today's Chile. The tasks and forms of this struggle were revealed by a leader of the Communist Party of Chile who worked for a long time in illegal conditions. We withhold his real name for obvious reasons. To the journal's correspondents, he was 'Comrade Jose.'

All our efforts are aimed at evolving an alternative to the dictatorship, one that the people, first of all the working class, would appreciate by virtue of its scope, clarity and democratic, popular and revolutionary character, accepting it as a road to victory, an alternative that would strengthen the people's will for struggle to overthrow fascism. I mean a broad anti-fascist front, which we have advocated ever since the early days following the coup.

The Communists' manifold activities contribute toward achieving this goal. Our primary task was to adapt the Party's organizing work to the difficult conditions of illegality. It was accomplished in spite of the telling blows we were dealt. Our Party is now in a position organizationally to mobilize thousands of its rank-and-file members. Its ability to win new fighters is growing day by day. Other Popular Unity parties are beginning a similar activity.

Another highly important task was to maintain our links with the masses, to preserve and safeguard the independence of the vast network of organizations brought into being by the people to protect their interests. The fascists fiercely attacked these organizations to destroy or subject them. However, their attempts got them nowhere. Most of the mass organizations continue to express the interests of their membership and have been steadily improving the standard of their struggle and their activity generally. It is within mass organizations that relations between anti-fascists — Marxists, non-party people, Christians — are developing most effectively. Our Party members make a decisive contribution to this process.

We must leave fascism no room for action in any public sphere. Flexibly combining legal with illegal forms of struggle makes it possi-

ble to closely interlink actions for immediate demands and for the decisive issue, that of power, of removing the junta. We are fighting primarily for the masses. But this fight must also set in motion anti-fascists or non-fascists among the military, those who are aware of the country's present drama.

These activities express themselves in devoted struggle by thousands of Communists. There are 'workaday' heroes among them, those whose efforts are often hardly noticeable and yet are of decisive importance, and heroes whose effort helps the masses to accomplish truly impressive actions. There is no point in singling out anyone, for they constitute a collective hero, the Party.

Our effort to set up an anti-fascist front now consists above all in work at grass roots. We strive to educate the masses and learn the art of always putting the people's common interests first so that we can form a united front against the chief enemy. Joint actions by the big national trade union federations, by youth, women's and neighborhood organizations and by associations of members of the middle strata promote their advance toward an anti-fascist front.

We seek new forms of dialogue between anti-fascist political forces and reject the arguments of those who have made political capital from the people's disunity. In the past, that disunity bred artificial antagonisms and played into the enemy's hands. The foremost task is to build up Popular Unity, called into life by the most determined and intelligent supporters of revolutionary social changes in the country, and to vigorously strengthen Socialist-Communist unity within this bloc. We regard this as a solid basis on which all anti-fascist forces can advance toward unity.

Last December our Party drew two conclusions, which subsequent events proved correct. It said that the decline of the dictatorship was nearing and that the regime remains in power not so much by force of arms as owing to the disunity of anti-fascist forces. This disunity is being eliminated step by step while the junta has begun to decline. Victory will be certain if Popular Unity grows strong enough and if a broad alternative to the dictatorship is evolved before long assuring unity of action with the Christian Democrats, and the bulk of independents. We are faced with a difficult struggle which can be won only if the masses join in it. This is a conclusion prompted by almost three years of struggle. Courageous work by thousands of revolutionaries has made it possible to stop the downturn in the popular movement that set in after defeat and to carry out increasingly resolute mass actions. This makes us confident of victory. 'We want to tell our comrades that our morale is high,' said the wife of Jose Weibel, a Communist who 'disappeared' a few months ago. 'I have lost my husband, the father of my children, but I am proud to have

been his friend in struggle. He is a model for young people, for all anti-fascist fighters.'

Who benefits by the assassination of Torres?

LETTER FROM BOLIVIA

All working people and democrats of our country opposed to the fascist Banzer regime were deeply shocked by the assassination this June in Argentina of General Torres, former President of Bolivia. This new fascist crime was condemned in Latin America and the world over.

Attacks on outstanding personalities of the anti-fascist resistance of Chile and Uruguay and the murder of General Torres testify to the intensified terrorist activity of the ultra-rightists and their use of increasingly brutal methods against revolutionaries and anti-fascists.

Kidnapping, torture and political crimes are particularly widespread in Latin American countries with fascist or pro-fascist regimes or where U.S. imperialism and the ultra-right oligarchies are bent on abolishing all democratic institutions. Political, trade union and student leaders, political emigres, prominent progressives are being systematically slain.

This terrorism is coordinated by reactionaries in various countries and carred out by CIA-trained gangs of killers on the payroll of corresponding reactionary governments.

The assassination of General Torres who played a prominent role in the anti-dictatorship opposition was part of an organized terror campaign against the workers' and mass movement on the continent. The facts show that it was prepared and carried out in cold blood.

In this connection we should like to recall that while he was President (October 1970-August 1971) General Torres adhered to democratic, progressive positions. During the short period he was in office a number of steps were taken in the working people's interests: miner's wages were increased, civil rights and freedoms were respected, wide scope was ensured for trade union and political activities, some of the mining enterprises were renationalized, and Bolivia's relations with the socialist countries improved. This patriotic and anti-imperialist policy was vehemently opposed by the

reactionaries and rightist elements in the armed forces, supported by U.S. imperialism and the Brazilian 'gorillas' who took advantage of the irresponsible actions of the ultra-leftists. Torres was overthrown and exiled. But in emigration, too, he continued persistently to support the Bolivian people's anti-fascist struggle.

It is only natural that Torres, one of the most prominent personalities in the democratic and anti-fascist opposition, commanded high prestige among the people. That was why the dictatorship, the CIA and the ultra-rightist terroristic gangs operating in Argentina and other countries decided to get rid of him.

Political tensions began rising last May, when the congress of the Bolivian Miners' Federation demanded higher wages, respect for democratic rights and freedoms and other social gains. Two weeks prior to the General's assassination this militant union suggested negotiations with the regime. The dictatorship did not react to the proposal, awaiting an appropriate time to start reprisals. The death of Torres gave rise to a wave of indignation, with workers and students calling protest strikes. The dictatorship cynically described this as part of a 'subversive plan' and introduced a state of emergency, followed by mass arrests, exile of hundreds of trade union, student and political leaders, and other unlawful acts.

This did not stop the mass movement. The miners are continuing their heroic resistance in spite of the fact that they have been denied food, water and electricity. It is two weeks, at the time of this writing, since the general strike was called. In the history of the Bolivian workers' movement there are not many such examples of patriotism, courage and determination to defend the people's rights, sovereignty and dignity.

Latin American reaction has not been and will never be able to destroy the people's spirit of patriotism and their urge for freedom.

L.V.

June 1976.

Socialist Republic of Vietnam

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam, a new state in the socialist world system, was proclaimed by the National Assembly elected on April 25, 1976. The whole people took part in the elections held on the entire territory of Vietnam. 'The Socialist Republic of Vietnam,' says the National Assembly declaration, 'is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which includes the entire country and is based on the worker-peasant alliance with the working class playing the leading role.'

The SRV has a population of about 50 million. The capital: Hanoi. The flag: a five-pointed gold star on a red background. The state emblem: a gold star embraced on both sides by sheaves of rice and half a cogwheel with the words 'Socialist Republic of Vietnam' in a circle on a red background. The national anthem: the song 'March to the Front.'

Ton Duc Thang was elected President of the country; Truong Chinh, Chairman of the National Assembly Standing Committee; and Pham Van Dong, Prime Minister.

The Working People's Party of Vietnam, the leading and guiding force in the country, was founded in 1930 (prior to 1951 it was called the Communist Party of Indochina). As of today, the Party has a membership of 1,100,000, including candidate members. Le Duan is its First Secretary.

The Party exercises its leading role in cooperation with the Socialist and Democratic parties and other mass organizations. The Ho Chi Minh Working Youth Union has close to three million members.

At the time of unification the socio-economic and political development levels in the North and South were very different. Socialist changes had been effected in the North, in the former DRV. Socialist transformation of private capital was carried out: by 1960, nearly 100 per cent of private business had been transformed. By the close of that year agriculture had in the main been placed on a cooperative basis. After the first five-year plan (1961-65) the socialist sector accounted for 95 per cent in industry and 85 per cent in agriculture.

In colonial Vietnam there was 95 per cent total illiteracy; some national minorities had no written language. Illiteracy was wiped out in the DRV. By 1960 all school-age children were studying.

The U.S. aggression arrested Vietnam's development for more than 10 years, and in order to make up for lost time, accelerated economic rehabilitation was planned (1974-75) to surpass the highest production levels of 1966 and 1971 so as to launch the new, 1976-80 five-year plan.

By the end of 1975 the DRV's economic potential had considerably surpassed the 1965 level, with electric power increasing 2.4 times, machine building 2.5 times and consumer goods 75 per cent. Agricultural output went up 11.5 per cent and livestock raising, 21.4 per cent.

The situation in the South, devastated by the aggressor and the Saigon puppets, was entirely different: a stagnant industry, destroyed roads, highways, canals, bridges ... At the time of liberation there were 260,000 political prisoners in South Vietnam's prisons and concentration camps. The country had approximately three million unemployed, almost one million orphans, 250,000 invalids requiring medical attention, over 500,000 depraved and corrupted. Tuberculosis, syphilis, malaria and other diseases were widespread.

All this could not, of course, be abolished in the course of one year. However, the people's revolutionary regime was able to overcome the chaos and restore law and order. Large groups of counter-revolutionaries were disarmed, reactionary parties and organizations dissolved, new, progressive legislation was introduced, people's courts and procurators' offices formed. The population received extensive democratic rights and political freedoms. Hunger was done away with and almost a million unemployed returned to work. The peasants took possession of land abandoned by the former landlords and feudals. The public sector in industry was founded, embracing close to 70 per cent of all enterprises. More than 7,000 industrial enterprises were restored, 12,000 kilometres of canals and dams were built or restored. Today in Ho Chi Minh City (former Saigon) almost all of the 3,563 industrial enterprises are functioning. In Quangnam, Da Nang Province, formerly the scene of the most fierce battles, of the 400,000 unemployed almost all have been given work or have returned to their villages, and 811 of the 822 enterprises are now functioning.

The peasants in the South are farming more than 500,000 hectares of unused or fallow lands. In the first few months after liberation more than 10,000 schools were opened and were attended by five million children. Literacy and other courses were attended by about one million persons this spring.

The Vietnamese people have started building the material and technical base of socialism throughout all of Vietnam.

Editions of the journal

'PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM'

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

(World Marxist Review)
Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WCIX 8PS, England.

Progress Subscription Service
487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto, Ontario, M5V IT4, Canada.

Imported Publications, 320 W. Ohio St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, USA.

Problems of Peace and Socialism, 5 Rani Jhansi Rd., New Delhi 55, India.

FRENCH EDITIONS:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et d'Information, 9 Boulevard des Italiens, 75 Paris 2e, France.

Librairie Nouvelles Frontières, 96 ouest, rue Sherbrooke, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wakt, P.O.B. 6247, Beirut, Lebanon.

AL-Thakafah Al-Jadidah, Al-Saadoon St., Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Bagdad, Iraq.

BENGALI EDITION: Manisha Granthalay Private Ltd., 4/3 B. Bankim, Chatterjee St., Calcutta 12, India.

BULGARIAN EDITION: 'Russki' 6, 'Hemus', Sofia, Bulgaria.

CZECH EDITION: Artia, Praha 2, Nové Mesto, Ve smeckach 30, CSSR.

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden, Brodgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark.

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti, Kotkankatu 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland.

GERMAN EDITIONS:

'Buckexport' Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb der DDR, 701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR.

'Globus', Vertrieb ausländischer Zeitschriften 1200 Wien, Hochstädtplatz 3, Austria.

Brücken-Verlag GmbH, Literaturvertrieb, Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf, Ackerstrasse 3, FRG.

GREEK EDITION: Papajanis Stephanos, Emanuil Benaki 25-6' Athens, Greece.

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace and Socialism, P.O.B. 9525, Haifa, Israel.

HINDI EDITION: Bihar State Council CPI, Ajay Bhawan, Patna 4, India.

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura, Könyv-és Hirlap Külkereskedelmi Vallalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary.

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita, Via della Botteghe, Oscura 4, 001 86 Roma, Italy.

JAPANESE EDITION: Nauka Ltd. 2, Kandu Zinbocho 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

MALAYALAM EDITION:
5 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 55, India.

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbatar Mongol Ulsyn Namyn, Khudaldaany Gazar V.I. Leninii Gudamzh 41, Mongolia.

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Boks 3715, Oslo 1, Norway.

PERSIAN EDITION:
P.B. 49034, 10028, Stockholm 49, Sweden.

POLISH EDITION: RSW, 'Prasa-ksiazka-ruch' BWKZ, Warszawa ul. Wronia 23, Poland.

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional, Av. Santos Dumont, 57, 2 Lisboa-I, Portugal.

PUNJABI EDITION: Punjab Book Centre, 1038 Sector 22-B, opp. General Bus Stand, Chandigarh, India.

RUMANIAN EDITION: I.C.E. 'Libri', Calea Victoriei 126, Bucaresti, Rumania.

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, Smolenskaya-Sennaya 32/34, Moscow 121200, USSR.

SINHALESE EDITION:
91 Cotta Road, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka.

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo, Apt. Aereo 1253, Bogotà, Colombia.

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A. Filosofia y Letras 34, Copilco Universidad, Mexico 20, D.F. Mexico.

Ideologia y Politica, Fr Rufino Torrico N' 671-Of. 401, Lima, Peru.

Edificio Cantaclaro, Esquina San Pedro, Parroquia San Juan, Caracás, Venezuela.

Libreria Internacional, Apdo 758, San José, Costa Rica.

Editorial 'Anteo,' Entre Rios 103³, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Revista Internacional, Calle 46 Este, No. 16, Panamá, Rep. de Panamá.

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa, 16616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR.

SWEDISH EDITION: Förlagsaktiebolaget Internationell Revy, Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden.

TURKISH EDITION: 1 Berlin 10, Postfach 100 229, West Berlin.

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp khâu Sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng, Há-nôi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam.