WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

October 1979, Volume 22, Number 10 $1.00

Workers of all countries, unite!

WORLD
Problems of
MARXIST
Peace and Socialism
REVIEW

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

October 1979, Vol. 22, No. 10

Features

3 A period of great achievement
E. Honecker

7 Instrument of construction
Z. Batmunh

12 The party of hope, the party of the future
O. Pato

Exchange of views

17 Revolution and democracy
International scientific conference

29 The communists and public opinion
P. Boychuck, J. Laborde

Future of mankind and science

34 Monopolies and technological progress
I. Nørlund

36 Capitalism over the next two decades
N. Inozemtsev

The party

39 Looking to the future
T. Bozhinov

43 New experience

Viewpoints

46 Maoist policy and China's future
S. Sudiman

50 The parameters of state enterprise
G. Smirnov

54 Sweden under monopoly rule
C. Hermansson

Revolution: the ways to it

57 Harbinger of coming battles
C. Gonzales

60 The perspective of the people's movement
A. Parreto

63 The objective prerequisites of change
J. Barrios

The press

65 Who orchestrates the Labour Party's policy?
B. Matthews

67 Zionism: substance and practices
S. Khalil

69 Facts and fairy tales
A.I.

71 New books

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

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

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is the North American edition of the monthly journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM published in Prague.

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

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

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

In the USA from IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS, 320 West Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

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

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

feature

A period of great achievement

Erich Honecker
General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee,
Chairman of the GDR State Council

THE GDR'S 30 YEARS OF STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIALISM

On October 7, 1979, the German Democratic Republic — the first German socialist state of workers and peasants — is 30 years old. In the three decades, our people, led by the working class and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, have travelled a road of fundamental revolutionary transformations in every sphere of social life, a road of persevering work, great sacrifice, and ceaseless and bitter class struggle against imperialism. Today we can say that we have done a great deal. The historical superiority of socialism, the only social system that gives all the working people a feeling of social confidence, true freedom, democracy and human rights, has also been convincingly demonstrated on German soil.

The GDR's formation marked a turning point in the history of the German people and the whole of Europe. The new state eradicated imperialism and militarism, with their pernicious spirit of reaction and aggression, and put an end to man's exploitation of man. We have learned the lessons of the execrable past, when German monopoly capitalism repeatedly plunged the German and other peoples into disaster. We have learned these lessons in the light of the general uniformities of our epoch, which manifest themselves in the transition to socialism throughout the world. Today, the GDR, in close unity with the USSR and the other fraternal countries, is a politically stable and economically healthy state, recognized all over the world and enjoying high international prestige. It is in the van of the fighters for peace and socialism, for anti-imperialist solidarity.

Naturally, the working people of our country are justly proud of their achievements over the past three decades. We are happy at the response which the GDR's 30th anniversary has evoked in the fraternal socialist countries and other friendly states, and also among our comrades and fellow-fighters in the communist and national-revolutionary parties and movements. In point of fact, our anniversary is celebrated by all the peace-loving and progressive forces of the world, for the establishment of the worker and peasant power in the GDR, which has successfully developed and grown stronger over the past three decades, not only agreed with our people's vital interests, but is also highly important in promoting progress throughout the world.

The formation and growth of the new, socialist Germany has from the outset been closely tied in with the world revolutionary process started by the Red October Revolution. Our people will never forget that the way to a new future was opened by the victory over German fascism scored by the Soviet Union and the other states of the anti-Hitler coalition. That victory, which saved mankind from the fascist yoke, cost the glorious Soviet people 20 million lives, whose memory we shall always revere. The GDR, which emerged as a result of the defeat of German fascism and the world's postwar development, embodies the aspirations of German and other anti-fascists, and also of the revolutionaries who championed the working-class cause, of many humanists and democrats. Throughout the German people's long and tempestuous history, they worked for a future free from reactionary and aggressive regimes, for the establishment in Germany of a progressive social system fit for man and permeated with a spirit of friendship with other peoples. In our republic, these aspirations have been translated into reality.

Socialism has taken root in German soil once and for all. The changes here have been vast: the GDR has travelled the road from anti-fascist and democratic transformations in the early postwar years to the present day, when a developed socialist society is being built in the GDR and, as it was pointed out in the resolutions of the Ninth Congress of the SUPG (1976), prerequisites are being created for a gradual transition to communism. The transformations range across the whole sphere of social relations, material production and culture. Their substance and scope show that, when in power, the working class and its party can successfully tackle all the problems arising in the course of society's renewal, only if they are consistently guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and rely on a strong alliance with the farmers, the intelligentsia and the other working people.

By the time the GDR was set up in 1949, much had been done in our country under the SUPG's leadership to overcome the chaos engendered by fascism and war, and to purge men's minds from the noxious spirit of racism, nationalism and militarism. But the country had yet to recover from the devastation, and there was hopelessness and confusion in the minds of many people. At that time, it took much imagination to envisage the socialist future advocated by our party, the happy life that was to be created by free labor. Today, 30 years later, reality has far surpassed the visions of that period. Our people have proved that socialism

is the only realistic alternative to capitalism on German soil as well.

The GDR is now among the world's ten leading industrial countries, although in area it ranks 102nd, and in population 37th in the world. From 1949 to 1978, its national income increased from 22,400 million marks to 161,100 million marks. In that period, the country's agricultural production more than doubled. We started building socialism in the industrially less developed part of the old 'German Reich.' Imperialism did its utmost to obstruct and bring to a standstill the GDR's economic development through ceaseless sabotage, speculation, blockade and blackmail. But owing to our socialist relations of production and economic planning, the GDR's economy has been growing steadily.

Under the worker and peasant power, the GDR people have achieved great revolutionary gains, which have gone to benefit the people themselves, enabling them to lead a decent life and giving them, as Marx put it, broader access to the life-giving sources of social wealth. In this context, special note should be taken of the ramified socialist education system, which has won broad international recognition. All children in the GDR go through a ten-year course at school; and all young men and women are provided with solid occupational training and, later on, with a job. More than 1.2 million young people have already gone through complete courses of secondary special or higher education. This reflects the policy of the party and state aimed at equipping the people with knowledge, occupational skills and other abilities that are increasingly necessary for participation in the conscious and balanced building of our society. We educate our working people in a spirit of peace and socialism, anti-fascism, socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

Throughout the whole of German history, science, culture and the arts have never had such scope for development as in the GDR's three decades. In their large-scale creative endeavor, science and culture have been successfully fulfilling their humanistic duty: to serve the people, promote social progress, and enrich the people's life. Culture and the arts have undoubtedly made an impressive contribution to the Republic's successful development over the past three decades.

In the GDR's early years, only a few countries — its closest allies — recognized it in international law. Today, 128 states maintain diplomatic relations with it. The GDR is a member of the United Nations and its special agencies. As a sovereign, independent and equal socialist state, it plays a fitting role in international affairs and takes a constructive part in the solution of urgent international problems.

The GDR's achievements, its steady and successful development are not just a reflection of the new international balance of forces that has taken shape since the Second World War. Our own successes have also helped to effect these changes. The GDR's fraternal alliance with the USSR and other socialist-community countries enables it better to fulfill its duty in the struggle for peace and socialism. It is better able to tackle the tasks arising in the course of further socialist construction and in the drive to achieve the long-term goals written into the SUPG's Program adopted at its Ninth Congress.

The SUPG has always started from Lenin's proposition that the crucial question of any revolution is that of power. In seeking to solve the question of 'Who will beat whom' in favor of the working people in the conditions of a hard and complicated class struggle, the party was guided by the conclusion of the Marxist-Leninist theory that transition to socialism can be effected only when the working class commands political power. This general uniformity was brought out and established by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and confirmed by the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The party has always acted consistently in accordance with this uniformity and applied it in the concrete conditions of our struggle. The SUPG has taken account of the experience in the class struggle which shows that once the worker and peasant power has been won, it can be successful only if it is reliably safeguarded against enemy encroachments.

The setting up of the socialist worker and peasant state marked the beginning of the socialist stage in the overall revolutionary process in this country. Owing to creative use of Lenin's theory, the party was able to tie in the anti-fascist and democratic revolution with struggle for socialism. Constantly assessing its achievements and thoroughly analyzing the level of the masses' consciousness, the party effected a gradual transition from the first to the second stage of the revolution. In our advance along the road of socialist revolution, we have laid the foundations of socialism in the GDR and are building a developed socialist society, with the contours of the communist future already taking shape.

The GDR's concrete experience once again confirmed the conclusion that, if the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party play the leading role at every stage of the revolutionary process, this will make it possible to win over to socialism the bulk of the people and muster them for the building of the new society. Taking that as a point of departure, the Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party of Germany united in April 1946 in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, overcoming the pernicious divisions within the working class engendered by imperialism and opportunism. The SUPG's experience shows that sound working-class unity is possible only on a revolutionary basis. Our unity was forged in the anti-fascist resistance movement, in the torture-chambers and concentration camps. In working for the unification of the CPG and the SDPG, we accumulated valuable experience, which confirmed the common-front principles elaborated by the Communist International. That experience showed once again that the way to working-class unity runs through joint action, primarily by communists and social democrats. In the struggle to meet partial demands and attain immediate goals, to effect revolutionary transformations in line with the working people's interests, we agreed in our

ideas on socialism as the goal of the working class and on the ways leading to socialism.

Socialism can only be the result of conscious, well-organized efforts by the working class and its allies, by millions of working people. That is why we have always seen ideological work as pivotal to the party's entire activity and have attached paramount importance to the spread of the Marxist-Leninist outlook. The fact that it has become the dominant ideology of our society is one of our major successes. More and more people are gaining a deeper understanding of the inherent natural and social uniformities, of the interconnections between the economics and politics, and this is a source of their lasting loyalty to the socialist way, a source of historical optimism, which has enabled us to stand the grim tests of the class struggle.

In the GDR, the right and freedoms of the working people have not only been proclaimed, but also guaranteed. The citizens have all the political, economic, social and cultural opportunities for enjoying their rights in practice. A well-tested slogan, 'Take part in work, planning and management,' is increasingly becoming the norm of everyday life. Our party regards the strengthening of the worker and peasant state and improvement of socialist democracy as its constant task, whose fulfillment will help further to bring out the people's creative initiative for the benefit of the whole of society and its every citizen.

The 1970s marked the beginning of a new period in the GDR's development, which is regarded as the most successful in its history. On a broader scale and at a qualitatively higher stage, we are now working to realize socialism's main goal: to do everything for the benefit of man. At its Eighth Congress in 1971, the party studied from every angle the question of building a developed socialist society and mapped out the main lines of its economic and social policy.

The SUPG formulated the major task, which is to continue raising the people's material and cultural living standards on the basis of rapid development of socialist production, its greater efficiency, scientific and technical progress, and higher labor productivity. The party emphasized the importance of gearing production to human requirements to an even greater extent, and of raising the people's material and cultural living standards. On the other hand, it pointed out the main prerequisite for the implementation of such a line: intensification of production was to become the main instrument in the drive to increase the country's economic potential. So, the state's economic policy and mass initiative was more decisively keyed to higher quality and greater efficiency. An important point to note here is that scientific and technical progress is increasingly a concern of the whole people, for the people come to realize better than ever before that under socialism they themselves stand to gain from this progress. The economic and social upswing that we have achieved in this country since then shows that the party had correctly assessed the country's development level and had drawn the correct conclusions.

The GDR does not have many natural resources, which is why we were heavily affected by the sharp rise in the prices of raw materials and fuel on the world market. In spite of that, our party's Ninth Congress decided to continue pursuing its policy aimed at solving the main problem. This was made possible only by the successes in building up our country's economic strength. In the new conditions, the conjunction of economic and social policy demands deeper and faster intensification of production. It is necessary markedly to enhance the economic effect from the application of the latest achievements of science and technology. We have concentrated our efforts on consistently reducing the per-unit inputs of costly and scarce materials. By turning out goods on a high scientific and technical level, we seek to make the best use of the raw materials involved. In the present conditions, the key component of our economic policy — the building up of the material and technical basis of production — comes to the fore.

Our successes in all the other spheres crucially depend on the growth of our economic potential. This factor is of decisive importance in realizing our socio-political program, the most extensive program of its kind in the GDR. It is pivoted on housing construction, with the task of building or modernizing 3.5 million flats. In this way, we want to solve the housing problem as a social problem by 1990. The housing problem is especially acute because of the shortcomings in construction under capitalism and the destruction wrought by the Second World War. Since 1971, we have already built 1.1 million flats.

The goals we have set ourselves in building a developed socialist society are not simple in any sense. But the GDR's three decades are the source of our optimism and confidence that we shall be able to cope with these tasks, because history has shown very well the tremendous creative forces which socialism generates. The close alliance of the working-class party with the working people is an alliance based on trust, and it helps us to stand the hardest trials and successfully to solve the most complicated problems. Our ties with the masses are the source of our strength, which allows us not only to use but also to multiply all the advantages of socialism, and display our society's superiority over capitalism.

The development of socialism is stable and dynamic, while the world of the monopolies cannot cope with its crisis. For us, social confidence is a daily reality. But under capitalism, only one thing is sure: the future of the working people has been and will continue to be uncertain. In contrast to the capitalist world's unemployment, partial employment and recurrent ups and downs which worsen the social conditions of life for masses of people, we have full employment and a steady upward trend in development.

In the 24 industrialized capitalist countries, there is a total of 20 million unemployed, and 40 per cent of them are people under the age of 25, which

epitomizes the malaise of the monopoly society. That system is incapable of opening up before the young any dignified prospects. On the contrary, it plunges a sizable part of the young into drug addiction and crime, and produces a crisis in education, so exposing itself as a historical anachronism. Ideas like freedom and humanity, which are endlessly repeated by the ruling circles of capitalist society, are no more than hollow words in the conditions of that system.

Of primary importance for the GDR's 30-year history is the fact that our socialist state has been advancing shoulder to shoulder with the fraternal countries, and with the Soviet Union, the mightiest champion of progress. Our friendship with Lenin's party and country has from the outset been and continues to be the basis of our successes. Even in the period when the Soviet Union itself had to make good the terrible destruction inflicted by war, it gave us disinterested support in word and deed as we started out to build a new life. This fraternal unity paved the way for the development of the worker and peasant state on German soil and served it as constant support. This unity grew stronger and became ever more fruitful in every sphere of life, in the interests of both fraternal peoples, the interests of socialist and communist construction. The new Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed between the GDR and the USSR in Moscow on October 7, 1975, raised the relations between our two countries to a qualitatively higher level. It determined the main lines of fruitful cooperation between the USSR and the GDR over the long term running beyond the end of this millennium. At the same time, it made a great contribution to the gradual integration of the peoples of the socialist community.

The ever closer interlacing of the scientific, technological and economic potentials of the USSR and the GDR is a characteristic feature of our socialist planned economy, and an important basis of our country's economic stability. This cooperation enables it to take part in tackling all the major problems and making use of the broad potentialities of scientific and technical progress, on the earth and in outer space. Our friendship with the Soviet Union exemplifies the new type of international relations, shaped in the community of socialist countries, which are also manifested in the economic sphere.

Together with the USSR and other fraternal countries, the GDR has been making an active contribution to socialist economic integration. The closer our cooperation, which meets the interests of the individual countries and the community as a whole, the broader our potentialities for solving our development problems within the national framework. Our 30-year experience has fully confirmed the conclusion drawn by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which he formulated in a message of greetings to the 33rd session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. He said: 'Socialist economic integration has become an inalienable feature of our community's life, a mighty and stable factor of the fraternal countries' all-round progress.'

With the crisis phenomena in the imperialist economy, the sharp growth of prices, and the ever more acute shortage of raw materials on the world markets, the socialist countries' joint efforts to develop the energy and raw material stocks have become even more important for the GDR. This and other vital problems — the development of engineering and transport, the expansion of the output of foodstuffs and consumer goods — are being tackled within the framework of long-term cooperation. The great advantage of the Program of Specialization and Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR, now being elaborated, also consists in the definition of long-term prospects for cooperation. The basic lines of bilateral cooperation have also been agreed with the other fraternal countries. Ultimately, these schemes for cooperation and specialization are the pivot for the CMEA's long-term goal-oriented programs which we have worked out and adopted together.

Implementation of such projects helps to consolidate socialism and increase its influence on world development. After all, on this influence largely depends world peace and the further rise of national-liberation and social-emancipation movements and the anti-imperialist struggle. That is how, as an internationalist contribution to the common cause, we regard the GDR's achievements in the past three decades. During the visits last February to four African countries — Libya, Angola, Zambia and Mozambique — by a party and state delegation which I headed, we saw for ourselves that these peoples entirely support us in this matter, because the greater the strength of socialism, the more effective the solidarity with their struggle.

The stronger the positions of socialism, the more successfully will it be possible to solve for the benefit of this and coming generations the problem of war and peace, the key issue in mankind's life today. The GDR has consecrated itself to the struggle for peace since its inception. It declared its resolve to do everything to prevent war from ever again starting from German territory, and it has remained true to this oath. Over the 30 years, in the course of which Europe has repeatedly been on the very brink of another world war, our party and the GDR government have pursued, shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, a consistent and constructive policy of peace. We have helped to bring about the switch from the 'cold war' to détente, which has opened up fresh potentialities for establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The GDR's 30 years are simultaneously three decades of peace on our continent. This is the longest period in the history of Europe without war. This has been achieved by the tremendous efforts of the Soviet Union, in the first place, and all the states of the socialist community. Largely because of it, realistically minded government circles in the capitalist countries began to understand that in our

day there is no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence. The peoples' urge for peace has been strengthened, and the numbers of those prepared to act for peace have grown. But the danger of a third world war has not yet been eliminated. That is why there is a need to continue the persistent and resolute struggle to ensure lasting peace and to make it a natural condition of human life.

The vital and most complicated problem of our day is to end the arms race, to limit the stockpiling of weapons, and take effective steps toward disarmament. For these purposes, the Warsaw Treaty countries' Political Consultative Committee adopted in November 1978 the Moscow Declaration, which is an acceptable program for negotiation. Since then, many new and constructive steps have been taken in this direction. We regard as an outstanding international event, serving the interests of peace, the Vienna meeting between Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and President Jimmy Carter of the United States. The signing of SALT-2 is a victory for reason and good will. The peoples pin their hopes on the ratification of this Treaty in Moscow and in Washington, because it will ease the way to disarmament and promote the relaxation of tensions. It has become evident that, given the appropriate approach, the most intricate problems in averting war can be solved. The Soviet Union's great role in the struggle to ensure lasting peace has been once again most clearly demonstrated to world opinion. Lenin's country has done an invaluable service to the whole of mankind by fulfilling this mission.

These facts show up the emptiness of the claim about a 'threat from the East,' by means of which the most aggressive imperialist circles have tried to justify the unceasing build-up of NATO armaments. These circles dream of a return to the cold war period, and make no secret of the fact that with their hatred for socialism and the peoples' liberation movement they are prepared, in certain conditions, to consider even the annihilation of millions of people in an atomic war. These plans have to be frustrated. That is why, following the objective logic of things, the GDR and other socialist-community states have displayed constant concern to maintain their defense capability on the necessary level. They have no other choice.

On the GDR's 30th anniversary, we assure our friends throughout the world, all the forces of peace and progress, that the communists of the Republic and our whole people are fully aware of their internationalist responsibility, which springs from the fact that the GDR lies at the junction of the two social systems, the two military blocs, the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. We shall continue to work to fulfill this responsibility with honor. Relying on what has been achieved, and in accordance with the decisions of the Ninth Congress of the SUPG, we continue to advance along the way leading to new and loftier goals. In its fourth decade, the German Democratic Republic will continue to make an active contribution to the struggle for peace and socialism.

Instrument of construction

Zhambyn Batmunh
Political Bureau member, CC MPRP, Chairman,
Council of Ministers, MPR

The experience of the community of socialist nations, which shows the wealth and diversity of the forms and methods of society's revolutionary reorganization on socialist lines, draws growing attention today. Interest in this cumulative experience and its compoents is widening as the range of approaches to socialism broadens and more and more countries opt for socialism.

Newly-independent Asian and African states have now adopted the socialist orientation. They face social, economic and political problems arising largely from the fact that their productive forces are small and their socio-economic relations are underdeveloped, as well as from the presence of foreign, primarily monopoly, capital. Our experience and developments in newly-free countries show that after political independence is won the focus of the struggle against imperialism moves to the economic sphere. National freedom, Lenin stressed, cannot be complete without economic liberation. To assure real economic progress is a problem of decisive significance to the present and future of the newly-free countries.

This problem also confronted Mongolia, whose people were among the first in the colonial East to give effect to revolutionary reforms. In a talk with a Mongolian delegation in November 1921, Lenin pointed out that only from the islets of a new economic way of life created under the influence of the party and the government would the new, non-capitalist economic system of peasant Mongolia take shape (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 42, p. 361).

This, as practice has shown, is the sphere in which the state plays a unique role. A country can end its economic backwardness, which requires the abolition of foreign capital domination and feudal-colonial structures, by setting up and developing state and cooperative sectors in the economy, ensuring growing social production and solving a wide range of other social and economic problems.

As we see it, all this can be achieved provided the state intervenes most actively in economic life.

Ours was an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and people's democratic revolution. Its chief locomotive was the arats (peasant herdsmen), who under the leadership of their political vanguard, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, formed a class alliance with Russia's victorious proletariat. The authority born of the revolution was essentially a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the working people.

From the old system we inherited an economy based entirely on nomadic stock-breeding. Pre-revolutionary Mongolia's industry consisted of a few small and primitive enterprises processing animal products and owned mostly by foreign merchants. Its one-sided subsistence economy, typical of all feudal-colonial countries, was in a state of deep stagnation. Feudal relations of production and foreign capitalist domination held up the development of the national market. Foreign capitalists, mostly Chinese merchants and usurers, sucked the lifeblood out of our backward economy.

The productive forces were handicapped by total illiteracy among a population strongly influenced by the Buddhist clergy. Mongolia had hardly any internal accumulation sources for economic growth and lacked a monetary and financial system.

'In a country dominated by pre-bourgeois relations,' wrote Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal, First Secretary of the MPRP CC and Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Khural, 'we had to build the material prerequisites of socialism from scratch, prerequisites that capitalism had taken centuries to create. This meant effecting simultaneously and gradually a series of crucial anti-imperialist and anti-feudal socio-economic changes and going through the necessary intermediate stages of development.'

Central to the democratic changes was the effort to abolish the class of feudal lords and put an end to foreign capitalist economic domination. The political and economic foundations of feudalism were shattered with the abolition of serfdom, the dismantling of the political institutions of the feudal system, the nationalization of the land, the abolition of feudal taxes and duties, the establishment of a progressive tax system, and the partial or total confiscation of the property of big feudal landowners. Moreover, these measures also prevented the emergence of local capitalist elements on the basis of small-commodity production.

To clear the way for Mongolia's non-capitalist development it was vital to free its economy from foreign capitalist influence. That is why, as soon as it was established, the people's power set out to curb and remove that influence.

In addition to its drive to destroy the political and economic foundations of the feudal system and foreign capitalist domination, the people's power set up and consolidated the new political system and shaped a non-capitalist economy consisting of state and cooperative sectors. State and cooperative enterprises, first in trade and then in material production, were formed immediately after the revolution. Monetary and financial relations were placed under state control.

These measures provided effective economic instruments which the state used for consolidating the gains of the revolution and ensuring the nation's non-capitalist development.

In those difficult years and afterwards, the decisive external factor in the struggle for political and economic independence and the establishment of a non-capitalist economic system was our durable alliance and all-round cooperation with the new, socialist world embodied in the homeland of the Great October the Soviet Union. Without this, we could not conceivably have consolidated the gains of the revolution, safeguarded our state sovereignty, and built up a new economy. Gratuitous assistance, loans and credits on easy terms, and the creation of joint Mongolian-Soviet organizations and enterprises, the latter subsequently becoming Mongolian property as they were strengthened economically and Mongolian personnel was trained to run them, are but some of the instances of the all-round, disinterested, internationalist aid from the Soviet Union. Its significance for Mongolia's economic growth can hardly be overestimated.

At the democratic stage of our revolution (1921-40) we laid the groundwork for a national economy and mechanized transport and communications. In the 1930s, we built an industrial complex, a power station, a building materials plant, and enterprises of the light and food industries. In agriculture that period saw the beginnings of the state and cooperative sectors. By 1940 industry had become an established branch of our economy. In step with the development of industry and mechanized transport, the first contingents of a working class came into being and our first engineers were trained. The state and cooperative sectors were shaped as socialist economic structures and the material basis for socialist relations of production.

Mongolia's experience shows that democratic and socialist changes comprise two intertwining and inseparable stages of the integral revolutionary process of transition from pre-capitalist social relations to socialism. We satisfied ourselves by practice that non-capitalist development turns from an idea into a reality provided the state does not put off to a distant future the fulfillment of socialist tasks but sets about carrying them out step by step and simultaneously with democratic changes, knowing that these, in turn, pave the way for future, social changes.

This was not easy, of course. There were serious difficulties, springing from the savage resistance of the exploiters and reactionary Buddhist clergy overthrown by the revolution and from the virtual lack of internal sources of accumulation, trained personnel and experience; in short, from the country's age-long backwardness.

In the challenging conditions of the period before and during World War II, our country had to divert considerable forces and funds to defend the gains of the revolution against foreign enemies. Fraternal friendship with the Soviet Union and disinterested

Soviet assistance enabled us to maintain our freedom and independence.

As Mongolia advanced to socialism the party and the government gave their unflagging attention to achieving a cultural revolution in the true sense of the word. Steps were taken to wipe out illiteracy, establish a public education and health system, lay the basis for the development of modern arts, culture and science, and train intellectuals. From the early days of the people's power, the party and the government displayed special concern for emancipating women and drawing them into active public life.

By 1940 Mongolia had completely eliminated feudal relations and forced foreign capital out of the economy. The country firmly steered a course toward non-capitalist development. In spite of the predominance of small-commodity structures, the government, backed by the state and cooperative sectors, held all the main economic instruments in its hands. The conditions for a gradual transition to the stage of socialist changes proper matured.

The democratic stage and later stages of the Mongolian people's revolution bore out Lenin's idea that during the transition to socialism 'state power ceases to be a parasitical apparatus dominating the production process: it begins to turn into an organization directly performing the function of managing the country's economy . . .'.

Mongolia's entry into the stage of socialist transformations and the fundamental changes that took place in the class composition of society led to the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of peasants gradually beginning to perform the functions of a proletarian dictatorship.

Planning began to underlie state leadership of the economy. In that period the state's activity in the sphere of economic organization and cultural education was aimed chiefly at steadily strengthening the positions of the socialist sector in the national economy. In regard to individual peasant households the party and the government carried on patient and well-considered political work to encourage the peasants' initiative and interest in increasing the livestock population and its productivity, improve the life of the peasants and show them the advantages of socialist farming. Further, steps were taken to limit the opportunities for the rise of exploitative elements on the basis of small-commodity production.

Developments demonstrated the credibility of this policy, which won the wholehearted support of the peasants. By the late 1950s, the voluntary association of peasants in cooperative farms had been completed. This signified the assertion of socialist relations of production in the whole of our society.

By about 1960 Mongolia had thus travelled from feudalism to socialism, for which the foundations had been laid. In the same period the republic became an agrarian-industrial state as a result of continuous industrial growth. The working class grew numerically and qualitatively. Mongolia entered a new period of development. The MPRP Program, approved by the 15th Party Congress, says that the central economic problem at the new stage is to complete building the material and technical basis for socialism by carrying forward industrialization, mechanizing agriculture, and supplying every branch of the economy with greater technical facilities, and to transform the MPR into an industrial-agrarian country in the immediate future.

When the material and technical basis for socialism was built Mongolia entered a new, more mature stage of its development, for which the social and economic prerequisites had been created by its preceding non-capitalist development. The establishment of social property in the means of production throughout the economy offered larger opportunities for economic advancement on socialist lines and for a steady improvement of the people's living and cultural standards.

Fulfillment of the historic tasks set by the party at this stage puts a special responsibility on the state. The MPR Constitution, adopted in 1960, declares that 'the socialist state shall protect and consolidate socialist social property, ensure active participation in economic and cultural construction by all citizens, promote socialist labor discipline by every means, and organize the country's defense against imperialist aggression.'

In accordance with the general strategy of the country's development formulated by the MPRP, our socialist state is following an economic, scientific and technological policy aimed at boosting efficiency in social production and raising the people's living standard and cultural level. In the process, economic organization and cultural education are coming to the fore as a function of the state.

This is why we constantly concentrate on increasing material production, enhancing economic efficiency, and improving the mechanism of economic planning. We attach great importance to scientific methods of economic management, socialist economic accounting and control, and material and moral incentives for work. Our state does its utmost to mobilize the financial and material resources needed for the comprehensive fulfillment of the tasks facing it at this stage of socialist construction. It emphasizes the need for judicious use of internal and external financial and material resources and for increasing socialist accumulation. Steps are being taken to ascertain internal resources and use them to the best advantages, introduce up-to-date techniques and technologies into production on a large scale, save resources, reduce the cost of maintaining the state apparatus and economic management, raise labor productivity and cut production costs. The purpose of these measures is to heighten efficiency in social production.

Mongolia's economy benefits greatly from the mounting trend toward the internationalization of the economic life of the socialist countries. Socialist economic integration enables us to concentate energies and resources on the priority development of economic fields for which natural and economic conditions are particularly favorable in Mongolia, to solve the problem of shaping a modern economy

and widely use the achievements of science and technology.

The economic development of the MPR in the period of building the material and technical basis for socialism is marked by a rapid increase in investments, fixed assets and production capacities, and by a steadily rising level of labor productivity.

In 1978 investments in the economy showed a 520 per cent increase over 1960. Gross industrial output was up by 460 per cent, and agriculture by 40 per cent. Dynamic production growth makes for higher living and cultural standards. In the same period, the national income increased by 110 per cent, retail trade by 200, the employed work force by 100 and real incomes by 200 per cent. Housing provided by the state and cooperatives increased by 250 per cent. Domestic output has a growing share in exports as well as in retail trade.

The party and the government see a pivotal problem in raising the people's educational and professional standards and in the training of specialists for the economy. We are accomplishing this task by improving general, higher, and secondary specialized education and vocational training. We now have 2,715 students per 10,000 of the population, or twice as many as in 1960. Thousands of young Mongolians are receiving a higher or secondary specialized education or getting vocational training in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Besides, these fraternal countries send highly-skilled specialists to Mongolia to help us build large economic projects and put them in operation, and also to train personnel.

Underlying the manifold activities of the state in the economic field is the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, which makes it possible to optimally combine centralized planning with active participation of local government bodies, work collectives and the people generally in the management of social production. Mongolians take part in government and in economic and cultural decision-making primarily through the khurals of people's deputies, which are elected by the people and function under their control. The khurals now comprise over 15,000 deputies representing workers, peasants, intellectuals and white-collar workers.

Moreover, the people participate in government through nationwide forums to which draft five-year economic development plans and other major government documents are regularly submitted. They control the activity of the state apparatus, enterprises and offices. The initiative of the people, who in fact manage production, expresses itself in socialist emulation, the work of production conferences, the collective discussion of draft production plans, and adoption and fulfillment of socialist commitments. Trade union, youth, women's and other public organizations play a growing part in the management of production and society, which is added evidence of democracy in socialist society.

Socialist democracy in the MPR means that all citizens enjoy broad rights (unattainable under any other social system) in every public sphere, including the right to work, rest and leisure, and education. The state provides the material, social, cultural and political conditions for the exercise of these rights.

Now that socialist construction in Mongolia has acquired qualitatively new dimensions, it is particularly important to perfect the management of economic and cultural construction. The MPRP sets party, government and public organizations new and more complex tasks: inducing people to approach their duties with a keener sense of responsibility, helping improve work at all levels, encouraging initiative, strengthening labor discipline, detecting and removing shortcoming in time and combating mismanagement more effectively. Our party stresses the special importance of educating the people in the spirit of a communist attitude to socialist property and to work.

These were central problems examined at recent plenums of the MPRP Central Committee. At the fifth Plenum in April 1979, Y. Tsedenbal said that the main task in steadily increasing labor productivity was to study and apply advanced experience and the achievements of science and technology by fostering socialist emulation. Our party sees this emulation as a powerful means of helping the people to apply their abilities and display creative initiative.

Our experience thus bears out a key Marxist-Leninist conclusion; namely, that what makes a state building socialism strong is its links with the masses. It serves the masses and derives its creative energy from them. The main conditions of success in building socialism are to win the masses for the program of socialist construction, educate them in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and unite them round the vanguard party adhering to scientific socialism.

Of fundamental importance to socialist construction is the work of the government in promoting all-round cooperation with the fraternal countries of the socialist community and fostering internationalist solidarity with the peoples fighting for democracy, peace and social progress.

The beneficial effect of international cooperation within the socialist world system is particularly evident in Mongolia's membership of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, founded 30 years ago. Only a short time has passed since our country joined the CMEA in 1962. However, CMEA membership has enabled our country to make considerable headway in building socialism.

The communist and workers' parties and the governments of the CMEA countries are making a large contribution to Mongolia's economic progress and to enhancing the efficiency of its economy. This has also found expression in the provisions of the Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic Integration that touch on the problems of bringing Mongolia's development up to the level of the other socialist countries. Under the Program, the CMEA members assist us on both a multilateral and bilateral basis in exploring and developing our natural resources, training specialists, and speeding scientific and technological progress. They

grant us low-interest credits and encourage our trade with them by paying advantageous prices for our basic export items, which consist of livestock products.

Our economy has favorable prospects for rapid growth thanks to long-term programs for cooperation between CMEA countries, the decisions of the 32nd and 33rd CMEA Sessions, and the special measures to accelerate economic development and to make Mongolia's economy more efficient.

Expanding cooperation with CMEA countries, primarily the Soviet Union, helps to quicken the pace of production, perfect the branch structure of of the economy, achieve greater efficiency, and strengthen the material and technical basis of socialism in our country. In the current, sixth five-year period, the volume of Soviet economic assistance to us will be twice as large as in the preceding five years. Thanks to this assistance, we are building many projects in industry, agriculture, construction, transport and communications, and are increasing the scale of housing construction.

With the assistance of fraternal countries, the MPR is rapidly developing its mining, coal, power, wood-working, metal-working, building materials, and light and food industries. The past 20 years have seen substantial progress in agriculture, particularly in the cultivation of virgin lands, where we have set up many new state farms equipped with the latest machinery. The material basis of livestock-breeding is being enlarged.

As a result of developing natural resources and improving the distribution of the productive forces, we now have new, expanding industrial centers and a growing working class.

This is eloquently illustrated by the example of Durhan, an industrial town built jointly by several countries of the socialist community. Second in size and economic importance only to Ulan Bator, it is justifiably called Friendship Town by the people. Erdenet, another new industrial center, is growing fast. The first section of a copper and molybdenum concentration plant built with Soviet aid went into operation in Erdenet last year. When this plant, the world's biggest in its class, begins operating at full capacity, it will substantially increase our export and industrial potential. With assistance from the Soviet Union we have begun to work large coal deposits at Baganur. The Mongolian-Soviet nonferrous metals complex is doing well. The International Geological Expedition, organized in line with the Comprehensive Program, is working fruitfully in our country.

The ideas of proletarian, socialist internationalism, a powerful factor for our progress, are materializing in our country. They guide our people in carrying out the decisions of the 17th Party Congress (1976) and in reaching the main targets of the sixth five-year economic and cultural development plan (1976-80) approved by the Congress. Fulfillment of the plan will enable us to advance further as we carry out the party's strategy of transforming Mongolia into an industrial-agrarian country.

On the international scene the MPR declares for peace, security and détente, against war and reaction, in complete unity with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The government and people of Mongolia hailed the results of the Vienna meeting between Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and U.S. President Jimmy Carter, who signed SALT-2 and other important documents designed to curb the arms race, promote détente, improve the international political climate and strengthen world peace. Implementation of the provisions of this treaty will give an impetus to the successful consummation of other talks on a reduction of armaments and on disarmament. This would meet the aspirations of all the peace forces and of all nations.

The MPR is consistent in its opposition to the anti-socialist, anti-Soviet, anti-Mongolian, great-power, hegemonic policy and activities of Peking, which has joined hands with reactionary imperialist extremists and threatens peace in Asia and the rest of the world. Expressing the people's will, the Mongolian government has emphatically condemned Peking's military aggression against socialist Vietnam in which it was ignominiously defeated, as well as its intrigues against Laos, Kampuchea and other Asian countries.

The Mongolian People's Republic has passed through many stages in reorganizing society on revolutionary lines. Experience has proved the Leninist policy of non-capitalist development chosen by Mongolia to be correct. Practice, which is the highest authority, has demonstrated in Mongolia's concrete historical conditions that the possibility of going over to the socialism without passing through the capitalist stage — a possibility established in theory by Marxism-Leninism — is an objective law. To materialize this possibility, it is necessary to consolidate the positions of world socialism, step up the struggle of the international working class, expand the national-liberation movement and enhance the vanguard role of the communist and workers' parties. Our working people's state, a state of a victorious people led by their genuinely revolutionary party of scientific socialism, has always been an effective instrument of radical social and economic changes leading to a socialist future.

The party of hope, the party of the future

Octavio Pato
Member of the CC Political Commission and Secretariat,
Portuguese Communist Party

The Ninth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party was held from May 31 to June 3, 1979. This was only a few months ago, but we are already entitled to speak of its broad political impact in the country and the undoubted influence which it is having on the activity of our party and other progressive forces in Portugal. The author of an article in the bourgeois newspaper *Expresso* on June 9 of this year was quite right when he said: 'The Ninth Congress of the PCP is yet another impressive confirmation of the strength of the only truly mass party existing in Portugal.'

Indeed, after decades of clandestine struggle, during which the PCP had to overcome tremendous difficulties and was constantly subjected to fascist repression, in a short period of five years of work and struggle in the conditions of legality it has become a major mass party, to the great chagrin of the enemies of democracy. Today, nearly 200,000 men and women, that is, over two per cent of the population, are members of the PCP and Communist Youth organizations.

We feel that the importance of the Ninth PCP Congress goes well beyond our country's borders, and not only because the international communist movement has taken an interest in the analysis of the way covered by the Portuguese revolution, and of its present stage, but also because the Congress was a vivid expression of solidarity and the interconnection of the Portuguese revolution and the world revolutionary movement. The Congress was attended by representatives of 60 parties and revolutionary movements from every continent. Delegates from 31 communists and workers' parties spoke from its rostrum. Seven friendship rallies with the participation of representatives of 28 parties and movements were held in various parts of the country. The Congress ended in a mass rally attended by tens of thousands of people.

The Congress met against the background of a national drive by the forces of reaction against the April gains and the democratic regime, and resistance to them. It is significant that within four days of its closure, the right-wing forces government headed by Prime Minister Mota Pinto, was forced to resign under pressure from powerful mass demonstrations, which were led by the communists.

Our party Congress showed that the Portuguese revolution is alive and will continue to live. It lives in its gains, which are being maintained by the broad struggles of the masses, it lives in the might of the popular movement, in the strengthening of the PCP and its growing influence and prestige.

I

The PCP's strength, influence and prestige spring from its political and ideological unity, and from its creative application of Marxism-Leninism, which has enabled it correctly to define its line, and this has been confirmed by life itself.

Throughout its history, the PCP has faced the hardest trials and has weathered the most violent political storms, in which it was guided by the proletariat's revolutionary theory, the surest guide to action. Because of its adamant ideological firmness in pursuing its essential objectives and in solving fundamental problems, because of its tactical flexibility, the party has always successfully emerged from the most intricate situations and withstood sudden changes in the balance of forces.

In its Political Resolution, the Ninth Congress confirmed that 'revolutions are not copied,' and that there are 'no recipes or models for revolution.' At the same time, the party has always taken into account and studied the experience of the communist movement and the world revolutionary process as a whole. The Portuguese revolution itself bears out the validity and universality of the laws which govern the development of the revolutionary process. It has confirmed, in particular, that the central issue in revolution is the state question.

A characteristic feature of the Portuguese revolution is that profound transformations in the country were effected without the establishment of a corresponding state apparatus. Since April 25, 1974, political power has invariably been shared by antagonistic forces in ceaseless conflict. Despite the abolition of numerous organs and departments, and despite the removal from the state apparatus of the most notorious fascists, structures, cadres, orientations and methods of the old regime remain in the courts, the ministries, in the diplomatic service and even in the Armed Forces. That is why the organs of power and the state apparatus hampered the entrenchment of the revolutionary gains, created a multiplicity of obstacles to the advance of the revolution, provided a basis for the reactionary forces in sabotaging the economy, and engaged in conspiracies and counterattacks.

The forces of the revolution proved to the sufficiently capable of securing major gains: democratic liberties; an end to the colonial wars and

colonial domination; better living conditions for the working people and the most deprived strata of the population; control over the activity of many enterprises; nationalization, elimination of monopoly groups which dominated the economy; agrarian reform in the zone of the latifundia; and a start on the establishment of ties with many countries of the world. But the revolutionary forces were unable to build a new state to defend these gains and achievements, and stand on guard of the anti-monopoly classes and strata. That was a bad mistake of the revolution, and it is fraught with a constant threat to the democratic regime, which explains many of the current difficulties.

Having analyzed the situation which had taken shape in Portugal, the process and extent of development of capitalism, and the class nature of the fascist dictatorship, which was a terroristic regime of the monopolies linked with imperialism, and the latifundists, the PCP, at its Sixth Congress held clandestinely in 1965, reached the conclusion that there is an indissoluble connection between the gains and defense of the freedoms, and the liquidation of monopoly groups and latifundia.

Life has borne out this conclusion. It confirmed it immediately after April 25, when the monopolists and the big landowners openly entered into a counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Life has continued to confirm that in our country's specific conditions, the struggle for political democracy has to be identified with economic and social democracy, and that the re-establishment of the power of the monopolies would destroy the democratic freedoms and aggravate all the country's problems. It is not surprising, therefore, that the policy of restoring the positions of the capitalists, latifundists and imperialists has entailed more intense repressive measures and constant attempts to limit and jeopardize the democratic freedoms. Nor is it surprising that this policy and the legislative counter-revolution, which was started in 1976 by the first constitutional government of the Socialist Party, connected with the right-wing forces, prevented the recuperation of the economy and led Portugal to the brink of disaster: the crisis was sharpened, the working people's hard living conditions and the positions of the middle classes worsened, the already tremendous foreign-trade deficit increased, the country's external debt grew, and this made it more dependent on other countries.

II

The gains of the revolution and the democratic system were subjected to all-round and systematic attacks in a tide of violence, arbitrary acts and pressures. Despite the impending threat, the April gains are alive and are being maintained. All the enterprises and industries *nationalized* directly, like most of the enterprises nationalized indirectly, remain under the control of the state. Nor were the gains of the *agrarian reform* liquidated: of the 550 collective producer farms set up, with 1,140,000 hectares of land expropriated in the latifundia area, 517 continue to operate on an area of almost 1 million hectares. At many enterprises, the *control of management* established by the working people continues to operate. The Portuguese people, rebuffing reaction, have defended and continue to defend their *democratic liberties*.

The right-wing offensive has failed. This happened because the gains of the revolution meet the objective needs of social development, and also because the working people — masses of people — stood up in their defense.

Manifestations, rallies, work stoppages, strikes and petitions — these are the main forms of struggle and mass participation in defending the gains of the revolution and the democratic system. The number of rallies and manifestations attended by millions of men and women increased from 135 in 1977 to 161 in 1978. There were 59 only in the first few months of this year. The strike movement has been spreading: in 1977, of the total number of working people's actions, 180 assumed the form of strikes, and in 1978, the figure increased by 50 per cent, to 270. In 1978, 1.8 million working people in 38 industries were involved in strikes. These entailed a loss of 2,202,159 work-days, and frequently covered the whole territory of the country, involving tens and even hundreds of thousands of working people.

The struggle of the agricultural workers in defense of the agrarian reform has been especially militant. Illegally despoiled of their land and agricultural machines, of their jobs and their wages, subjected to brutal repression, they resisted the arbitrary decisions of the authorities, staged powerful protest action, and continued to work in the fields. The mass struggle became national and popular, ranging over the whole country, and involving the most diverse classes and strata, workers and peasants, women and young people, the small and middle bourgeoisie, and intellectuals.

Direct contribution to the solution of problems agitating the minds of people in the localities by organizing productive, creative work on the collective producer farms in the agrarian reform zone, by promoting normal operations and skilled management of nationalized and self-administered enterprises, industrial and fishing cooperatives and cooperatives in the services, and finally by putting forward and standing up for proposals on constructive solutions of national problems is another form of popular participation in this struggle.

The activity of communists in the central and local organs of power also helped to defend the April gains and the democratic regime. For instance, thanks to the action by the PCP parliamentary group in the Assembly of the Republic, a number of reactionary bills were rejected, and some progressive laws passed. Before the Ninth Congress, the Communist parliamentary group tabled 50 bills, 10 of which were enacted into law. This testifies to the positive results achieved by combining mass struggle with parliamentary struggle for democratic legislation.

Elections are yet another form of popular participation in defending the democratic regime and the gains of the revolution. The December 1976 elections to the local organs of power were the only general elections held between the Eighth and the

Ninth Congresses of the PCP. In these elections, the reactionary parties and the Socialist Party had to pay a high price for the policy of alliances with the right-wing forces: they lost hundreds of thousands of votes. The People's Unity Alliance (APU), in which the communists are the chief force, won 18.1 per cent of the poll, as against the 14.6 per cent cast for PCP candidates in the elections to the Assembly of the Republic. APU won a majority on 37 municipal councils. In the industrial centers, in the agrarian-reform zone and in many cities, the democratic forces gained leading positions, scoring considerable successes in the north and center of the country.

The reactionaries tried very hard to isolate the communists, and to reduce and neutralize their influence in the masses. But the supplementary elections to the local organs of power held after December 1976 showed that, contrary to the assurances of reaction, the Portuguese people, far from moving away from the communists, had in fact put ever greater trust in them. In the elections to the municipal chamber of the city of Evora, which lies in the agrarian-reform zone, the number of votes cast for APU went up from 41.5 per cent to 53 per cent. In the elections to district assemblies in the north and center of the country, even in the areas traditionally dominated by the reactionaries, APU was the only force which did not lose any votes.

III

A characteristic feature of the present situation in Portugal is the narrowing down of the social basis of the rightists and an extension of the social basis of the forces supporting the policy of defense of the democratic regime as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic.

Indeed, the anti-monopoly sections of the middle bourgeoisie and ever more numerous groups in the intermediate strata and classes, which in 1975 were terrified at the large-scale revolutionary transformations and which turned to the rightists, now face tremendous difficulties as a result of the reactionary policy of re-establishing the positions of the capitalists, latifundists and imperialists in the country. The PCP seeks to involve these social classes and strata in the struggle for defense of the democratic regime, and whenever that is impossible, to neutralize them.

The fact that the democratic regime and the liberties won by the working people and the masses have become an insuperable barrier in the way of the efforts to liquidate the April gains and re-establish monopoly capitalism has caused an evolution of the *right-wing parties and forces* toward pro-fascist and blatantly fascist attitudes and goals. But this has not been accompanied by a similar shift among the mass of their adherents and voters. That is why differences and crises tend to break out among the right-wing forces, leading to the emergence of groups disagreeing with the orientation of the leaders, and inclined to have political solutions within the framework of the democratic system. That is what happened with 37 deputies who left the extreme right-wing Democratic People's Party (PPD).*

The social shifts and class contradictions develop into conflicts within the Socialist Party (SP), which has continued to pursue its contradictory policy, whose main features are defense of formal political democracy and alliances with right-wing forces in seeking to re-establish the positions of the capitalists, latifundists and imperialists.

As for the *leftist parties and groups*, they remain in a state of permanent splits. These parties are increasingly isolated, lose their influence and disintegrate.

Thus, thousands of men and women in Portugal who recently supported the right-wing parties and agreed with the SP's splinter policy or allowed themselves to be lured by the sweet songs of the sirens coming from the leftist camp are now taking part in a broadly united popular movement. It has powerful and diverse forms of organization and is the most dynamic and definitive force both of the social and the political front of democracy.

The unitary trade-union movement, rallied around the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People, the CGTP — Intersindical Nacional — includes organizations with 1,720,556 members out of a total of 2,006,710 unionized working people. Despite the splinter action repeatedly undertaken by the SP and the reactionary forces and parties, the CGTP — IN has been steadily strengthening its positions as the common candidates are returned in elections to trade-union bodies.

Working people's commissions, whose experience and heroic traditions go back to the fascist period, continue to play a highly important role in Portugal. Exercising control over management, they have resolutely helped to transform the socio-economic structures, defend the economy and shape democracy. *Dwellers' commissions* are another form of grass-roots unitary organization, which have done much to solve local problems and successfully work for genuinely democratic administration in the local organs of power.

The *peasant movement* has become a mighty force in our country, especially since the establishment in February 1978 of the National Confederation of Agriculture (NCA). It brings together 300 organizations with thousands of small and middle peasants as members. The organization of the peasant movement on the scale of the whole country is a major qualitative shift whose importance tends to grow as the social basis of the reactionary parties is narrowed down.

Working people's economic organizations, especially the collective producer farms in the agrarian reform zone, and also producer, consumer, housing and service cooperatives and self-managed enterprises are a basis for the country's economic organization and a powerful force of the popular movement.

Intellectuals, engineers and technicians take an active part in the political struggle, staging strikes

*Now the Social Democratic Party (SDP). — *Ed.*

and coming forward with major initiatives. The *movements of small and middle industrialists and merchants,* who fight for their own specific interests, are also growing. The *movements of pensioners and elderly people,* with their numerous organizations and also *disabled persons' associations* are also large-scale mass movements.

The *youth movement,* which involves young workers and students, has been developing. It has a vanguard of more than 30,000-strong contingent of Young Communists. The Ninth Congress of the PCP reached the conclusion that the conditions are ripe to unite the two organizations of communist young people: the Communist Youth League and the Communist Students' Union.

The *unitary women's movement,* which has tens of thousands of members, has three basic organizational forms: the Women's Democratic Movement (MDM), the Women's Unitary Commissions (CUM) and women's sections in the trade unions.

People's sports and cultural organizations (collectives, societies, orchestras, choirs, art groups, and cine clubs) are being established in the country's democratic life.

Unitary organizations of democrats, like the Union of Portuguese Resistance Anti-Fascists (URAP), have a tremendous role to play in making the people aware of the crimes of fascism.

Friendship societies, notably societies of friendship with socialist countries and countries which freed themselves from Portuguese colonialism, help to gain better understanding, cooperation and friendship between the Portuguese people and the peoples of these countries.

In the past few years, the *movement for peace and disarmament, and against colonialism, racism and apartheid,* the movement of solidarity with the peoples fighting against imperialism, and with the victims of fascist and reactionary dictatorship have been spreading among the masses.

The democratic people's movement, with its diverse forms, which I have described, is a broad and powerful mass movement, involving millions of Portuguese men and women representing all the anti-monopoly classes and sections with different political views. But the cohesion of the unitary popular movement has still to be reflected in the political and party sphere, and this is something that has prevented the growth of its strength and influence.

In the current political situation in Portugal, mutual understanding and joint action by Socialists and Communists acquires crucial importance in realizing a democratic alternative. If the PCP and the SP reached an agreement, this would radically change the political situation in the country, and the balance of forces would then tilt in favor of democracy. That is why, while resolutely criticizing the SP's alliances with the right-wing forces and exposing the socialists' responsibility for the policy of restoring the positions of capitalism, latifundism and imperialism, and their splinter activity within the trade union movement, the PCP has invariably emphasized the need for rapprochement, mutual understanding and joint action with the Socialist Party.

But the unity of democrats implies not only unity between communists and socialists. In general political terms, highly positive experience comes from the cooperation between the PCP and the Portuguese Democratic Movement and other democratic organizations and circles. Thus, during the elections to the local organs of power, these organizations helped the People's Unity Alliance to win.

That is why the main task facing the Portuguese communists in shaping a broad political front for defending, strengthening and developing the democratic regime is to isolate the reactionary and fascist parties, forces and circles, to seek mutual understanding and joint action with the SP, and to extend and strengthen cooperation and unity with all democrats.

IV

The April Revolution scored all its gains in its first 18 months, but for three and a half years now, the Portuguese revolution has been subjected to fierce and ever more intense attacks designed to wipe out its major gains and liquidate the democratic regime as established in the Constitution of the Republic.

The global drive by reaction against the April gains and the threats of subversion of the democratic regime urge the need for a democratic swing in national policy. That was the patriotic purpose of the Ninth Congress, when it adopted and put before the democratic forces and the rest of the people a platform consisting of ten main planks: stability of the democratic regime and observance of the Constitution; guarantee of citizens' rights and freedoms; development and immunity of the diverse existing economic structures (nationalized sector, collective producer farms and cooperatives in the agrarian reform zone, small-scale commodity production, and capitalist enterprises); and economic and financial policy aimed to develop the country; protection and improvement of the living standards of the working people and the middle classes and strata; reform of the education system and pursuit of a cultural policy meeting the people's interests; unity of the Armed Forces and their stability; national unity and territorial integrity; relations of friendship and cooperation with all the peoples of the world; and review of the government's anti-constitutional and illegal acts and decisions.

This platform, adopted by the Ninth Congress of the PCP, is also the party's programmatic document and the basis for mutual understanding and joint action by democrats and patriots. It also determines the main policy lines for a future democratic government.

The people's heroic struggle has halted the fierce reactionary drive, which went on for three and a half years. The masses are deeply convinced that the country needs a government that would conduct a democratic policy. The masses have understood that it is possible to defend the most important gains meeting the people's objective needs and will, against the attack by right-wing government in

breach of the Constitution and with the use of arbitrary and illegal acts and violence. They have also understood that the present situation may continue for some time, but that it cannot last for ever. Unless the democratic forces succeed (and the PCP is sure that they will succeed) in bringing about a radical swing in the policy of the organs of power, the latter will abolish the April gains and with them the democratic regime itself. That is why a democratic government pursuing a relevant policy needs to be set up to safeguard the gains and to strengthen the existing regime.

Immediately upon the resignation of the Mota Pinto government, the PCP once again demanded the formation of a democratic government. This demand could not be implemented because the Socialist Party refused to join the PCP in studying the possibility of establishing such a government and finding a constitutional way out of the crisis through mid-term elections.

The Ninth Congress of the PCP urged the need to create the appropriate conditions for solving these three problems in the course of these elections: inflict another defeat on reaction and keep the right-wing parties in a minority; win a democratic majority in the Assembly of the Republic (a majority of communists and socialists); markedly increase the number of PCP deputies, which is the basic condition for effecting a democratic alternative.

We are sure that these tasks will be fulfilled.

However, the reactionary forces did not demand elections within the framework of the Constitution, but the very opposite. The Social Democratic Party, the Socialist Democratic Center and other reactionary parties and circles insisted that, in defiiance of the Constitution, the new Assembly should have the right fully to review the Constitution. They also insisted on waiving the two-thirds majority for such a review, and also on the abolition of the constitutional ban on a revision of fundamental issues like nationalization, agrarian reform, the working people's rights and freedoms and so on. The reactionary forces came out for the adoption of a new electoral law and the abolition of proportional representation. They demanded the holding of a referendum, which is prohibited by the Constitution, in order to manipulate the votes.

Had the demands of reaction been met, it would have signified a de facto coup, resulting in an unconstitutional revision of the country's Fundamental Law and the elimination of the democratic regime. But the plans of reaction failed. The formation of the Maria de Lurdes Pintasilgo government, which is to guide the country until the interim elections, nominally signifies a constitutional way out of the crisis.

The PCP has taken a clear-cut stand with respect to the new government. It has to respect the Constitution, it must demonstrate a desire for dialogue, effectively solve the vital problems, and ensure freedom, equality and pluralism. Without predetermining the PCP's final stand, which depends not only on the make-up of the government, but also on its program and policy, one could say even now that the formation of the new government is of positive significance because it means a defeat for reaction, which had sought to keep the old government in power in order to continue its attacks on the democratic regime and to stage a farcical election ensuring a victory for the right-wing forces.

The present balance of political forces in Portugal is characterized by the fact that the PCP alone stands unflinchingly in defense of the people's interests, the revolutionary gains and national independence. It has been tirelessly working to strengthen and develop the democratic regime, as entrenched in the Constitution. That is why every day tens and even hundreds of Portuguese men and women display an ever growing simpathy for the PCP, support its policy and join its ranks.

The party's growth and organizational consolidation were expressed at its Ninth Congress. In October 1974, during the Seventh Congress, the party had 30,000 members, and in November 1976, at the time of its Eighth Congress, 115,000. By the Ninth Congress, the PCP had 164,713 members, apart from 30,000 members of Young Communist organizations. This means that in the interval between the two latest Congresses, the number of party members increased by nearly 50,000. Five new regional directorates, 32 new district commissions, hundreds of local commissions, and 433 party-cell secretariats were set up in that same period. Altogether, the number of party organs increased by roughly 2,000.

The Ninth Congress was attended by 1,749 delegates, of whom 51.3 per cent were workers, and 38 per cent, people under the age of 30 years. The make-up of the Congress reflected the party's social and age composition, for 57.3 per cent of its members are workers, and 33.3 per cent are under the age of 30. One in five members is a woman.

The new Central Committee, elected at the Congress, has 72 members and 61 alternate members; 51 per cent of them are workers, and 75 per cent are industrial workers and employees, which is also a reflection of the class nature of the party.

Some will be surprised by the fact that in Portugal, where there are so many parties going through internal crises, splits and purges, the PCP has succeeded in maintaining complete cohesion, as the whole work of the Congress so obviously demonstrated. It showed that *party unity* is the product of its class nature, of its correct line, which has been borne out by life, the soundness of its principles, Marxist-Leninist education, the leadership's close ties with the whole party, the communists' active participation in formulating the general line, mutual respect among party members, inner democracy and conscious and voluntary discipline.

Against the background of internal conflicts, divisions and betrayals observed in the other parties, the PCP's unity shows not only that its political line and practice are correct, but also that the principle of democratic centralism is right. Applying this principle creatively, in accordance with its own revolutionary experience, the PCP has developed its own *style of work*. It was said at the Ninth Congress that the main features of this style are the class spirit, which permeates the whole of the party's

activity; collective effort with individual responsibility; open and comradely criticism, natural and voluntary self-criticism; a spirit of comradeship, honesty, mutual respect, brotherhood and solidarity of the communists; democracy as a principle, as a line of work and standard of behavior, a factor of unity and discipline; the winning of authority by work and personal example and not in virtue of some formal principles; a respectful attitude to all assignments, however simple; constant and direct contact between the leadership and the primary organizations and the masses; dynamism, energy, initiative, loyalty to the cause of the working people, democracy, national independence and socialism.

The party's organizational growth, its high political consciousness, the revolutionary élan and enthusiasm of the communists, the trust, cohesion and unity of all its members, the party's deep roots in the working class, and the masses of people, show that the PCP is a *party of hope and the future.*

The Ninth Congress reaffirmed this faith in the future. Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the PCP, said this in his Report about the CC's activity: 'The Portugal of the April Revolution, the Portugal of the Revolution of Carnations, free, democratic and independent Portugal, the Portugal of nationalization and agrarian reform will be defended and consolidated. It will ultimately enter upon the road of socialism.'

We have no doubt that our friends on every continent share this confidence with us.

---

exchange of views

Revolution and democracy

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

This is the third and final instalment* of our survey of the proceedings at a scientific conference on 'Revolution and Democracy' sponsored by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP) Central Committee together with *World Marxist Review* and dealing mainly with the international factors in the struggle for democracy and socialism. Various aspects of this problem were dealt with in their papers, speeches and rejoinders by: *Pavel Auersperg,* CC member, CP Czechoslovakia; *Janos Berecz,* CC International Department head, HSWP; *Peter Boychuck,* CC Central Executive Committee alternate member, CP Canada; *Wieslaw Klimczak,* CC alternate member, Polish United Workers' Party; *Julio Laborde,* CC member, CP Argentina; *Karoly Lipkowicz,* Cand. Sc. (Hist.), representative of the HSWP on the Journal; *Badamyn Lhamsuren,* D.Sc. (Hist.), CC member, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party; Professor *Jose Luis Malo de Molina* of Madrid University; *Orlando Millas,* CC Political Commission member, CP Chile; *Sarada Mitra,* National Council member, CP India; *Maria de Piedade Morgadinho,* CC member, Portuguese CP; *Nguyen Khanh Toan,* Chairman, Social Sciences Committee, Socialist Republic of Vietnam; *Ib Nørlund,* CC Executive Committee and Secretariat member, CP Denmark; *Carlos Nunez Anavitarte,* CC alternate member, Peruvian CP; *Tommy O'Flaherty,* representative of the CP Ireland on the Journal; *Bert Ramelson,* representative of the CP Great Britain on the Journal; *A. Sobolev,* D.Sc. (Philos.), department head, Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee; Professor *B. Spasov,* chairman, Bulgarian Jurists' Union, consultant on Bulgaria's State Council; *Dimitris Tsaras,* CC member, CP Greece; Professor *Antonio Jannazzo* of Rome University; *Konstantin Zarodov,* D.Sc. (Hist.), Editor-in-Chief of *WMR; Barbu Zaharescu,* Central Auditing Commission member, Rumanian CP, corresponding member, Rumanian Academy of Sciences.

This review ends with a short presentation of the speeches at the final plenary meeting of the conference by the chairmen of its sections, *Sandor Lakos,* CC member, HSWP, Director, Institute of Social Sciences under the HSWP CC: and *Ib Nørlund,* CC Executive Committee and Secretariat member, CP Denmark, and also by corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences *Ivan Frolov,* Executive Editor of *World Marxist Review.*

All the papers, speeches and rejoinders are presented here in abridged form.

III. DEMOCRACY AND INTERNATIONAL FACTORS IN THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

Revolution without war; potentialities and prospects

The participants in the conference analyzed the new potentialities of the revolutionary process opened up by the changing world balance of forces

*See WMR, Nos. 7, 8 and 9 for 1979.

in favor of democracy and socialism, and considered the prospects for carrying out socialist revolutions without war, in the conditions of peaceful coexistence of states, and the international aspects of ensuring a peaceful transition to socialism (without civil war) connected with preventing the export of counter-revolution, and imperialist intervention. The question of the potentialities of the revolutionary process in one individual capitalist country was also considered in the light of the unifying trends in the imperialist system.

On the question of a peaceful transition to socialism, *Peter Boychuck* warned against the tendency to underestimate the importance of international factors within the set of conditions ensuring such a transition. In our day, new opportunities have been opened up before the revolutionary process, he said. However, imperialism, led by the United States, has worked out fairly efficient mechanisms for resisting the working people's urge for social change in the various countries. Imperialism's aggressive blocs, the step-up of the arms race, the development of capitalist integration, the coordination of the imperialist countries' political activity on an international scale, and the establishment of supranational institutions like the European Parliament, all of these must have an effect on the national ways to socialism, and the forms and methods of the class struggle. He also drew attention to the actual threat posed by the activity of the multinationals to the struggle of the working class and the national-liberation movement.

Boychuck expressed the view that the idea of a peaceful transition to socialism which fails to reckon with the danger of external intervention in the revolutionary process by other imperialist states appears to be less than realistic. The facts show that whenever it comes to defending the class interests of imperialism, the capitalist countries mount joint intervention. Is such a prospect ruled out, he asked, in the event, say, that the capitalist system in a NATO country is faced with a threat? One has to take into account the role of that aggressive bloc in resisting deep social change. NATO, led by the United States, is a force which protects the capitalist system.

The problem of a peaceful transition to socialism, Boychuck said, should be dealt with in the light of the fact that in the period of its general crisis capitalism has a tendency to reaction. It is in the interests of the working class to preserve democracy and further to extend it. But in the capitalist countries, democracy is far from being guaranteed. Whenever democracy is displayed on the stage, the capitalist state apparatus is always in the wings to call the tune or pull down the curtain in any emergency. Objecting to the view that in Canada capitalism was not what it used to be, because it had been transformed into a 'democratic spirit,' Boychuck recalled the occupation of French Canada in 1970 by federal troops to put down the French Canadians' urge for equality with the English Canadians. In light of this fact, he asked, how realistic is the idea of attaining socialism through the channels of capitalist democracy.

The experience of some countries following the Second World War showed that for them the way to a peaceful transition to socialism was opened up by the victory of the people's democratic revolutions. Recent experience has also shown that successful national-democratic revolutions clear the way for a possible peaceful transition to socialism. In view of this experience, Boychuck said, the practical problem facing such developed capitalist countries as Canada does not consist so much in whether a peaceful transition to socialism is possible generally, as in whether it is possible to solve by peaceful means the problems of the immediate anti-monopoly stage of the struggle: to overthrow the power of monopoly capital, and to overcome the resistance of international imperialist alliances, preventing any armed action by the counter-revolution in the country and from outside.

The Chilean experience, *Orlando Millas* said, shows that in the present conditions the internal counter-revolution relies on the support of external reactionary forces. In Chile, the armed forces would have been incapable of frustrating the revolutionary development if they had not been closely connected with U.S. imperialism and the Pentagon. It is these ties that were crucial in the counter-revolutionary acts in Chile. Today, despite the growing isolation of the fascist junta in Chile, and despite the deepening contradictions within the Chilean armed forces, the Pinochet regime's ties with U.S. imperialism, including its military alliance with it, continue to be the main factor which makes it possible to keep the fascist dictatorship going. All of this shows once again that imperialism's military blocs and the interdependence of capitalist states are a factor hampering the development of the democratic process in a given country.

Considering the mechanism of imperialist intervention in the revolutionary process, *Pavel Auersperg* and *Janos Berecz* noted that in the present conditions monopoly capital makes use, for counter-revolutionary purposes, not only of violent methods, but also of other means of intervening in the peoples' internal affairs. Among these are, for instance, economic sabotage, political destabilization and psychological warfare. The use of the mass media for counter-revolutionary purposes poses a grave danger. Experience shows that intervention in various forms may create grave complications for the revolutionary process. That is why the revolution must be prepared to resist any interference by imperialism.

The Portuguese revolution, *Maria da Piedade Morgadinho* said, provides weighty evidence that peaceful coexistence creates favorable conditions for the people's revolutionary struggle. One of its lessons is that in détente and peace it is possible to put an end to monopoly domination in one, individual capitalist country. Of course, subversion by imperialist circles and strong resistance by reaction and imperialism to revolutionary change are not ruled out. Thus, there has been intervention in Portugal's affairs, with considerable pressure exerted

from outside on the class struggle in the country. But the new international situation, which has resulted from the changing balance of forces in favor of peace, the peoples' independence and socialism, and the climate of détente created in Europe, promoted the development of the Portuguese revolution. Evidently, in a cold-war atmosphere it would have faced great obstacles.

On many occasions in the past, *Bert Ramelson* said, the development of a democratic revolution into a socialist revolution did not entail civil war. However, this was preceded by armed struggle on an international scale, like the Second World War, or wars of independence. The present approach to the problem of transition to socialism bases itself on the possibility of transforming a capitalist society into a socialist one in conditions when imperialism is prevented from unleashing a world war. Consequently, this means the possibility of realizing a socialist world not as a result of or after a world war — and this is impossible without the triumph of socialism in the developed capitalist countries. The prospect of revolution without a world war is closely bound up with the consolidation of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems and a deepening of détente.

Today, transition to socialism without civil war is not only possible, he said, but quite probable from the theoretical standpoint. But, he added, the importance of a theoretical elaboration of the concept of a peaceful transition of developed capitalist countries to socialism has been underestimated. The key factor on which this concept is based is that just now important changes are taking place on a world scale in the balance of forces in favor of socialism and the weakening of imperialism.

The present alignment of forces in the world has reduced the danger of a military suppression by international imperialism of a revolution in this or that country. Of course, imperialism may well go to extremes, but one must start from the assumption that there is some common sense in what the class adversary is doing. In the event of a revolution, imperialism would be unable to mount military intervention on the scale on which it had done so in the past, under the old balance of forces. Other forms of imperialist intervention — economic, political and ideological — will undoubtedly be attempted, but they are not as dangerous nowadays as military intervention, which is fraught with world conflict. But the main thing is that the working-class movement and the other revolutionary forces, relying on international solidarity, can resist both direct attacks by imperialism and its indirect intervention. To wait until the imperialists lose every hope of restoration would mean never realizing the revolution.

Considering the possibility of a victory of a socialist revolution in some individual West European country, Ramelson characterized the Common Market as the main obstacle in the way of such socialist transformations. If, as he assumed, a working-class government were to come in to power in some West European country and were to pursue a policy threatening the very existence of capitalism in that country, the whole economic strength and political institutions of the EEC would inevitably be used to frustrate their realization. That is why opposition to the Common Market is a fundamental aspect of the struggle for a revolutionary perspective. The problem does not consist so much in resisting EEC policy, as in working to get one's country out of it, which is, the speaker said, an important prerequisite for transition to socialism without civil war. Ramelson disagreed with the view that a simultaneous revolutionary transformation of the West European countries within the EEC was possible. The conditions for revolution, he said, mature unevenly, in accordance with the changes in the balance of forces between the working class and the ruling class in each country.

Ramelson said that it would hardly be right to compare the parliament in Strasbourg with a national parliament which can be transformed into a democratic institution. However, the idea of democratizing the Europarliament — although possibilities of this in some respects do exist — could produce the illusion that it is possible to change the reactionary substance of the EEC's politico-economic system as an instrument of the monopolies against socialist transformations in Western Europe.

Capitalist integration, *Ib Nørlund* said, poses a number of new problems before the revolutionary process. Throughout the whole postwar period, the West European countries have tried to integrate, first on the basis of the Marshall Plan, then through military integration on the basis of NATO and economic integration within the Common Market framework, whose class substance as an economic-political instrument has been expressed as the 'Europe of monopolies.' While the integration processes have somewhat slowed down in the past few years because of the growing contradictions between the EEC countries under the impact of the crisis, they are still being continued, as will be seen from the efforts to transform the EEC into a 'European Union.'

Denmark's membership of the EEC has sharpened the country's problems of mass unemployment and inflation, and has worsened the condition of the masses. Anti-democratic trends in socio-economic life have intensified. The situation is being compounded by the fact that the EEC is being used as an instrument to make the weaker EEC countries bear the brunt of the economic crisis.

It is natural, therefore, the speaker emphasized, that there is a growing popular movement in Denmark against EEC membership, against capitalist integration. This movement is national and democratic, and is objectively aimed against the monopolies. The speaker said that the direct elections to the Europarliament were an attempt to encourage imperialist integration and a step toward the establishment of a 'European Union.' If the Europarliament is given enough powers, this will

eliminate the right of veto in the EEC Council of Ministers, and this, for its part, will curtail the small countries' national rights. The Europarliament can have a negative impact on the international situation on the continent. The question of the Europarliament's prerogatives became central in the electoral campaign. In order to calm the voters, it was said that the powers of the parliament would not be extended, but it was also stressed that participation in the parliament would help to secure passage of definite decisions, which implied an extension of its influence. This is a contradictory position. Actually, however, the formation of the Europarliament does not signify any progress in democracy. The speaker said that it would be wrong to describe the parliament and the elections to it as democratic institutions. The democratic movement has been intensifying its resistance and the EEC ruling circles' policy with respect to that association. Because the struggle against the Common Market and its policy is one of the important problems facing the working-class movement in Western Europe, Nørlund said that it required further collective study.

Considering the impact of the EEC on the revolutionary process, *Tommy O'Flaherty* said that it had been set up by the monopolies and the imperialist circles as a counter-weight to the socialist system and the national-liberation movement. The EEC is designed for economic and political integration of the West European countries, and submission to the policy of the monopolies, and that is what makes it undemocratic. Such integration cuts across the interests of the working class in the West European countries. One of the purposes of the EEC is to exploit less developed capitalist countries, including Ireland, and to gear them to the interests of the multinationals. In political terms, the EEC countries which are not members of NATO are being subjected to ever greater pressure to make them abandon their neutral position.

The Europarliament does not extend the members' rights on EEC matters, let alone being an organ of its members' 'popular representation.' That is why the influence which the left-wing forces could command within the Europarliament is not the most important question. No matter which grouping dominates the parliament, it will remain undemocratic. It is being fortified as a counter-weight to the national parliaments. Any powers vested in the Europarliament would serve undemocratic purposes.

It would be an erroneous strategy to use the Europarliament to try to democratize the EEC, the speaker said. Integration for the benefit of the monopolies would continue against the background of a debate on extending its powers. The most effective way of fighting for democracy in Western Europe is to fight for democracy in each country. One of the key lines of this struggle is opposition to the EEC. In this sense, the Europarliament should only be used as a rostrum to resist EEC policy. The key problem of democracy in the West European region is to set up a broad alliance against the monopoly-imposed integration. It would be wrong to adopt a strategy oriented upon effecting revolutionary changes simultaneously within the framework of all the EEC countries. The long-term goal is not to democratize the EEC but to have it dismantled and to carry out a revolution in each individual West European country.

Dimitris Tsaras showed the connection between the Greek working people's struggle for democracy in the country and the struggle against its dependence on the major imperialist centers — the United States, NATO and the EEC — and against the infiltration of its economy by the multinationals. He described the EEC's policy as a factor having a negative effect on the democratic and revolutionary process in the country.

Assessing the 'democratic Western Europe' slogan, *Konstantin Zarodov* noted that this posed the question of the extent to which the existing supranational organs of administration in Western Europe could be democratized. Was it possible to set up political institutions of capitalist integration with real powers and authority, while being subject to popular control? Consequently, would such organizations help to eliminate the power of the monopolies and advance toward socialism in this or that West European country? Considering these questions, Zaradov drew attention to the fact that even if the united left-wing forces did succeed in securing political control over the European parliament, that would hardly give them real power, because the bourgeoisie, retaining the whole apparatus and resources of the economy, would be capable of neutralizing any political victory of the left or simply of breaking up the mechanisms of the association once these had ceased to serve its purposes. That is why even the most democratic organs will hardly have the power to exert a real influence on, say, the behavior of the monopolies in this or that country.

It is obvious, at the same time, that the consolidation of the Common Market tends to tighten up the harness by which the individual countries are tied to the monopoly-capital of the big and stronger states, including the United States, the leader of the monopoly world. So long as capitalist relations of production remain supreme, so long as the monopolies have control over the economy, the 'Europe of concerns' will not become a 'working people's Europe.' On the other hand, supranational political institutions, however democratized, can never fundamentally restructure society in the individual countries so long as these are dominated by big, monopoly capital. But that does not rule out, of course, the use of the Europarliament for fighting against the monopolies and for the working people's interests.

Of course, Zarodov said, it would be better for this or that country to advance toward socialism together and simultaneously with other European countries. But the working people can hardly be mobilized for the struggle for their ideals, by 'biding' one's time and waiting for the moment when the whole of Western Europe becomes democratic and when the possibility of exporting counter-revolution is totally ruled out. This kind of approach,

Zarodov said, is directly connected with an underestimation of the world balance of forces under the détente in favor of democracy and socialism, and implies a neglect of the concrete analysis of the concrete situation, which leads to an understanding of the need of taking some risk (and revolutions are never without risk) so as to carry out a fundamental swing in a given country's political, social and economic development, without waiting until other countries have done so. The question of revolutionary transformation in the modern world is, of course, exceptionally complicated and requires of Marxist-Leninists much thorough thought, great organizational and ideological effort and, more than ever before, patience and a drive against the 'revolutionary itch.' But the patience should not be overdone, it should not be carried to the point at which the people refuse to endure, having lost faith in our patience.

Zarodov then considered in what sense and in what context abiding importance attached to the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the socialist revolution could and should initially win out in one or several countries. He said that the accent in this formula today could not be on the word 'initially,' because a start on the world's practical transition from capitalism to socialism had been made decades ago. But the point was that the continuation of this process was governed by a uniformity which did not allow for revolutionary victories in accordance with some international agreed schedule.

There can be various views of West European democratization arising from the search for the best solutions for these problems, but the 'democratic Western Europe' slogan can ultimately be assured only from the standpoint of its economic class basis.

Dialectics of peaceful coexistence and the revolutionary process

Continuing their discussions of the interconnection between revolution and peace in the world today, the participants in the conference considered the socio-political nature of peaceful coexistence and its role in the class contest in the world arena. They devoted considerable attention to the class approach to the problems in democratizing the system of international relations.

Disagreeing with the adversaries of revolution who claim that profound revolutionary transformations tend to introduce elements of instability into international relations and to unhinge peace, *Maria da Piedade Morgadinho* said that the Portuguese revolution did much for the democratic renewal of international relations by sweeping away the fascist regime, ending colonial wars and colonial domination, and establishing equitable relations with other countries, notably the socialist states. She emphasized that revolutionary action in the capitalist countries does not run counter to the deepening of peaceful coexistence. For its part, peaceful coexistence does not imply a fold-up of the revolutionary process. It is not a comprise with imperialism entrenching the social status quo or some division of the world into zones with definite social regimes. On the contrary, it asserts the people's right freely to decide their own socio-political future.

The interconnection between revolution and peace, *Janos Berecz* said, is expressed in the need to carry on a struggle for socialism within the national framework and in the international arena in such a way as to prevent the outbreak of a world thermonuclear war and to exclude war from relations among countries for good. The latter, for its part, produces the need of cooperation between states with opposite social systems and requires definite compromises which, however, do not cut across the gains of socialism and the advance of the revolutionary process.

Characterizing the main criteria of peaceful coexistence the speaker said that they consist, first, in that it implies a coexistence of countries with different social systems which agree to develop relations with each other on the basis of equality; second, in that some means of struggle, war in the first place, are excluded from their confrontation; and third, in that all the states bear a common responsibility for solving the problems which in global terms affect the whole of humanity. Such is the international framework established by peaceful coexistence, in which the contemporary revolutionary process develops as a unity of three main forces: the community of socialist countries, the international working class, and the revolutionary national-liberation movement, which includes the socialism-oriented countries. Each of these forces has its own forms and methods of class struggle for social progress. The problem is to combine the various forms of class struggle with peaceful coexistence.

Militarism is a formidable enemy of any strengthening of peaceful democratic international relations and carrying out the socialist revolution by peaceful means. If it is to be kept in check, all the revolutionary and democratic forces must unite. Berecz said that for the socialist community the need to strengthen its defenses is imposed by the present-day international conditions, which are fraught with the danger of imperialist aggression. The defense potential of the Soviet Union and its allies serves democratic purposes which are an expression of mankind's vital interests. These are the holding of the aggressive forces of international imperialism in check; preventing their use of military means in some areas of tension; preventing the export of counter-revolution; and stimulating disarmament and solution of international security problems. The socialist countries' military might, which serves to defend peace, helps to ensure favorable international conditions for the peoples' choice of their own way of development.

The adversaries of détente, *Bert Ramelson* said, allege that peaceful coexistence is a communist instrument for attaining socialism. But that is not true, because it is an instrument for maintainining peace in conditions which are acceptable not only to socialist, but equally to capitalist countries.

The conception of peaceful coexistence, *A. Sabolev* said, does not boil down to the struggle for peace. He brought out the general democratic and

class aspects of peaceful coexistence. The former relate to peaceful conditions within the system of international relations and the cardinal problems in world development which can be solved by states belonging to opposite social systems: non-interference in internal affairs, repudiation of war, disarmament, etc. The latter is connected mainly with the contradiction of the epoch, which, for its part, contains an internal aspect (social revolution maturing within the entrails of the capitalist system) and an international aspect (the contest between the two social systems, and the interaction of socialism with the other revolutionary forces). This contradiction is resolved in the international framework not by means of war but in the course of economic, political and ideological competition and struggle by peaceful means. This leads to a change in the balance of class forces, which are regrouped, so ultimately ensuring the upward development of socialism and opening up fresh opportunities for the revolutionary process. The state of international relations has a substantial influence on the course and forms of the class struggle in the individual countries. There is good reason why the importance of democratic means and methods in the class struggle has increased together with the consolidation of peaceful coexistence and the deepening of the détente.

Characterizing the class substance of peaceful coexistence, Sobolev said that it is not a forced historical compromise between socialism and capitalism. It is a specific form of class struggle connected with the struggle for peace, the development of the revolutionary process and consolidation of the international positions of socialism.

In a rejoinder, *Berecz* said: Of course, peaceful coexistence is not a compromise, but at the same time the development of relations between states does not occur without compromises.

Sobolev explained that he was not using the term compromise in a social sense. Peaceful coexistence does not imply any concessions either on the part of capitalism or on the part of socialism, either reciprocal or unilateral. The class contradiction between the social systems is not resolved on the basis of compromise.

It would be wrong, *Pavel Auersperg* said, to regard peaceful coexistence as a departure from class positions, as a concession to imperialism. Socialism is not faced with a 'compromise or class struggle' dilemma. In the speaker's view, when analyzing the substance of peaceful coexistence, one must draw a distinction between interstate relations and relations between social systems. From the theoretical standpoint, no compromise is possible in relations between systems, because the convergence, the symbiosis of capitalism and socialism, are inconceivable and would, in practice, be attended with changes in the very substance of the socialist social system, or dangerous deformations jeopardizing the working people's social gains. Interstate relations are a different matter. Here, compromises are possible in solving concrete international problems, like the problem of taking steps toward disarmament, etc. Of course, there are class limits to such compromises, which are, incidentally, determined by the conditions of peaceful coexistence, for these require efforts to maintain international security, with respect for sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of nations, and equality of the parties. Characterizing détente in this connection, the speaker said that it is a state of international relations which is not simply the opposite of 'cold war,' and does not simply mean the overcoming of its survivals. It is also a constructive program for democratizing the whole system of international relations, a program for ensuring peaceful cooperation among nations, disarmament, development of trade, economic and cultural relations, and solution of some global problems.

Social contradictions and the class struggle in the capitalist world, he went on, tend to develop in accordance with their own objective laws and defy the will of governments and states. The imperialists' attempts to impose on socialism the view of peaceful coexistence which follows from their ideology as a social compromise clashes with the objective requirements of social progress, which, while dictating the need to strengthen peaceful coexistence as a principle of relations among states with different social systems, determines the steady advance of society along the road to socialism and communism. While peaceful coexistence does not apply to the struggle of classes in capitalist countries, it does exert a great influence on it by shaping a favorable international situation.

The system of imperialist alliances is a big obstacle in the way of democratizing international relations. It was analyzed by *Carlos Nunez Anavitarte*. Together with the operations by the multinationals, the establishment of international alliances of imperialist powers, he said, is a characteristic feature of the contemporary policy of state-monopoly capitalism. It is determined, on the one hand, by attempts to overcome the inter-imperialist contradictions, and on the other, to unite the imperialist forces in defending the common class interests of capital in its fight against the world socialist system, the international working-class and the national-liberation movements. The speaker characterized the system of U.S. imperialist-sponsored military-political blocs in Latin America, which are geared to fight the Latin American peoples' struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism. The purpose of the system, he stressed, is to prevent the installation of democratic, anti-imperialist regimes by every means, including intervention in the nations' domestic affairs.

The formation of the Trilateral Commission, the speaker said, marks a new phase in the development of international state-monopoly alliances. Like some super-government, it formulates global strategy to suit the multinational monopolies. The main goal of this new center of world imperialism is to extend the international framework for the joint activity of monopoly capital in the various countries and to coordinate on an international scale the

imperialists' policy aimed against the socialist system and the peoples' liberation movement.

The emergence of the socialist system, *Barbu Zaharescu* said, radically transformed the international relations based on the domination of a handful of imperialist states, and favors their democratization, and also the establishment of a new democracy in countries recently released from the colonial yoke. These countries are now working to achieve real economic independence by developing their own industry, modernizing their agriculture, and ramifying their economy, in accordance with each nation's need. Such development leads to important changes in the social structure and shapes the working class. As a result, he said, there should be a growth in the masses' participation in the whole of economic and political life, with a simultaneous strengthening of the democratic order in each of these countries. Of course, in some countries released from the colonial yoke, the objective historical process has to run against the action by the imperialist powers, the transnationals, and local groupings connected with the neo-colonialists' interests.

Such development, the speaker continued, cannot rest on autarky. Economic growth requires an exchange of material and spiritual values with the other countries of the world. The transnationals and the imperialist forces supporting them seek to use this exchange to maintain neo-colonial oppression. A socialist country cannot but pursue and support a policy of cooperation with developing countries on the basis of complete equality and mutual advantage, respect for national independence and sovereignty, and non-interference in domestic affairs.

The establishment of these principles signifies a democratization of relations among states. One cannot say that these principles have already been finally entrenched in international affairs, because the imperialists seek to divide the world into spheres of influence, to impose inequitable economic relations and to meddle in others' domestic affairs. But in contrast to this, the new policy of cooperation is being ever more firmly established. The growth of the economic and political influence of socialism throughout the world, the socialist countries' policy of strengthening peace and extending international cooperation has had a crucial role to play in the ever more resolute introduction of democratic principles into international affairs.

Replying to *Sarada Mitra*'s question concerning the need to take into account the social-class aspects in tackling problems in democratizing international relations, notably economic relations, *Zaharescu* said that some developing countries have chosen the socialist road, and others, the capitalist road. These distinctions are taken into account. When we speak of developing economic relations with all countries, we do not have in mind their internal conditions.

Referring to *Ramelson*'s question concerning the assessment of political interstate agreements, *Zaharescu* said that every country has the right to conclude a peace treaty: that is its business. But the question is, he added, how peace in a given region can be ensured. No treaty can prevent a people from fighting for its liberation and the right to have its own state.

In abstract terms, *Ramelson* objected, one could say that every country has the right to conclude a peace treaty. But it is not right to assess agreements in non-concrete terms, without drawing a distinction between the kinds of peace they lead to, a democratic or undemocratic peace infringing the people's very right to self-determination. Solidarity with the struggle of other peoples does not imply paternalistic policies which diverge from the stand taken by the progressive forces of these peoples.

The class approach, *Mitra* said, joining in the discussion, dictates the need to develop the socialist countris' relations with developing countries that would be based not only on the principles of peaceful coexistance but also on internationalist support of revolutionary-democratic, anti-imperialist regimes. This approach disappears if one considers the problems of cooperation between existing socialism and these countries outside the context of the socio-political nature of the regimes they have.

The need to reckon with this aspect springs from the comprehension of the interconnection between the class struggle and peaceful coexistence, which creates favorable conditions not only for advancing the struggle for peace and democratizing international relations, but also in developing the revolutionary movement in each individual country. Another important thing to note, the speaker went on, is that a strengthening of the non-aligned movement is also directly connected with the struggle for détente. The détente also creates a psychological climate for reducing the danger of war, by inducing, for instance, the conservative ruling circles in developing countries to repudiate military pacts and take a non-aligned stand.

In present-day conditions, *Julio Laborde* said, the aggressive policy of imperialism has not been relaxed. As in the past, the working people of Latin American countries are seeking political and social rights in face of stubborn resistence from internal and external reaction. Whenever the imperialist forces have an opportunity — as they now have in many Latin American countries — to eliminate these rights, they do so with the use of force.

The struggle for democracy in Latin America, he went on, has become profoundly anti-imperialist, because no genuine democracy can exist for any lengthy period in a country dependent on imperialism. Laborde then emphasized an aspect of the connection between the struggle for peace and the class struggle which is an important one in Latin American conditions, namely, the resistance by the revolutionary and democratic forces to the imperialist attempts to provoke international conflicts for the purpose of suppressing liberation movements. In Latin America, he said, the imperialists seek to divide the working class by stirring up chauvinistic attitudes among the population so as to prevent the advance of the anti-imperialist struggle and to divert the people from their main goal.

The sharpening relations between Argentina and Chile, he went on, show who stands to gain from international conflicts. It is U.S. imperialism which is trying to intensify its influence on these countries, and the fascist forces seeking to bolster their positions by militarizing the economy and suppressing popular movements under the pretext of warding off an 'external threat.' It is indicative that in the recent period, when the conflict became less acute, the struggle for democracy and social progress in both countries assumed greater proportions. This provides fresh confirmation of the close interdependence between the class struggle and the struggle for peace.

The struggle for democracy, the speaker said, runs through various stages, but it would be wrong to assume that democracy can be won gradually, step by step. Experience shows that the revolutionary forces frequently take over after a period of savage reaction. Everything depends on the objective and subjective conditions created in the country by the development of the revolutionary process.

In the recent period, he went on, imperialism has been dealt heavy blows, and these have opened up fresh opportunities for intensifying the Latin American people's struggle for democracy and against fascism and reaction. Realization of these opportunities is largely promoted by the conditions of détente, and by the socialist-community countries' support of the progressive, anti-imperialist forces.

Wieslaw Klimczak dealt with some ideological aspects of the correlation between the class struggle and détente. The sharpening of the ideological confrontation between the two systems shows, he said, that peaceful coexistence does not rule out class struggle. On the one hand, there is a growing recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence among realistically minded circles of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and on the other, there is a spread of the imperialists' subversive activity against socialism, democracy and peace. Imperialism adapts its tactics to the new situation and tries to slow down the détente. But it does not shun the use of compromised means and methods of psychological subversion and provocation borrowed from the cold-war arsenal. Subversive propaganda, the speaker went on, is unstinting in offering advice on how to 'improve' socialism. The mass media catering for imperialism keep trying to impose bourgeois standards of life on the socialist community and ever more frequently resort to attacks on the state-law institutions of socialist democracy. This kind of propaganda clashes with the spirit of democracy and peace, poisons the international atmosphere, prevents the realization of democratic norms and principles of cooperation among nations, and is, in effect, a form of interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

Poland, like the other socialist-community countries, Klimczak said, does not interfere in the affairs of others, but it has not abandoned the idea of spreading the communist ideology in accordance with the democratic principles of international life. The Marxist-Leninist approach to ideological struggle has always been scientifically argumented, based on facts, and used to defend the objective truth. It rules out any possibility of shifting the ideological contradictions between the two different systems into the sphere of inter-state relations, and implies respect for the sovereignty, laws and customs of other countries, and their juridical and ethical norms.

Reactionary substance of hegemonism

Considering the factors complicating the development of the revolutionary process, the participants in the conference drew attention to the great danger of the Chinese leadership's foreign policy and the Maoist ideology for world peace and the security of nations, and their struggle for social progress and democracy. In this context, they dealt with the question of the social sources of Peking's hegemonism.

The Peking reactionaries, *Nguyen Khanh Toan* said, regard Vietnam as their chief enemy in the region of Southeast Asia, because socialist Vietnam, which defeated the United States, the mightiest imperialist power, has become an outpost of independence, democracy, peace and socialism, and has won great international authority. This is a great obstacle for the Peking reactionary group's expansionist, hegemonic goals in its policy of isolating Vietnam, ranging the Vietnamese people against the other peoples of Indochina and Southeast Asia, and the Chinese people, by artificially fanning the problem of the 'Hoa,' that is, ethnic Chinese, accusing Vietnam of alleged hegemonic urges and calling it an 'Asian Cuba,' an 'agent of the USSR,' and so on and so forth.

The speaker described the forms in which the Chinese aggression in Indochina is being carried on (the conflict along Vietnam's south-western border provoked by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sari clique, the Maoists' acts of subversion along its northern borders, the staging of disorders in the country with the help of the Chinese comprador bourgeoisie, similar acts against Laos and so on), and showed the substance of Peking's war against Vietnam. What kind of war is it, what is its nature? Did it spring from some controversial border issue, or from past national strife? How could two socialist countries start slaughtering each other?

This is not a war over some border issue, he declared. When both parties are members of the socialist community, no border issue is ever steeled through a sanguinary armed clash for the simple reason that for them there is no such issue in substance, because truly socialist states respect the territorial integrity of other states. Nor is it a war over past national strife. When both parties are truly socialist states, and when such a problem does exist, they work hard to do away with this harmful survival of the past.

The speaker said that, deliberately or otherwise, some regard both parties as socialist, but Peking's ruling group, which has an exaggerated sense of great-power chauvinistic nationalism, has tried to

channel China's social development to suit its own interests, so converting the socialist regime in China into a reactionary military dictatorship. That is why the Peking aggressors' war of aggrandizement against Vietnam is not in any sense a war between two socialist states. It is a criminal, barbarous counter-revolutionary war, a part of the crusade by the imperialist, fascist and reactionary forces against socialism, independence, democracy, peace and friendship among nations. Those who regard this war as a clash between two socialist countries have, wittingly or unwittingly, fallen into the trap set by the Peking reactionaries and their imperialist mentors.

Peking's expansionism and hegemonic claims, *Carlos Nunez Anavitarte* remarked, are encouraged by world imperialism in order to create a political and economic basis for aggression in Asia against socialism and the progressive regimes. The aggression against Vietnam, which is a bulwark of struggle against imperialism in Southeast Asia, is part of the effort to attain that reactionary goal. In this context, he said that the dangerous changes in Peking's foreign policy could well grow deeper, because of imperialism's increasing political influence on China and the Peking leadership's reorientation of the country's external economic ties upon the capitalist market.

Orlando Millas emphasized that in Chile, in view of the compact between the Chinese leaders and Pinochet, the Maoists' betrayal of the cause of revolution and democracy appears in a clear light. He pointed to the need to expose the roots and peculiarities of the anti-democratic, anti-popular and anti-socialist deformation that has taken place in China.

Analyzing the social basis of the Peking leaders' hegemonic foreign policy, which has developed into aggression and war against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, *Sobolev* emphasized that the socialist system and world peace are indivisible. There can be no war between socialist countries, he said. For class reasons and in virtue of the socio-economic organization of socialism and the uniformities governing its functioning and development, the socialist society never pursues a policy of aggression and wars against other nations, and rejects the chauvinistic, militaristic ideology which informs such a policy.

When analyzing the social sources of hegemonism, Marx and Engels's indication of the reactionary nature of various conceptions of unscientific socialism — feudal socialism, militarized and egalitarian barrack-room socialism, etc. — has important methodological implications. When such reactionary trends are realized in practice, especially when social deformation and degeneration are based on a chauvinistic, militaristic ideology, foreign policy may entail aggression and war. That is what the Peking leaders' expansionist and hegemonic line has now demonstrated, the speaker said.

The foreign policy shaped after the victory of the revolution in China, *Julio Laborde* said, initially had a socialist content, but it clashed with the interests of the ruling group, which altered its class character and turned it into a policy that is in substance blatantly counter-revolutionary. This expansionist policy, he stressed, does not merely violate the basic principles of socialism, it is totally in contradiction with them.

Sarada Mitra said in a rejoinder that when analyzing the Chinese leaders' foreign policy, there is a need to reckon with the fact that from the first few years of the people's Republic of China, this policy was under the strong influence of the nationalistic ideology of the petty-bourgeois strata, which dominated the circles that laid down the line. That is why, when bringing out the social roots of the Peking leadership's hegemonism, one also has to sort out the question of whether it is a product of the degeneration of China's foreign policy, of the social deformations in the country, or whether it has resulted from the development of the petty-bourgeois nationalistic trends which that policy earlier contained.

Janos Berecz noted the need to continue the collective analysis of the Peking leadership's foreign policy and ideology and the social roots which fuel them, without interfering in China's internal affairs. Such an analysis is important, the speaker said, also because there is a need to rebuff the latest bourgeois propaganda inventions that socialism does not rule out war. The Chinese aggression against socialist Vietnam, he said, springs from the policy of hegemonism, which has nothing in common with socialism. He stressed that there can be no reconciliation with Maoism and the Chinese leaders' hegemonic foreign-policy line.

On the question of present-day terrorism

In analyzing the possibility of effecting the revolutionary process by democratic means and methods, some speakers dealt with the question of the need to study present-day terrorism and its social roots.

In Western society, *Antonio Jannazzo* said, the only forces oriented upon traumatic solutions are the forces of the new terrorism engendered by the crisis and the defects of capitalist society. This terrorism, fed by the dire crisis of values and the irrationality of some forms of capitalism, seeks to impose on society ceaseless violent conflicts so as to erode it and pave the way for anti-democratic gambles. Its purpose is to limit the democratic policy's field of action for the sake of chimeras which have nothing in common with the complicated realities of the civil society and the revolutionary process.

In Spain, *Jose Luis Malo de Molina* stressed, terrorism is a weapon in the hands of the anti-democratic forces. On the one hand, it shows the weakness of the oligarchic circles, which daily find it ever harder to obtain mass support, without which they cannot keep their regime going, and on the other, it has a destructive function to perform, because it produces and spreads a sense of uncertainty among the masses, markedly curbs individual and social freedoms, and hampers the solution of society's real problems. Just as inflation is used as an instrument to redistribute surplus-value in favor of the monopolies, so terrorism is used to redistribute

political power in favor of the oligarchic forces. Terrorism poses a grave threat to the 'democracy of the overwhelming majority' and is objectively aimed against the interests of the working classes.

The question of terrorism, *Berecz* suggested, should not be considered only within the national framework, for its roots are linked with international imperialism and militarism. The fresh tide of terrorism which originated in the middle and the latter half of the 70s has assumed great proportions, in particular, in countries with fascist traditions. It is characteristic that bourgeois propaganda has sought to depict terrorism in 'leftist' tones, and to place the blame for it on the left-wing forces. Any assessment of terrorism in this or that country requires a concrete approach, a study of the conditions in which it originates, and exposure of the socio-political forces in which it is rooted.

Is it right to connect terrorism, the development of terrorism, *B. Spasov* asked, solely with fascist traditions? In this connection, *Karoly Lipkowicz* asked *Tommy O'Flaherty* to explain the roots of terrorism in Northern Ireland.

Disappointment of petty-bourgeois groups in the possibility of attaining legitimate goals by means of the constitutional methods of bourgeois democracy, rejection of the forms and methods of the working-class struggle and refusal to carry on painstaking work among the masses had a considerable role to play in the emergence of present-day terrorism in Western Europe, *O'Flaherty* replied. But in Northern Ireland, there are more aspects to the roots and problem of terrorism. Disappointment in the traditional bourgeois norms has affected not only the group constituting the Provisional IRA, but also a part of the population of Northern Ireland. One should not ignore the fact that the Provisional IRA has its base in the community in Northern Ireland. Another important point is that the Provisional IRA operations, its acts of terrorism, and the bomb blasts in public places promote the growth of sectarian attitudes and prevent the establishment of an anti-imperialist alliance. At the same time, these acts enable the British government to intensify its repression on the plea that it is protecting the population. Actually, the repression is being applied not only against the Provisional IRA, but against all the progressive forces in Northern Ireland. Still, it is not terrorism that is Northern Ireland's chief problem, but the presence of British imperialism and its policy in the area. The activity of the Provisional IRA is only a symptom of the need for fundamental changes in the country. Terrorism is the very opposite not only of democratic, but also of revolutionary methods and goals of struggle.

Some problems of international solidarity

In the light of the dialectics of revolution and democracy, the participants in the conference examined some questions of proletarian internationalism. Their exchange of views was concentrated on the correlation of the class and the general democratic elements in the international solidarity of the revolutionary and democratic forces, and the conjunction of the national and the international in the revolutionary process.

Proletarian internationalism in our day, *Lhamsuren* said, has gone well beyond the framework of the intra-class unity of the working class of the various countries, and now ranges over a broad complex of relations of mutual solidarity of the three streams in the present-day revolutionary process: world socialism, the international working-class and the national-liberation movements. The extension of the scope of proletarian internationalism is epitomized in the fact that members of the most diverse non-proletarian strata tend ever more broadly to join in solidarity actions by the working class. But that does not mean that the conception of proletarian internationalism has become too narrow for the establishment of solidarity relations among all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces. Of course, not all the forces involved in the common struggle or even those accepting some aspects of the working-class ideology switch to the working-class positions. In practice, many of them understand and accept international solidarity in terms of the democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle. That is quite natural.

But when it comes to the communists' stand on this question, they must necessarily take an explicit class approach. The ideas and principles of proletarian internationalism, the speaker stressed, constitute the core of the broad anti-imperialist solidarity of the democratic forces, and provide class guidelines in their struggle. The extension of the social basis of international solidarity, he went on, has gone hand in hand with an enrichment of the content of proletarian internationalism, chiefly of its general democratic aspects, which have their specific features in each of the revolutionary streams.

The speaker further showed the futility of the attempts to substitute narrowly viewed national or regional tasks for the rich content of proletarian internationalism. Any effort to contrast the national and the international, he said, is incompatible with the communists' internationalist stand, whose class substance is revealed in their acts of solidarity for the sake of their ultimate goal and a stand for the interests of the movement as a whole. The communists' national and international duties are indivisible, and efforts to ensure their dialectical unity are among the chief conditions of success in revolutionary struggle.

The dialectics of proletarian internationalism is directly connected with the dialectics of the present-day revolutionary process, *Nguyen Khanh Toan* said. The starting point for the mighty movement of international solidarity in our epoch was Lenin's slogan: 'Proletarians of all Countries and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!' The speaker emphasized the tremendous importance of the Great October Revolution, the community of socialist countries and the rise of the working-class and national-liberation movements for the development of the working people's international solidarity, and said that this has markedly enriched the ideas of proletarian internationalism and Leninism.

We are now witnessing an aggravation and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. The strike movement in the developed capitalist countries has been growing. Tens of millions of workers are involved in a militant offensive, demanding democratic changes in the structure of the capitalist economy. That, the speaker said, is the new aspect of the struggle of the proletariat and the other working people against the monopolies today. Another characteristic point is that the working class links up the struggle for its demands with the struggle for peace, for détente, and against the arms race.

Nguen Khanh Toan drew attention to the resolve with which the developing nations have been fighting for their independence and freedom, increasingly taking the socialist orientation. In defiance of the neo-colonialist offensive mounted by imperialism, the idea of the socialist road has been steadily winning more and more supporters in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The socialist countries have been giving effective political, economic, technical, cultural and military assistance to the progressive forces in developing countries. That is not some sort of interference in their domestic affairs, but fulfillment of the class, internationalist duty, which has been made possible by the existence and growth of the socialist community, of international solidarity and proletarian internationalism.

There should be a historical approach to the conception of proletarian internationalism, *Lipkowicz* said. It contains principles which remain valid at every stage of the class struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism. These are, he said, its stable and constant elements. At the same time, there is a steady development and enrichment of the content of this conception in view of the requirements of the epoch on the basis of the theoretical legacy of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. The speaker pointed to a number of areas where, in his view, such enrichment has occurred in the postwar period. There is the extension of the principles of proletarian internationalism to the relations between the socialist-community countries, and to the relations with socialism-oriented countries. New aspects of the content of the proletarian-internationalism conception are also connected with the growth and spread of the anti-monopoly struggle.

The broad international campaign of solidarity with the people of Chile, where a fascist dictatorship has been set up, *Orlando Millas* said, is an expression of the understanding by all the democratic forces on every continent of the danger posed by fascism. He stressed the responsibility of the communists in the anti-fascist struggle, and for the unification, organization and mobilization of the forces capable of stopping fascism, and overthrowing and eradicating it, whenever it is in power.

He noted the international nature of the antagonism between the growing democratic aspirations of the masses and the anti-democratic tendencies of state-monopoly capitalism, and added that the working class is carrying aloft the banner on which are inscribed human rights, immunity of the individual, legality, as an inalienable part of political democracy, equality of opportunity, and freedom of choice not only in politics, but also in economics and culture. In the past, these slogans were heralded by the bourgeoisie when it was rising against feudalism and absolutism. But nowadays, with the financial oligarchy and the multinational monopolies seeking to suppress the working people's struggle for their rights, and to hamper the liberation of peoples still under oppression by racist regimes, to install and maintain fascist and pro-fascist dictatorships, substitute neo-fascist institutions for parliamentary ones, curb the powers of representative organs and militarize the economy, democratic demands are invested with an anti-imperialist content. There is, on the one hand, a trend toward authoritarianism in the state apparatus, which is subordinate to the monopolies, and on the other, the formation of popular governments. Both trends have been developing in a situation that is complicated, multi-tiered and characterized by various peculiarities. In the course of stubborn class battles, the working class enriches and raises democracy to a higher qualitative stage. The defense of political democracy, the speaker said, is being carried on in close connection with the struggle to democratize the relations of production, to effect a socialist revolution, and turn the means of production into social property. Attainment of these goals implies the establishment of a people's power. The dialectics of revolution and democracy is expressed in all the diverse social processes of our day, including the working class's alliances with the peasantry, the middle strata, the intelligentsia and all the other progressive forces.

Examining the distinction between the international solidarity of the working class and other forms of international acts of solidarity, *Bert Ramelson* noted that there are strata of the population in many countries which, while not being supporters of socialism for various ideological motives, stand for peace, support the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and condemn China's aggression against Vietnam. These are important forms of solidarity, but they are no substitute for the international unity of the working class, although, the speaker said, some think that it is no longer necessary. Current facts show that the international solidarity of the working class has been winning supporters among ever broader sections of the working people, revealing in its manifestations a growth of their class consciousness.

The non-use of the term 'proletarian internationalism,' the speaker said, is neither an expression of some kind of 'crisis' of communist international solidarity, nor a consequence of any refusal to take part in international acts of solidarity by revolutionary forces; it is due to the narrow, one-sided interpretation which is frequently given to this term. There is a need for the international solidarity of the working people wherever the class struggle goes on. Of course, all the forces standing for socialism must express solidarity with the socialist countries, which have a tremendous positive role to play in changing the balance of forces in

the international arena, and in advancing the struggle for socialism all over the world. But such solidarity, the speaker said, does not exclude criticism of that which hampers the development of the international working-class movement as a whole.

The arguments for abandoning the 'proletarian internationalism' term are untenable, *Sarada Mitra* said in a rejoinder. Who is it, in fact, that gives its content a narrow interpretation, so evoking negative associations? At any rate, it is not those who believe that this term is still valid today as a scientific expression of international solidarity, which does not set any limits to its development in accordance with the requirements of the revolutionary process and the struggle for democracy and peace. Ultimately, Mitra said, it is not a matter of terms. The main thing is how the principles of internationalism are realized in practice.

Mitra continued: Do comradely relations among revolutionaries based on principle rule out criticism and self-criticism aimed to create the most favorable conditions for attaining the common goals of the movement? He recalled the positive impact exerted by the ideas of the 20th Congress of the Soviet communists on the world revolutionary movement. He also expressed disagreement with any attempts to separate mutual solidarity of the forces engaged in the class struggle in the non-socialist world from their solidarity with the countries of existing socialism, and stressed that this runs counter to the interests of these forces in the first place.

Analyzing the concept of proletarianism, *Berecz* identified some of its features: solidarity and mutual support in the class struggle; the dialectics of the international and the national requiring a conjunction of these elements in the vital interests of the working class; mutual concern for each other's successes; cooperation on the basis of comradely relations and non-interference in domestic affairs. These features, he said, invariably characterize the solidarity of the communists and the working class, although their manifestations naturally tend to change in our dynamic epoch. The speaker showed the flimsiness of the claim that proletarian internationalism is in 'crisis,' and stressed that there is no crisis at all. There is a quest for specific ways to socialism, there are relevant discussions, which are sometimes acute, international solidarity on the basis of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin continues to be the definitive feature of the international communist movement.

The present-day revolutionary process, *Sobolev* remarked, is characterized, on the one hand, by the internationalization of the class struggle, and on the other, by the growing importance of the national factor. There is a dialectical interconnection between these two phenomena: the deeper the internationalization, the greater the opportunities for bringing out the national specifics in the transition to socialism.

The diversity of international situations, phases and conditions in which the revolution goes forward, and also the distinctions in the patterns of class forces on the national and international scale, *Morgadinho* said in a rejoinder, implies anti-imperialist, democratic solidarity of the social forces working for different progressive goals, and the communists have a duty to strengthen it.

Proletarian internationalism is being constantly enriched by the development of the world revolutionary process and all the forces involved in it. But in the process, the interests and fundamental goals of the working class always remain identical throughout the world. This must never be replaced by some 'extra-class' internationalism. The communists formulate their political line independently, without any outside interference, Morgadinho went on. But this does not contradict the principles of internationalist solidarity, because independence is established above all through the communists' class stand, in virtue of the fact that they resist the influence of the ideology of other classes. Independence, she said, is no bar to explaining the successes of the Soviet Union and other socialist-community countries, or to friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist nations. This stand enables the communists to carry on a successful struggle against opportunism and reaction, and to win new allies.

Upon the completion of the exchange of views in the sections, the conference met in a final plenary session under the chairmanship of *Berecz* to hear reports from the section chairmen.

Sandor Lakos, chairman of the section 'Interconnection of the Struggle for Democracy and the Struggle for Socialism,' said that 33 persons took part in its work, with over 50 speeches and many rejoinders in the course of the discussion. On the whole, the exchange of views had been substantive and multi-faceted and yielded valuable information. The problems were discussed with an eye to the propositions set forth in the papers and in a constructive spirit. Characterizing the lines of the discussion, Lakos said that according to the participants' joint assessment, every one had benefited from it.

Ib Nørlund, Chairman of the section 'Democracy and the International Factors of the Revolutionary Process,' said that 20 persons had taken part in its work, many taking the floor several times in the course of five sessions. He listed the problems which had been central to the discussion, and noted that it had brought out both identical and differing standpoints. On the whole, he said, the participants in the section work were unanimous in that comradely discussion is one of the most productive ways of comprehending new problems which constantly arise in the practice of the class struggle.

In conclusion of the conference, it was addressed by *Ivan Frolov,* Executive Editor of *World Marxist Review*. The conference, he said, had successfully fulfilled the task before it. Its participants had an all-round discussion of the subject and exchanged new experience and new ideas. In the course of the creative discussions, they gained a deeper mutual understanding of the views and approaches to the

theoretical, scientific examination of the problems.

The success of the conference, Frolov said, was undoubtedly promoted by the fact that its topic — Revolution and Democracy — is extremely important both in terms of scientific theory and political practice. He said it was one of the 'growth points' of the Marxist-Leninist science. Indeed, the problems which it covered are now central to the attention of the fraternal parties working in different concrete conditions. And the conference, Frolov stressed, has helped to gain a better understanding of the concrete line of theoretical quest by the communists' collective thinking, its scientific results, and also the problems which call for further study and vertification of the solutions proposed, both in discussion and in the practice of the class struggle, the ultimate arbiter of the communists' scientific views.

He said that the problems of democracy has been considered in close connection with the internal and international factors of the struggle for socialism, and specifically stressed three points. First, the unanimous opinion of the participants was that democracy is a great value for the working people. Today, Frolov said, a qualitative swing in the struggle for democracy has taken place thanks to the experience of socialist democracy and the gains of the working class in the capitalist world. Democracy is not confined to the political order, but runs deeper, down to the economic roots, man's social status in society, and his rights and freedoms. Democracy and freedom are the greatest values without which mankind's progress is inconceivable; the communists take pride in the fact that they have assumed the struggle for these human values as their supreme mission, seeking realistic ways for their practical realization from the standpoint of the working class and all the other working people.

The second point which the speaker noted, and which, he said, did not minimize the role of the other factors in the development of the revolutionary process, is the special importance of the struggle for détente. It is clear to everyone that in the international plane, the future of democracy now depends precisely on the struggle for peace, and for the peaceful coexistence and freedom of nations. Democracy in peace, and peace in democracy, those are the two interconnected aspects of the reality of our day. There is no alternative to this, because world war is not an alternative at all.

Frolov listed as his third point the connection between the present-day revolutionary struggle and the broader humanistic goals of communism. This new humanism, he said, as an existing movement and an ideological and ethical principle, as an alternative to fanaticism, rigorism and spiritual sectarianism, is the 'living soul' of genuine democracy and is adequately embodied in the communist perspective for which the communists are working. This makes the communists a force which is most capable today and in the future to carry on a historical dialogue bearing on the destiny of mankind.

Those are the general positions, Frolov said, from which the communists approach concrete tasks in the practical solution of the problems of revolution and democracy. The capability for dialogue and the spirit of frank discussion have invested this conference with a truly scientific character and a genuinely democratic atmosphere.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Editorial Board and the Editorial Council of *World Marxist Review*, and also on behalf of all the guests who came to Hungary, Frolovo expressed heartfelt gratitude to the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party for providing good conditions for the work of the conference and for their cordial reception.

The communists and public opinion

A KEY ASPECT OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE

A Dialogue between *Peter Boychuck*, Alternate member, Executive Committee, CP Canada, and *Julio Laborde*, CC member, CP Argentina.

Public opinion and its role in capitalist society today. The mechanism of mass-consciousness formation and functioning. The main lines of the communists' activity to win over the masses for peace and socialism.

Laborde. We should apparently start our discussion by accepting that the problem before us is a very important one, indeed. 'Public opinion' is a term that is firmly established in the political lexicon of the communist and workers' parties. Public opinion is dealt with in the programs of some parties, the decisions of many congresses and other documents of the communist movement.

Boychuck. And it is here that we have, in fact, to face the first problem: why do the communists give so much attention to public opinion proper? Why is this aspect of the functioning of mass consciousness so important in their activity today?

Laborde. I think that this is above all a matter of the important objective changes which have taken place in the characteristics of public opinion, and in the status it now has in the world as a whole, in capitalist society in particular. The main thing in these changes is the definite growth of the importance and role of public opinion in the world's socio-political life, and the marked increase of its influence on the institutions of power and social administration.

Bourgeois social science and practice are very well aware of this fact. Here is an admission by a U.S. specialist in ideology, who says: In all the countries, when working out their foreign and domestic policy, national leaders must take public

---

Continued from *WMR*, Nos. 2 and 6, 1979.

opinion into account. A few decades ago, major decisions on world problems were taken by the leaders of states and diplomats. In most cases, the people had either insignificant influence or none at all on the management of the country's policy. Nowadays, the ordinary city dweller, peasant or inhabitant of the tropical jungle want to be heard.*

Of course, theings are not that simple, but democratic opinion under capitalism invariably has to face great difficulties which are engineered by the ruling classes. Still virtually no capitalist government can afford not to reckon in one way or another with public opinion expressing the mood of the masses, and the political and socio-psychological state of society.

Boychuck. I agree that public opinion is playing an increasingly prominent role in capitalist society today. I should like, however, to throw a little more light on the question of the *nature* and *factors* of such changes. They are not, after all, someone's special idea. They were called forth by objective social processes and the needs of the times.

The need to rally the support of the masses in the bourgeois revolutions in England, the United States and France was the first impulse for the emergence of public opinion on the historical arena. The challenge of the working class to the capitalist class positions could not be contained by force alone. In order to remain in power the ruling classes needed the support of the 'great majority,' and this intensified effort in the capitalist countries to win over public opinion.

The emergence of the USSR and the socialist community, the worldwide contest between socialism and capitalism, have added to the importance of public opinion on a world scale and within the national framework, elevating it to a new height.

Finally, the development of communications, particularly radio and television, has to a large extent circumvented the illiteracy problem and has brought new vast sections of people into motion more rapidly, in deciding or affecting world developments, as well as accelerating local and regional development.

Indeed, people want to be heard. But why? Why is today any different from yesterday? The answer will be found, say , in the 'accessibility' of information in the world today, produced by the mass media. When French people in Canada watch TV broadcasts of UN proceedings in New York and listen to French-speaking representatives of independent African countries, be they from Gabon, Senegal or Madagascar (countries with a smaller territory and population than French-speaking Canada, with a far less developed economy and culture) this naturally raises in their minds various associations and analogies about their own status as compared with English-speaking Canada. A long-standing and dormant idea comes to active life.

Laborde. I think that when considering the role of public opinion in the life of society, one should bear in mind that the modern world is extremely varie-

*See J. Gibson. *Ideology and World Affairs*. Boston, 1964, p. 14.

gated, notably in terms of socio-political structures in the various societies. Because public opinion is meshed with society's political life and has definite ties with the institutions of power and social administration, such diversity of historical and national conditions must have an effect on the various characteristics of public opinion.

Boychuck. Of course, one need only compare the conditions of political democracy in Canada, where public opinion is a recognized institution of society's socio-political life, and the blatant fascist dictatorship in some Latin American countries where the authorities seek to root out any opposition attitudes by force.

At the same time, in spite of various distinctions, there are common features characterizing the state of public opinion in developed capitalist countries, making for a productive discussion of the topic of 'The Communists and Public Opinion.' I think that two main problems require priority consideration: (1) What do the communists and Marxists *mean* by public opinion; how do they assess its nature and basic characteristics in capitalist society? and (2) how do the communists *regard* public opinion in practice; how do they *take it into account* in their day-to-day mass political activity?

Laborde. I agree. Concerning the first problem, let me say briefly that the Marxists regard public opinion as a sum total of views and notions on various social problems which reflect (in one form or another — whether true or false — on the level of ideology and everyday consciousness, scientific knowledge, and superstition) the economic, social and other realities, which are accepted by various groups and sections of the population.

It is plain that in an antagonistic capitalist society the vehicles of public opinion are the two main opposing social groups, the classes, thus imparting a *class character* to public opinion. And the efforts to gain influence here become an important aspect of the class struggle.

Boychuck. This is a big and complicated question concerning the relations between public opinion and other, notably, class forms of social consciousness. On the one hand, we frequently quite rightly speak of the 'public opinion of the working class,' the 'public opinion of the capitalist class,' etc., especially when having in mind some global problems of mankind's social development. On the other hand, just as frequently in our day-to-day activity we face situations when representatives of this or that class actually have more than one standpoint (including some incompatible ones).

This also happens now and again with the working class and the capitalist class. Let us bear in mind, for instance, that there is stiff competition within the ruling class of present-day capitalist society. Different groups of the national bourgeoisie are engaged in active struggle against each other, naturally, within the framework of their common power. In that struggle, they not only constitute discrepant 'sectors' of opinion, but also broadly appeal to national public opinion, seeking to secure support from the masses. In such instances, we

must evidently recognize that the boundaries of public opinion do not coincide with the boundaries of the various social groups and classes.

Incidentally, there is yet another, more obvious fact to indicate this: the borad spread in capitalist society today of notions and views which are not founded on class positions but have a broader base. Among these are religious beliefs, concepts of life and death, some moral and aesthetic values, some views on the attitude to the environment, etc.

Laborde. That much, of course, is true. That is why I said that under capitalism public opinon takes a *basically* class approach to problems. With respect to some global problems bearing on mankind as a whole or this or that nation, public opinion even under capitalism can be a reflection of the feelings of a majority of the population involving different classes and sections of society. In Argentina, for instance, the ruling circles now conduct a policy which infringes the interests of a majority of the nation. It is not only the working class, but also the national entrepreneurs, a large part of the peasantry, and other strata of Argentinian society that most resolutely oppose this policy (which does not, of course, preclude different approaches to the problem).

Still, in assessing public opinion, we must start from a class analysis of mass consciousness in the first place. The reflection of reality in public opinion may be either true or false. In view of this, the bourgeoisie has tried hard to induce public opinion to accept various false notions of the course of history. There are now a large number of phenomena and problems whose meaning has been distorted by bourgeois propaganda in shaping public opinion. thus, the capitalist world is designated as 'free,' the plunder of the dependent countries as 'aid' and 'cooperation,' the socialist countries are labelled 'totalitarian' (for alleged violations of human rights), etc.

Boychuck. I think that the class character of public opinion under capitalism is most strikingly revealed in the *content* of public opinion. The contending forces in the world, including each society, seek to fill the mass consciousness with their own ideas and notions. The bourgeoisie, for its part, has spread false and demagogic constructs on a tremendous scale in order to gear the mass consciousness to its class interests.

I could add to your examples the following. In Canada, for instance, bourgeois propaganda has widely spread the idea in the country, including the working class, that the long postwar economic boom demonstrates the superiority of private enterprise over socialism. Another widely disseminated idea is designed to reduce the impression from the successes of existing socialism. A false alternative is suggested between 'political democracy' which allegedly exists only in the capitalist society, and 'economic democracy' which is also possible under socialism, and so on and so forth.

Laborde. Under capitalism the class character of public opinion is strongly expressed in the *mechanisms of shaping and expressing* public opinion. And the first thing that needs to be said here is the obvious disparity among the various political, ideological and other forces from the standpoint of the possibility of their publicly expressing their stand and so exerting an effective influence on the hearts and minds of men.

The bourgeois state has infinitely more means at its service than the opposition. Modern capitalism has created a huge ideological and propaganda machine that influences every sphere of society at every level. The ruling classes start shaping mass consciousness in the desired direction long before the school takes over. The education system carries on and, finally, the mass media — press, radio, television, cinema and advertising — finish the job.

True, this system does not always accomplish the desired effect. At times, the ruling classes lose control and public opinion comes out against the system. Depending on the circumstances, the bourgeoisie then uses other well-known methods: reprisals against the people or a more or less camouflaged deception of the masses by creating the impression that it is heeding the people's will. In the capitalist countries, this is a daily occurrence, particularly during election campaigning when bourgeois leaders are ready to promise the people almost anything. Once ensconced in office, they pursue a policy that is a far cry from their electoral promises.

As for the ideological and educative activity of the progressive forces, primarily the communists, it has to proceed in constant struggle against the restrictions imposed by capitalism. In many countries, as in Latin America, this work is possible only in illegal forms. The brutal persecution I spoke of earlier is aimed mainly against the communists.

But, even in those capitalist countries where the working class has won many rights and freedoms in hard struggle (Western Europe, for example) the means available to communists to voice their ideas can in no way be compared to the propaganda machine at the disposal of the ruling classes. Here also, the capitalist governments strive to reduce to a minimum any opportunities and channels open to communists and other democratic forces, who find they are refused studio time; face restrictions on publishing, etc.

Boychuck. A recent example is the national election campaign in Canada (May 22, 1979). The Communist Party, although a registered political party contesting over 25 per cent of the seats, was blacked out by the national news media. This did not prevent two radio stations whose employees were then on strike from inviting communist candidates to present their program and offer them considerable time on the air. Naturally, we sidestepped this trap which would have been used to depict communists as strike-breakers.

However, this evident inequality is but one side of the problem. The ohter, equally important side has to do with the methods used by the ruling classes in shaping public opinion.

You mentioned the education system's ideological brainwashing of the younger generation.

What is important here is not only what is taught at school, but also what is not taught. For example, it is a scandal in most developed capitalist countries in North America and Europe, that polls of primary and high schools show them to have the vaguest idea of Hitler and nazism, to say nothing of the most crucial episodes of the Second World War.

Laborde. While screening ideologically and politically important news the bourgeois media are also a source of more or less well concealed misinformation, half and quarter truths, skillfully sidetracking public attention away from society's real problems and focusing on what Vladimir Lenin called 'sensationalist trash.'

A few years ago the UNESCO Higher Journalistic Research Center in Quito made a study of the mass media in Latin America. It found that most of the information carried by the press throughout the continent came from the foreign news agencies (79.3 per cent from UPI and AP) who 'followed their own criteria' in selecting news items. The larger part of these were on sport, crime, natural disasters, and so on, leaving only about 9 per cent dealing with 'topics bearing directly on social and economic development and education' (in the corresponding countries).*

When speaking of the main lines that the major imperialist ideological centers follow in their propaganda work, I would single out these: (1) the old traditional line of crusading for 'democracy,' 'freedom,' 'culture' in Western society and, of course, attacking peace and ideas of socialism up to and including anti-communism; (2) a newer trend connected with the convergence theory and changes in the social and ther structures of capitalism, and, finally, (3) the latest trend which makes use of leftist elements and pits all manner of self-styled 'revolutionary' forces in society — petty-bourgeois minded sections, declassed elements, etc. — against Marxism-Leninism, the communist parties and the proletariat.

Boychuck. Besides, keeping in mind the mechanism used by the ruling class in shaping public opinion, we should not forget the widely used public opinion polls and surveys by various scientific and non-scientific, governmental and non-governmental centers and agencies. In the capitalist countries, particularly in the United States, this has grown into a real industry grinding out social information. It is no secret that these polls, for wahtever purpose they may be conducted, are inevitably used by the ruling classes as a powerful means of turning public opinion in the desired direction and manipulating mass consciousness as they see fit.

The pattern here is a very simple one: the mass media start by actively spreading some notion about reality in the mass consciousness, and then unerringly bring out this notion in the course of public-opinion polls, which enable them triumphantly to declare: 'Here's what the people think, want, etc.'

Consideration of this fact helps us to obtain the right idea of the expression and functioning of broad democratic public opinion in the capitalist countries, and of the possibilities and forms of its participation in social administration.

We talk a lot in North America about our free press in the sense that the opposition can express its views. But, when our dailies, often running to 80 or 100 pages, carry letters disagreeing with official policy or complaining about the state of affairs, it is apparent that this is just an opportunity to let off steam, creating the impression of having a say, of freedom of expression, and no more. This is, in essence, yet another classic form of manipulating mass consciousness.

The socio-economic nature of capitalism in principle limits direct participation by public opinion (a majority of the nation) in the administration of social processes. In Canada, for instance, the only real opportunity for this is available at election time. And even here a very small minority of the people actually participate in the sense of advocating candidates for elections. The vast majority of the people have absolutely no say whatever in the selection of candidates and can only vote for one of those selected by a very small group of electors. In other words, here again we see how public opinion is restricted. One result of this is the continuing decline in the number of people voting.

A favorite way of paying heed to public opinion, while ignoring it, is for Canadian governments to establish what are called independent government commissions. They are supposed to study the problem in depth and bring in recommendations for corresponding agencies to implement. Actually, as experience has shown (for example, the commission set up in 1978 to investigate the illegal acts of the Canadian political security police, the RCMP), such investigations are far from being objective and are carried out only in the interests of the ruling classes. If this is not the case then the findings are either ignored or pigeonholed long enough for a new election to take place.

Laborde. What are the conclusions to be drawn by the communists from what has been said? Clearly, the answer cannot be a simple one. It is apparent, however, that the most important direction these activities must follow is to gain the support of national public opinion, influencing the change of its content in the spirit of peace, democracy and socialism.

The strong ideological pressure exerted by the bourgeoisie (which we already discussed) must not be underestimated. Large sections of the population in capitalist states, including a part of the working class, share the ideas, views and values that are formed and disseminated by institutions of power. For this reason our first task is to expose the assertions made by bourgeois propaganda, and acquaint the masses with the truth about the ideology and practice of scientific communism and the prin-

---

*See Jorge Florez McGregor. *La red y la tigera*. 'Abece' ed., Buenos Aires, 1971, p. 93.

ciples and tactics our parties follow in their activities.

What this really means is that we must change the mass consciousness, deformed by bourgeois upbringing and propaganda, and introduce to it the ideas and notions that correspond to the working people's basic interests. We must base our work on the realities we are concerned with, interlacing our ideological work with the specific historical situation. This means we must be deeply familiar with the working people's needs, their consciousness, their mood, etc.

The mass consciousness cannot, of course, be won by means of propaganda alone. International experience shows that communist ideas are more rapidly accepted by the working people in the process of extensive political, social and revolutionary struggle. That is why we need to combine our explanatory work, propaganda and agitation with political and organizational activity and the effort to rally the masses in the struggle for their demands.

Boychuck. Our party, like other communist parties, is constantly engaged in this kind of work. Here, the important thing is to fight for the observance of democratic principles and norms in the life of present-day capitalist states.

We have already said that the bourgeois democracy in these states, with all its historical limitations, is also constantly being violated by the ruling classes and their administrative machinery with the result that public opinion is unable to function properly and the positions of the democratic sections of society are weakened. And it is we communists, the most consistent fighters for democracy and for freedom, who must draw the people's attention to such violations of democracy, to all set-backs of public opinion in the fight against capitalist management. And this needs to be accompanied by a formulation of demands in defense of democratic freedoms and organization of mass movements to back up these demands.

Laborde. The struggle for democracy is, indeed, closely connected with the struggle for respect of public opinion, and a growing role for it in the solution of national and international problems. This is a dialectical process: public opinion has a big part to play in winning democracy, while the winning of democracy, for its part, turns out to be a powerful factor of social development. While noting the great complexity of the problems in sharping public opinion I should like to stress that in tackling these problems we have on our side a key factor for success, and that is — truth. Some may think this to be no more than a literary figure of speech. However, it is this element of Marxist-Leninist theory — truth — that will make possible the final defeat of the bourgeoisie's huge propaganda machine, because, as we have already agreed, capitalist propaganda is essentially founded upon the distortion of reality, on half-truths, blackouts and lies. And that is its Achilles heel.

Historical experience provides good ground for such optimism: the world is moving from capitalism to socialism, and this advance is ever more fully mirrored in broad public opinion.

Of course, not all our ideas spread across the world as fast as we wish. But it does prove that we must not only formulate and bring to the forefront ideas we believe to be correct, we must likewise skillfully and energetically work to popularize these ideas, making the working people and the nations aware of them.

Boychuck. In this context, I should like to say a few more words about the importance for communists of making a serious theoretical study of the problem of analyzing public opinion in society, of elaborating the scientific and organizational principles for establishing and measuring the requirements, opinions and moods of various sections and population groups in a capitalist society. The experience of the CP Canada shows that, more often than not, our reaction to public opinion is instinctive, being based on common sense rather than on the exact ideas of Marxist science.

Bourgeois social science — philosophy, sociology, psychology, etc. — performs such an analysis in the light of the interests of the ruling classes and on the basis of a corresponding methodology which is mainly positivist and pragmatic. Of course, we cannot use the results of this analysis, and have to carry out our own studies, based on the principles of dialectical and historical materialism.

On the other hand, it is not, of course, only a matter of purely theoretical work. There is the equally important problem of handling the instruments for the practical and political 'mastering' of public opinion, of being able to use the methods of its establishment and precise evaluation at every given moment in the life of society. The solution of the latter problem is an important condition for our efficient, practical activity, including the shaping of broad, national public opinion in its revolutionary development, and the winning over of broad masses of people for the ideas of peace and socialism.

I should like to underscore once again, and this is supported by our party's experience, that the attitude of communists to public opinion cannot be purely pragmatic, in the light of the tasks and interests of some transient historical moment. The objective complexities of the nature of public opinion and the mechanisms of its formation and functioning in modern types of societies imply not only a practical but also a theoretical 'mastering' of mass consciousness, involving its deep and comprehensive analysis by means of the Marxist-Leninist science. What is more, the latter now turns out to be the most important and necessary condition for achieving stable successes in practical activity on the basis of various inter-relations with public opinion.

Future of mankind and science

Our journal continues the publication of material on the impact of science on the modern historical process and its prospects.* The influence of scientific and technological progress on the economic life of capitalist society, which, according to some bourgeois experts, has entered a new phase of crisis, is a major aspect of the subject. The bourgeois press has been writing of late that a world crisis of capitalist production looms large on the horizon of the new five-year cycle and considers possible steps to prevent the 1979-80 recession from growing into a major economic upheaval. In the interviews with *WMR*, Ib Nørlund and Nikolai Inozemtsev consider some specifics of utilizing science and technology under capitalism, which have evoked a fear of the future in bourgeois society. They offer a Marxist forecast of capitalist economic development in the next two decades. *WMR* invites readers to join this exchange of views.

MONOPOLIES AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

Ib Nørlund
Member of the CC Executive Committee and Secretariat, Communist Party of Denmark

What is the influence of the scientific and technological revolution (STR) on the class struggle and, in particular, on the ideological struggle? What, in your opinion, are the main directions of this battle of ideas over the STR's possible impact on the future of mankind?

The scientific and technological revolution could become a source of hope for mankind. But its effect has been difficult in the capitalist world. As a result, new trends have emerged in the ideological struggle over the problems posed by this revolution.

As the general crisis of capitalism grows deeper, bourgeois ideology becomes increasingly pessimistic about the fate of culture and is in fear of the future. Fear and uncertainty are felt in its approach to questions of scientific and technical development. Such sentiments, I must admit, are not entirely unfounded, since the results of utilizing the major achievements of science and technology under capitalism cause both optimism and concern. These achievements make possible — and even presuppose — a deeper and broader intrusion into nature than ever before. This gives rise to new problems like the danger of irradiation, a change in the composition of the earth's atmosphere, and a possibility of genetic shifts, while the old problems like environmental pollution and rapacious exploitation of natural resources in the process of capitalist production are acquiring a qualitatively new dimension.

However, while creating all these dangers, science at the same time offers people (a fact often overlooked by bourgeois ideologists) new vast potentialities and the means of controlling them. Cybernetics, computer technology, and automation open up fresh prospects for accomplishing tasks which hitherto were unimaginable. Therefore, in the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution mankind is faced with a far higher responsibility for mastering this potential for the benefit of the people.

It is vitally important today for all nations to solve the problem of how to utilize the achievements of science and technology. Its solution depends on the nature of society and the basic motives of socio-economic development. Bourgeois ideologists charge socialist countries with 'ignorance' and 'thoughtlessness' because, unlike capitalist countries, they have no fear of the future. But the understanding of what is going on in the world and the sense of responsibility are greater among those who have technological progress under control. Only under socialism, when society controls the use of the new potential offered by science, is it correct to regard scientific and technological development as progress. Socialism's answer to the questions posed by the STR is a source of hope for mankind.

The differences in the approach to STR problems, depending on the character of the social system, are observed in the ideological sphere as well.

In capitalist society there are two schools of thought concerning the problems created by the progress of science and technology. Some see a way out in arresting progress, so as to prevent its misuse. This view is unrealistic. Others seek solutions in studying STR problems. This position helps one realize that the solution of the STR contradictions is not merely a technical problem but, above all, a social one. The conflict between the two approaches constitutes one of the directions of the ideological struggle today.

By revealing the true character of the contradictions of scientific and technological progress, their interdependence, the Marxist science has again demonstrated its own topicality and viability. The Marxist point of view is that the STR contradictions in capitalist society are directly linked with the contradiction between modern productive forces and the capitalist relations of production, which are at the basis of the general crisis of capitalism. The STR, which has given an impetus to the growth of productive forces, has deepened the crisis which is now reaching new

*See *WMR*, August 1979.

areas, posing new problems, and causing ideological clashes in new spheres.

What is behind the STR contradictions?

Though many of these contradictions have become global, they can be eliminated solely by stepping up the class struggle on the basis of anti-monopoly alliances and abolishing the capitalist relations of production. This conclusion is self-evident if one takes a close look at the problems posed by the STR. The pernicious effect of discoveries in many fields is a result of the monopolies' profit drive.

Capitalism's dangerous influence on science and technology is most strikingly obvious in their militarization, which places scientific discoveries at the service of the forces of destruction. Arms manufacture bring fabulous superprofits which are extorted from society mainly through taxes paid by the working people. Continuously perfecting the means of destruction, the military-industrial complexes put pressure on governments and spur the arms race. In the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, too, grave dangers are created by the profit drive. A number of accidents at nuclear electric power stations has caused deep public concern. It is alleged that atomic energy is uncontrollable. But the accidents have taken place not because of inadequate knowledge, but because safety rules were ignored. For instance, the construction of the nuclear power station in Harrisburg, USA, where the accident caused broad repercussions, was completed in haste, as otherwise the firm would have had to pay extra taxes and fix lower prices of its power. The accident at Brunsbüttel, West Germany, occurred when the safety system had been switched off. In many other cases, the workers, fearing dismissal, did not stop production even in most critical situations.

Similar problems are caused by other kinds of environmental pollution — the result of irresponsible organization of production. The contamination of water reservoirs and soil, pollution of the atmosphere by sulphuric compounds and the growing amount of carbon dioxide in it, which may cause dangerous climatic changes, and so on, may have far-reaching consequences. Capitalist enterpreneurs assert that they are not responsible for the pernicious effects of their activities. Let the government remedy the harm they do at its own expense, they declare. In our view, however, the entrepreneurs themselves must bear the cost of combating the harmful effects of production. This is the only way to ensure a responsible approach to the introduction of new technology, and this approach requires public control of monopoly activities.

The unfavorable consequences of scientific and technological progress affect man's health as well as nature. Discoveries in the medical industry are also used for profit-making, and the need to control the immediate or more long-range effect of new medicines is irresponsibly ignored. As a result, such medicines often prove detrimental to human health.

Serious problems are also caused by the social consequences of the use of scientific and technical achievements under capitalism. Technical achievements help to rationalize work in production, management, and in other spheres. Theoretically, this should have made work easier and extended workers' leisure time. But under capitalism rationalization totally 'relieves' many people of their jobs, resulting in what is hypocritically described as 'technological' unemployment. But the main reason for the growing unemployment is the capitalists' striving to shift the burden of cost onto the shoulders of wage and salaried workers.

These examples show that the disasters brought by technical progress are not the result of the shortcomings allegedly inherent in technology, but are mainly the result of tecnological abuses under capitalist relations of production.

How would you assess the monopolies' policy in regard to technological progress? What new tasks of the class struggle arise in response to this policy?

Modern technology requires huge inputs. Under capitalism this means a further speed-up of capital concentration and, as a result, the growth of its organic composition or, in other words, 'a rise in the cost of new jobs.' This, in turn, leads to intensification of monopoly activities aimed at increasing the rate of profit, and to further extension and sophistication of state-monopoly methods.

These processes have acquired such a wide scope that monopoly activities increasingly go beyond national boundaries. Capitalism responds to new problems by creating mighty multinational concerns having more power than many capitalist states which they use as pawns. The monopolies seek to control, above all, the economic jugulars — energy and raw material supply, the technically most advanced industries, the credit system — and strive to secure the necessary markets. The multinationals support capitalist integration and the setting up of blocs of capitalist states, thereby pulling down national barriers in their way and getting an opportunity of bringing pressure to bear on some states. It suits them that capitalist integration is carried out according to the right of might.

By no means can we regard the striving for faster and broader capitalist integration as a democratic process: constant rivalry increases the unevenness of capitalist development and undermines the positions of the weaker partners, in relation to which the supranational organs of integration are an instrument of national oppression and exploitation, first in the economic and then in the political and military spheres. Technological progress in the framework of capitalist integration hamstrings the productive forces of the weaker partners. All this gives rise to more national problems, and Denmark's membership in the Common Market is a case in point. The Danish shipbuilding industry, the pride of the country, which has won sound positions in the world market, is threatened with complete or partial liquidation. This is how the monopolies are

using technological progress in developed capitalist countries to slow down their development.

They are even tougher and more ruthless when dealing with the countries which are trying to eliminate the backwardness of their productive forces, a legacy of the past. The activities of the multinationals and capitalist integration contradict the objective demands of progress. With the quantitative and qualitative growth of the productive forces the internationalization of production provides an objective basis for a rational international division of labor. But the multinationals, on the contrary, undermine the basis for a mutually beneficial international division of labor, since they are conglomerates bound together by accidental financial ties and not by common interest in balanced economic development on a national or international scale. They use the gap in technical levels in order to subordinate developing countries to the policies pursued by the multinationals and imperialist states, thereby causing new international contradictions.

The scientific and technological revolution leads to greater internationalization of capitalist contradictions, and therefore, to the further internationalization of the class struggle, which grows in scope and assumes new forms. In this situation working-class internationalism is becoming an ever more important and necessary factor. The working-class world view, based on historical optimism, is a major prerequisite of the effort to solve the problems posed by the STR. It would be wrong to give way to despair and retreat before the 'menace of technological progress,' or to seek ways of 'arresting' it and 'blocking' the channels between technology and scientific discoveries. This progress must be controlled by society. We see the solution to this problem first of all in replacing the monopoly control of the productive forces by development of effective democratic control.

The problems of scientific and technological progress pose new democratic and anti-monopoly tasks in capitalist countries: disarmament and détente to prevent application of modern technology for destruction; nationalization of the power and other advanced industries and active democratic control over them; and ensuring equitable cooperation of states with the purpose of developing a rational and mutually beneficial international division of labor.

The peoples' concern may be turned into a means of mobilizing the masses for the solution of these problems, for a transformation of capitalist society, for the struggle which gives men a sense of confidence in the future.

CAPITALISM OVER THE NEXT TWO DECADES

Nikolai Inozemtsev
Academician, Director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences

How is the scientific and technological revolution affecting the economic, social and political processes in the capitalist world?

The past few decades have witnessed dramatic changes in the economies, production pattern and efficiency, and technological levels of the leading capitalist states. Also, under present-day capitalism there have been significant shifts in the balance of class, social, and political forces. Highly developed state-monopoly capitalism is characterized by a drastic exacerbation of economic, social, and political contradictions, an unprecedentedly acute collision between the interests of the monopolies and the vital interests of the overwhelming majority of the nations, and a steady growth of democratic movements that are successfully countering the threat from fascism, from reactionary bourgeois dictatorship.

Lastly, capitalism's place in the world and its position in the world economy and international relations have likewise undergone a radical change. Suffice it to say that in contrast with the past, the industrialized capitalist countries now account for roughly 50 per cent of its industrial product. As a world socio-economic system, capitalism has to coexist and in some areas cooperate with countries belonging to the opposite, socialist system.

A point that must be made clearly is that the scientific and technological revolution has altered much in capitalism's internal make-up and in the external conditions of its existence.

Under capitalism scientific and technological progress is both complex and contradictory. The unparalleled advances in man's knowledge of unexplored forces of nature and the scientific and technological revolution's enormous potentialities for promoting progress in society's material well-being live side by side with the greatest danger ever faced by mankind, namely, the threat of destruction of civilization. This is the direct result of imperialism's drive to militarize science, to harness it to its reactionary, aggressive objectives.

The prime responsibility of all progressives, of all peace forces, of scientists and technicians is thus to prevent a thermonuclear catastrophe, to safeguard world peace and security. This is, in the full sense of the world, the central task of our times, the greatest task facing mankind.

The influence of the scientific and technological revolution on the capitalist economy is a highly dialectical process. This is implicit in the nature of monopoly, whose hallmark is, as Lenin noted, a struggle between two opposing trends in science and technology: toward progress and toward stagnation, toward an artificial retardation of progress. Competition with world socialism gives an impetus to the first tendency, but capitalism's very nature erects serious obstacles to it.

On the one hand, under capitalism, too, technical progress leads to an improvement of the means of production and a growth of labor productivity, to a rapid build-up of the economic potential, the involvement of new, hitherto untapped natural resources in the economic turnover, the creation of new industries, the rise of specialization and

cooperation, the expansion of markets, and so on.

On the other hand, the growth of the productive forces, accelerated by the impact of this revolution (suffice it to note that in 1950-1973 the annual industrial output increment was 5.4 per cent, compared with 1.8 per cent in 1913-1937), has aggravated many contradictions, chiefly, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist appropriation of the fruits of labor. This is seen most strikingly in the mounting conflict:

— between the increasing monopolization of the economy speeded up under the impact of technological progress and the vital interests of the working masses, which results in economic crisis, unprecedented inflation rates, and unemployment;

— between the limited possibilities for state-monopoly regulation and the objective requirements of effective planning and prognostication springing from the steadily growing scale of production under the influence of the scientific and technological revolution;

— between the mechanism of state-monopoly regulation, whose sphere of operation is limited mainly to the framework of one country or another, and the unparalleled spread of the multinationals, which recognize no national boundaries;

— and, between the economic mechanisms of individual capitalist countries, the interests of monopoly capital of these countries, and the development requirements of the capitalist world economy as a whole. This is seen from the structural crisis of the capitalist world economy — energy, primary materials, food, and monetary-financial; the exacerbation of the antagonism between developed and developing countries; the acute economic rivalry between the three main centers of present-day capitalism — the USA, Western Europe and Japan; the collisions arising from the increasing economic integration of a number of capitalist countries, and so on.

Together with what has accumulated during the most recent cycle, all these contradictions generated the grave economic crisis of 1974-1975 and the economic convulsions of the middle and close of the 1970s. It is symbolic that this crisis, the most severe since the crisis of 1929-1933, hit the highly developed postwar state-monopoly economy with its methods of regulation and incentives, despite the bourgeoisie's readiness to permit partial reforms and its striving to make wide use of scientific and technological achievements to enhance efficiency in industry, accelerate the development of production, and strengthen its own positions.

The capitalist world economic crisis of the mid-1970s ushered in a period of capitalist economic development marked by a considerable deterioration of the conditions of reproduction compared with the preceding three and a half decades.

What are the prospects for further scientific and technological progress under capitalism? How will this progress affect the capitalist economy?

The difficulties and contradictions stemming from the scientific and technological revolution under capitalism are obvious; more, they will inevitably grow and deepen. But this in no way means that science, technology, and the economy will stagnate or subside. Neither does this mean that within the next few years or decades we shall witness a halt in the development of capitalism's productive forces, its automatic stagnation. On the contrary, it would be a mistake to underestimate modern capitalism's potentialities. 'The communists,' Leonid Brezhnev said, 'are far from foretelling an "automatic collapse" of capitalism. It still has considerable reserves.'

One of the most important of these reserves lies in the further development of science and technology and in the use of their achievements in the economy, for the promotion of the productive forces. There are large possibilities for this development, and there are grounds for expecting that far from a slowing down there may be a further acceleration of scientific and technological progress.

The economy will be increasingly influenced by a factor like the practical realization of the existing and rapidly growing scientific backlog. In particular, automation of production will be perfected and broadened through the improvement of computers, the mass dissemination of micro-electronic devices, and the wide use of robots. The revolution in biological knowledge will make it possible to achieve a steep rise of efficiency in the output of foodstuffs. The successes in the use of chemicals in industry will broaden the possibility of developing new programmed materials. Substantially greater use will be made of unexplored zones of our planet — the world ocean, arctic and subarctic land masses. and deep-lying layers of the earth — for production purposes. The successes in developing new sources of energy, particularly nuclear breeder-reactors, thermonuclear synthesis, solar-power engineering and so on, will help to resolve energy problems.

In recent years our institute has been doing much in the way of prognostication in order to assess the basic tendencies, orientations, and rates of the capitalist world's economic development in the years 1990 and 2000. This is part of a more general task of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the State Committee for Science and Technology — I have in mind the drafting of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technological Progress and Its Socio-Economic Effects Up to the Year 2000.

In working on this forecast our point of departure has been that capitalism's economy will continue its cyclic development, that severe crises, recessions and slumps are inevitable in the future. The factors hindering the development of the capitalist economy will be a high inflation rate, chronic unemployment, the aggravation of social conflicts, structural crises and the further exacerbation of foreign economic contradictions. We believe that the coming decades will witness further breaches in the chain of imperialism, that there may be social revolutions in the most diverse regions of the capitalist world and also in developing countries.

Naturally, our prognostications take into account the prospects for the further development of international political relations, the results of détente, and the possible changes in military spending levels.

If we bear in mind the factors slowing down economic development and the factors facilitating it (scientific and technological progress, the improvement of the organization and management of production, the expansion of internal markets through the growth of individual and especially state consumption, the enhancement of the role and volume of external markets, and so on) we shall find that the long-range forecasts of economic development making allowance for cyclical fluctuations indicate that until the close of the century the growth rates of the capitalist economy are expected to be much lower than in the 1950s and 1960s, although they may still be quite substantial. Under the forecast rates the gross national product of the developed capitalist countries may increase by the year 2000 by roughly 100-130 per cent over the 1978 level, and industrial output may rise by approximately 150 per cent. We cannot ignore this in our forecasts and plans for the development of the socialist world economy, in our assessments of the long-term competition between the two world systems.

Let us now consider some indices of the impact that scientific and technological progress may have on the capitalist economy. Our forecast is that in the near future the accent will be placed on the development and utilization of machinery and technologies consuming less energy and materials. By the mid-1980s this will lead to dramatic structural changes in the economy of the USA and other leading capitalist countries. The main direction of these changes will be along the line of a further diminution of the relative share of the extractive industries and metallurgy and a growth of the share of the power engineering, chemical and heavy engineering industries. There will be a considerable increase in the manufacture of computers; it is quite possible that in 1985 the number of programmed machine-tools will double compared with 1978; there will be a steep rise in the number of robots. Particularly high rates of growth will be observed in the production of aluminum and other of the most modern materials, as well as of plastics and synthetic resins.

The law of uneven development will continue to operate unabated in the coming decade as well, with the result that there will be further significant changes in the correlation of the basic economic indices of the USA, Western Europe and Japan. For instance, in industrial output Western Europe will, by the year 2000, reach roughly 120 per cent of the U.S. level, while Japan will move to about 50 per cent of that level (as against 95 and 29 per cent, respectively, in 1977); there are grounds for expecting that compared with the U.S. level in the year 2000 labor productivity will reach 70 per cent in Western Europe and 75 per cent in Japan (the corresponding figures for 1977 were 48 and 38 per cent).

It is quite probable that by the year 2000 the developing countries will account for a much larger share of the non-socialist world's industrial output — up to 25-28 per cent as compared with 14.7 per cent in 1977. Their share of the output of energy may rise to 55-60 per cent and of the output of oil to 80 per cent. At the same time, in key indices of economic development such as production efficiency and per capita consumption the gap between capitalist and developing countries themselves; in a number of indices some of them will draw close to countries with a medium level of development; possibly, some centers of 'sub-imperialism' will appear in the developing world.

Unevenness, i.e., faster rates of development in some countries or groups of countries compared with others, will be the objective basis of the further deepening of inter-imperalist contradictions and also of the contradictions between industrialized and developing countries. Moreover, in the capitalist world there will be both a centrifugal and a centripetal tendency, with the identity of class interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie of different countries underlying the latter tendency. Hence the objective need for cohesion among all the revolutionary forces and the special importance of unity in the international communist movement.

What are the role and place of the scientific and technological revolution in the present class struggle?

First and foremost, I should like to note that the struggle of the working class, of large segments of the masses for the use of scientific and technological achievements in their interests and for a halt to the growth of militarism and elimination of the threat of another war is most closely linked to their struggle to limit the power of the monopolies, preserve and raise the living standard, and democratize management in all areas of economic and social life. In other words, this is part and parcel of the anti-monopoly, democratic struggle in the broadest sense of the word.

An inescapable result of the scientific and technological revolution is the further socio-class polarization of capitalist society, the numerical growth of the working class, the rise of its level of education and professional training, an enhancement of its organization, the further convergence with it of large sections of the intelligentsia and white-collar workers, and the aggravation of old and appearance of an infinite number of new antagonisms. Cumulatively, this creates largely new and more favorable conditions for the struggle of the working people, for the activity of all the anti-monopoly forces.

Relative to the developing countries, their efforts to use the potentialities opened up by the scientific and technological revolution in their interests are also indissolubly linked to the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, for genuine independence and sovereignty, for deep-going progres-

sive economic and social changes. A major condition for the success of these efforts is to restructure international economic relations on a democratic basis, a demand that has the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Further, mention must be made of the fact that the scientific and technological revolution has aggravated some global problems that require concerted efforts. The prevention of another world war and the bridling of the arms race are an indispensable condition for the solution of any of these problems. The growing acuteness of these global problems makes closer international cooperation for their solution ever more urgent.

The scientific and technological revolution thus facilitates profound qualitative changes in the entire spectrum of conditions of human life and in the alignment of class, social forces in the world. The character of these changes and the problems engendered by them are unquestionably one of the most pressing areas of all-sided scientific, Marxist-Leninist analysis.

---

the Party

Looking to the future

Todoz Bozhinov
Political Bureau member, BCP Central Committee

IMPROVING THE ADMINISTRATION OF BULGARIA'S AGRICULTURE

Thirty-five years ago, on September 9, 1944, Bulgaria's working class, the working peasantry and all the other democratic and patriotic forces in Bulgaria rose up in arms under the leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party and with the decisive support of the victorious Red Army, to overthrow the monarchist-fascist regime and the rule of the bourgeoisie. The September Revolution marked the establishment of the people's power and the beginning of socialist construction. In the 35 years, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has travelled a long way: from a backward agrarian country to a socialist state with a developed modern industry, mechanized agriculture, and steadily growing material and spiritual living standards. At the end of 1977, the country's fixed assets exceeded 62,000 million leva. Roughly 56 per cent of the national income comes from industry. Fundamental changes have also occurred in the Bulgarian countryside. The national income has been growing rapidly: in the past decade, its annual growth rate averaged 7.5 per cent. The Bulgarian Communist Party and the PRB government have always attached much importance to improving socialist economic administration.

Our party has always paid much attention to improving farm administration, for a highly developed agriculture constitutes a necessary basis for an all-round economic upswing and a steady increase in the people's living standards. In tackling the various problems, the party reckons with the specific features peculier to the stage of building a developed socialist society, with objective economic laws, with the scientific and technical revolution, and with the need to involve more and more farmers in running agriculture.

One of the major tasks facing the socialist revolution in Bulgaria was to transform agriculture on socialist lines, for that was the only way to overcome the country's backwardness and solve the acute economic and social problems inherited from the capitalist past. Georgy Dimitrov's historic achievement was that he had found the type of farming association that was best suited to the country's conditions: Labor cooperative cropping farms (LCCFs), which enabled the socialist relations of production to win out throughout the Bulgarian countryside.

The transformation of small-commodity farming into socialist farming was the chief result of the party's agrarian policy in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. That revolutionary transformation was carried out on the basis of Lenin's cooperative plan, with due regard for the classical experience of collective-farm construction in the USSR, and in accordance with Bulgaria's historical specifics and traditions.

The BCP Central Committee's plenary meeting in April 1959 opened a new stage in the development of Bulgarian agriculture: concentration and greater efficiency of agricultural production. In its consistent and perserving drive to implement its agrarian policy, the BCP followed up the complete victory of the cooperative system (in 1958) with steps to amalgamate the LCCFs into larger complexes (1958-1960) and created the conditions for more intensive farming.

Under the decisions of the BCP Central Committee's plenary session in April 1970 on the need to deepen specialization and cooperation, agro-industrial complexes (AICs) were set up across the

country as a qualitatively new form of agricultural organization, making it possible organically to combine agriculture with the processing industry. Other socialist countries have applied in practice Bulgaria's experience in setting up agro-industrial complexes.

In accordance with the Party Program, which formulated the main task as 'completion of the material and technical basis of socialism, steady and rapid development of the productive forces, and continued intensification of the economy,' vast capital investments were made in agriculture. In 1978, fixed assets in agriculture totalled almost 8,000 million leva, with a more than fourfold increase over 1960. In that period, the number of tractors almost quadrupled, from 40,300 to 152,000 (in 15-h.p. units), and power facilities employed in agriculture more than tripled, from 3.2 mln. to 10.8 mln. hp. Last year, there was one conventional tractor per 312 hectares, as compared with 1,211 hectares in 1960.

In the period of socialist construction, gross output in agriculture has increased 2.5-fold, average wheat yields 3-fold, and maize yields 3.3-fold, while the number of those employed in the sector has come down by about two-thirds. Today, almost 24 per cent of the country's national income comes from agriculture and the food industry. In the export of some farm produce, Bulgaria ranks among the world's ten leading countries and first among the CMEA member-states.

The fundamental transformation of Bulgarian agriculture as a result of the party's agrarian policy has accelerated the approximation of the two forms of property, and the distinctions between town and country are being steadily erased. The machine-operator is now the central figure in the countryside. The farmers' living standards have been rising: since 1960, their real incomes have increased 2.5-fold and have almost reached the income level in industry. Today, persons employed in agriculture and industry with the same working record receive equal social-insurance payments. Social and everyday facilities are being built on a large scale, the housing stock in the countryside has been renewed, and living conditions have almost reached the urban level.

In accordance with the basic principle of the Marxist-Leninist theory of social administration, First Secretary of the BCP Central Committee and Chairman of the PRB State Council Todor Zhivkov specially emphasized that 'without the skill of developing and creatively applying our revolutionary theory while taking into account the concrete historical situation, it is impossible to control new phenomena and processes, or to organize and lead the masses in a successful drive for communism.'* He analyzed the changes that had occurred in agriculture and formulated the tasks arising in the course of its transformation on an economic basis. The major factors necessitating such a transformation are the growing scale and intensification of agricultural production as a result of faster application of scientific and technical achievements, deeper specialization and concentration, and more intricate economic, production and technical ties.

In the new conditions, the traditional and no longer effective administrative methods and instruments, which involve excessive centralization and administration by fiat, should be replaced with effective economic incentives that would help to muster the people's creative initiative in the effort to improve socialist labor organization in every unit of the National Agro-Industrial Complex.

In March 1979, a plenary meeting of the BCP Central Committee considered the question of further improvements in socialist labor organization. Its decisions affect every aspect of production relations in agriculture and contain important principles for administrative improvements in other sectors of the economy.

In its agrarian policy at the present stage, the BCP attaches much importance to the consistent application of Lenin's principle of economic calculus as an active factor in improving socialist labor organization and planned economic administration. Lenin's principles of democratic centralism have been further elaborated, and the prospects for the development of production relations through an approximation of the two forms of property are being considered. Our party thinks it necessary to use economic calculus on a wider scale in order to eliminate state subsidies for agriculture, which has to pay its own way. On this basis, we intend to make broader use of economic instruments in administration, and to alter the criteria for assessing performance at every level. In applying economic calculus and its economic content — operation without subsidies — we are guided by Lenin's principle of administration and management, which says that the end results of economic activity should cover all the inputs and ensure a minimum profit margin to create conditions for expanded reproduction and make it possible to finance society's general requirements.

Complex implementation of the BCP's decisions should help to raise the quality of centralized planning. When the central planning organs no longer have to perform undue functions (primarily, those relating to the solution of minor economic problems, which have to be dealt with in the course of day-to-day planning and management at the level of production units), they will have fresh opportunities for concentrating on the basic strategic problems of economic development, aiming, first, to determine growth rates for agriculture meeting internal and external demand, and also with the programs for introducing major scientific and technical achievements; second, to improve the structure of agricultural production; third; to balance out resources and requirements and constantly to keep material and value balances in accord with the changing conditions of production and demand; and fourth, to create similar economic conditions of labor for all the farming organizations by working

*Todor Zhivkov. 'Socialism's historic mission.' *World Marxist Review*, No. 2, 1979, p. 4.

out a comprehensive and scientifically valid set of norms, harmonizing centrally established norms with indicators elaborated in the production units and economic organizations.

It has been decided to reduce to a minimum the number of indicators established 'at the top,' and so markedly to extend democracy in planning 'at the grass-roots,' that is, in the economic organizations, cropping teams, farms, and other production units.

There was a time when dozens of centrally planned indicators 'decreed' in great detail virtually all the natural and economic parameters of agricultural production. Today, there are no more than four mandatory plan targets laid down by the state: first, physical indicators for the purchase of farm produce; second, size of deductions into the state budget; third, an indicator for foreign-exchange earnings and an import quota; and fourth, a quota for the supply of the main types of machinery, fuel, energy, raw and other materials.

The number of mandatory physical indicators established for the purchase of farm produce should not exceed eight for individual farming enterprises, and ten for the various regions. There is now a total of 26 types of farm produce that are subject to centralized planning and balancing. This helps to guarantee national requirements in the main types of farm produce (fresh or processed), to meet the needs of the domestic market, and ensure the fulfillment of foreign-trade obligations.

Work collectives are enabled to take independent decisions on concrete matters bearing on the output of produce covered by directive indicators, and also to decide the type and amount of produce to be turned out with the use of uncommitted production capacities. This helps to harmonize social, collective and individual interests in the production of extra-plan output, which serves to increase farmers' incomes.

The amount of mandatory deductions into the state budget is fixed on the strength of the absolute total contributed by the National Agro-Industrial Union as a whole to the revenue part of the state budget, which goes to form the social funds and ensure expanded reproduction. A special fixed rate for a kind of land-tax, which does not depend on the size of income, is established for every agro-industrial complex. This is designed to induce the most efficient use of the land, and its cultivation even under unfavorable natural and climatic conditions. In effect, the broad range of land-tax norms in agriculture is not used fully to extract the differential rent, but to redistribute it so as to create similar economic conditions for all agro-industrial complexes, irrespective of soil fertility. In order that the land-tax norms should take fuller account of the quality of the land, these are established, first and foremost, on the strength of a technical assessment of the land with the use of cadaster of natural, climatic and soil conditions, for under the present structure of agricultural crops, the profitability of production largely depends on these conditions. The doubling of the rate of deductions into the budget from once-cultivated land that has been neglected should stimulate fuller use of the available land stock.

The mandatory indicator for foreign-exchange earnings from exports and the import quota enhance the responsibility of economic organizations directly involved in the marketing of farm produce abroad.

The quota for the supply of the main types of machinery, raw and other materials, fuel and energy is, in effect, a mandatory plan indicator for other sectors of the economy, which ensures the necessary resources and conditions for normal agricultural production.

So, centralized planning sets the input and output targets for the system, and the given collective has to meet these targets within its production unit without allowing any administrative interference. Once the number of mandatory indicators has been reduced, planning tends to play a more important role in economic administration, for it can be put on a realistic, scientifically valid normative basis. The BCP's decisions are also aimed to stimulate creative initiative among farm managers; we seek to offer them greater incentives for the most efficient use of land and machinery, of all the material, financial and manpower resources.

In the past, managerial personnel and specialists wasted much effort in 'fighting for the plan.' disputing the targets 'handed down from above.' Today, farming collectives have direct incentives to introduce high-yield crops and productive breeds of cattle, and to frame upwardly adjusted plans, mobilizing all their resources to increase efficiency, boost output and reduce costs.

With the improvement of agricultural administration in Bulgaria, economic contracts come to play a much more important role as an active economic instrument stimulating the output of produce that is in high demand on the domestic and international markets. Such contracts are signed for the whole volume of the planned output, so that the mandatory targets for the sale of produce to the state set before the AICs and other farming organizations are simultaneously a plan for marketing and purchasing agencies.

The contract system is based on the general principle that the party which has failed to meet its contractual obligations in terms of quality or in due time should bear full responsibility for the damage actually inflicted and also for the lost income to the extent of unrealized profit, including the whole of the lost income in foreign exchange.

Contracts between farming organizations and producers of fertilizers, machinery and so on, should help to deliver the necessary resources in due time, ensuring timely and efficient agrotechnical and zootechnical operations and drives.

Prices for additional farm produce turned out as a result of the involvement of earlier unused land and the most efficient use of all the other resources are also fixed on the basis of contracts signed between equal partners: theAICs and purchasing, marketing and other agencies. This is an effective incentive to increasing the output of high-quality farm produce,

and it should help considerably to increase the resources going to develop the AICs and raise wages.

This does not imply ungoverned operation of the market mechanism, because, first, the basic economic proportions are formed by the planning organs in a centralized manner and, second, contracted prices cannot exceed the established ceiling prices. We seek to adjust the economic organization of production to the existing economic ties, and to create an economic setting in which the market mechanism would operate under society's control and help to strengthen the socialist relations of production. The BCP has consistently applied Lenin's principles of economic management under commodity-money relations and regulation of the economy through state planning of the basic economic proportions.

The principle of economic calculus and operation without subsidies is applied on the basis of a scheme for the formation and distribution of the gross income patterned on Marx's scheme for the distribution of the aggregate social product.

The main feature of the new system for the formation and distribution of the gross income is that wages are a resultant (residual) magnitude. At first, in accordance with the established norms, deductions are made from the gross income into the state budget and the social-insurance funds, credit principal and interest are repaid, and funds are set aside for capital investments; after that, the social funds of economic organizations are formed: the development fund, the communal and culture fund, the reserve and the foreign-exchange fund, and, finally, the residue is used to set up the wages fund. Such a sequence in the distribution of incomes is aimed to induce the enterprises to meet all their obligations to society in full and as a matter of priority. If the residue is inadequate, this affects the enterprise's own funds and wages.

In these conditions, the economic unit's chief concern is to turn out more high-quality produce and reduce costs, for this serves to increase the funds which remain at the enterprise's disposal and which go to develop production and pay wages. This system of incentives encourages the most economical use of material, financial and manpower resources, and protection of socialist property. Any over-expenditure, mismanagement, freezing or inefficient use of capital investments, etc., directly affects the enterprise's income and wage levels. This agrees with the objectively operating law of distribution according to the quantity and quality of work.

The new remuneration system has some specific features. First, individual wages paid both to managerial personnel and rank-and-file workers are not guaranteed, but vary, because the whole of their volume (and not only the amount paid out over and above the basic wage or the rate for time-work) changes depending on the size of the income obtained from the sale of the end product. Second, wages can grow virtually without limit (although, naturally, not faster than social labor productivity). Third, those workers and office staff who hav fulfilled their production targets well, in due time, and in accordance with internal economic-calculus indicators are paid a full wage. If there is a shortage of funds, the enterprise draws on its reserve fund, on the central funds of the National Agro-Industtial Union, or bank credits. Fourth, steps are being taken to introduce the most effective remuneration systems: team economic calculus, normative costs, etc., which make it possible to tie in wages more closely with the end economic result. The new system alters the relations between the AIC management and the teams: special internal contracts guarantee full compensation of damage and lost income, if these losses are caused through the fault of the AIC management. In this way, the principle of responsibility for the decisions adopted is being realized.

Consistent use of the economic approach in running agriculture calls for improvements in the administration of the National Agro-Industrial Complex. In 1979, a National Agro-Industrial Union was set up in place of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Food Industry. Other socialist countries do not have this kind of agricultural administration, which is an example of the BCP's creative application of the basic principles of Lenin's agrarian policy. As Todor Zhivkov emphasized at the Constituent Congress of the National Agro-Industrial Union, 'organizational and administrative forms do not automatically derive from the objective processes and uniformities in the development of the economic basis. Correct choice of such forms is a subjective matter and calls for a creative approach, for an ability to bring out and solve new problems and meet in due time the latest requirements of social development. This most fully reflects the leading role of every individual Communist Party.'

The National Agro-Industrial Union is an economic complex of a qualitatively new type, a voluntary economic association of state and cooperative economic organizations operating on the principles of economic calculus and mutual advantage. The formation of the National Agro-Industrial Union was not just a conventional reorganization of the administrative system, but marked the introduction of future-oriented forms of economic administration, combining the state and the social approach, the function of state direction and that of the working people's voluntary association.

The Union comprises all the lines of production and spheres of activity of the National Agro-Industrial Complex, among which there are broad production and economic ties that are to be further developed. This is necessary to link up the whole 'land — end product' reproduction cycle, including the processing of farm produce, the formation and repair of the fixed production assets, scientific and design services, supply, trade, marketing, and other subsidiary and auxiliary operations.

The delegates to the Congress of the Agro-Industrial Union — its highest organ — and all its other governing organs are elected. Wide representation of the work collectives on the Union, which

commands the national resources of Bulgarian agriculture, enhances the role of the social element in the running of production. Various forms of the working people's involvement in management — general meetings, meetings of representatives, economic committees and councils — will be filled with new content. These approve plans for socio-economic development, the forms of applying internal economic calculus, the concrete types of payment for work, and the structure and content of the activity of the sector's administrative organs.

The efficiency of the measures aimed to improve the economic form of administration adequate to the present level of agricultural development can be judged from the extent to which conditions have been created for eliminating state subsidies and turning agriculture into a highly efficient sector of our economy providing the bulk of our foreign-exchange earnings.

The early results of the use of the economic approach in agriculture and the food industry, as reflected in the upwardly adjusted plan for 1979 and 1980 adopted by the work collectives, show that the party's decisions are being implemented.

The effect from the use of the new economic principles cannot be full enough so long as the new economic mechanism is confined to agriculture. This means that conditions for economic organizations will differ by economic sector. There is a danger that agriculture-related sectors will be a source of difficulties for those who work in the new conditions, cramping their creative initiative. That is why we have already started to explore the question of how to apply these principles in other sectors of the economy, primarily in transport and the building industry, for these are connected with all the sectors and units of the reproduction process. Todor Zhivkov emphasized: 'The main thing now is to use the newly created conditions and prerequisites for a resolute switch from the restructuring and improvement of separate economic sectors to an improvement of all the sectors and spheres of activity, of the whole mechanism of social adminstration.'

Realizing the difficulty and complexity of this task, the BCP seeks to muster for its solution the country's communists and members of the Young Communist League, the whole farming population, the working class and the intelligentsia, all the working people of Bulgaria.

New experience

UPHOLDING THE RIGHT TO LEGALITY

Arsenio Hernandez Fortuna
CC Member, Dominican Communist Party

The press has reported that the Supreme Administrative Tribunal in your country has ruled that the Secretary of State for the Interior and Police was in breach of the Constitution in preventing a manifestation by the Dominican Communist Party. How would you assess this fact in the light of your party's struggle for democratization and legality?

A. Hernandez Fortuna. That incident was connected with one of the earliest mass manifestations of solidarity with the people of Nicaragua initiated by our party. In accordance with the law on such matters, the party had informed the Ministry of the Interior and Police in advance of its decision, of the time and venue of the manifestation. The Secretary of State for the Interior and Police declared that the communists could exercise their right, but only if the manifestation were held indoors or in some isolated area. The Communist Party's leadership reaffirmed its earlier decision. The Ministry of the Interior and Police continued to raise obstacles in the way of the popular manifestation. Then the DCP's Secretary for Juridical Affairs Dr. Julian Pena started court proceedings, pointing out that that was a breach of legality: under the law, administrative organs are only entitled to 'protect the demonstrators and maintain public order.'[1]

The judgment subsequently passed by the Supreme Administrative Court on the Secretary of State for the Interior and Police, lawyer Vincente Sanchez Baret, said the same thing, stating that he had violated a right written into the Republic's Constitution; the decision he had taken fell within the competence of the National Congress or, in exceptional circumstances (when the Congress has been dissolved or is in recess), of the Republic's President, and could be taken only if there had been a 'breach of public law and order,'[2] whereas in this instance there had been no emergency situation of that kind.

The judgment passed by the Supreme Administrative Tribunal was widely discussed across the Dominican Republic. For the first time in the history of our jurisprudence, a government official who had exceeded his authority was obliged to revoke his decision. What makes the judgment even more important is that the plaintiff in the case was the recently legalized Communist Party.

Another remarkable feature of the judgment is that it condemns the actions of one of the leaders of the Dominican Revolutionary Party, which under Joaquin Balaguer was in opposition, was persecuted by the regime (which gave an arbitrary reading to the Constitution and the other laws), and repeatedly protested against that persecution. The judgment helps to expose the double-faced policy of the present ruling party with respect to the Nicaraguan people's struggle.

In spite of the fact that arbitrary government action frustrated the solidarity manifestation, the subsequent judgment passed on the Minister of the Interior creates a precedent which is of great impor-

tance for the struggle to strengthen the Dominican citizens' rights. That is why, in assessing the judgment, the party's Political Committee drew the following conclusion: 'We hope that after the important judgment handed down by the Supreme Administrative Court, the Dominican authorities will realize that all their moves should conform with the country's Constitution and other laws.

'Such a stand will help to establish a state of security demanded by the citizens in order to use their abilities for the benefit of society. Such a state of security cannot be established by a mere repetition of good intentions, unless these are underpinned with firm resolve on the part of the authorities to act in accordance with their duty.

'The Dominican Communist Party takes the opportunity to reaffirm its determination to continue using the lawful means at its disposal to exercise its right to legality.'[3]

THE COMMUNIST PRESS

Essop Pahad (RSA)

For nearly 30 years now, the South African Communist Party has been forced to carry on its struggle in clandestine conditions. What is the role of the underground press in this struggle today?

E. Pahad. If you ever happen to read a copy of *Inkululeko — Freedom*, a newspaper of the South African communists, you will find the following words addressed to the reader:

'Big risks have been taken to get this to you. Every copy is valuable. Don't waste it. Pass it on. But be careful, the police are vigilant.'

These words are quoted in every issue of the paper and they give a good idea of the situation in which the Communist Party has to publish and circulate its publications.

In the Republic of South Africa, where the apartheid regime has built up a sprawling machinery of terrorism, which is designed to prevent the penetration of communist ideas, the publication and circulation of illegal literature. This is arduous and hazardous work. Ahmed Timol, a school teacher, was murdered by the Special Branch after 400 copies of *Inkululeko — Freedom* had been discovered in the trunk of his car. Five years is the minimum prison term handed out to anyone found in possession of the leaflet by the police. But the communists continue to carry the party's word to the masses in defiance of these reprisals.

In view of the fresh upswing of the liberation struggle in the South of Africa in the 1970s, the Central Committee of the South African CP has decided to invigorate the circulation of clandestine publications so as to extend their influence. *Inkululeko — Freedom*, the organ of the party's Central Committee, which gives the communist view of the most important events in the country and which exposes apartheid, is regularly circulated in the RSA. It is printed on thin paper in a small format.

The first issue of the clandestine *African Communist*, the theoretical and information journal of the South African CP, appeared in a special pocket-size edition in 1971. This publication, like the clandestine version of the journal issued in the underground, appears four times a year, with each issue running to over 100 pages. It carries statements by party leaders, leading figures in the international communist movement, and authors from the fraternal parties. Since publication was started in the RSA, tens of thousands of copies have been circulated illegally.

The party has also arranged the publication of clandestine Marxist literature. Despite stringent control by the authorities, Marxist-Leninist classics, issued under false covers and 'accepted' titles to avoid the South African censors, are being circulated in the country. The most popular of these are *The Communist Manifesto, Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, What Is to be Done?, The State and Revolution and Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder,* which have been issued in English, and some also in two African languages. The Program of the South African Communist Party, disguised as a popular South African 'memo' book, is also part of this important library. A special clandestine edition of the party's history, *Fifty Fighting Years,* has been widely distributed at home and helps to inform a whole new generation about the party's activity since its inception.

The party makes extensive use of leaflets. These are circulated through the post, distributed in working-class areas, at railway stations, etc. In this way, the party circulated *A Message to the Workers from the South African Communist Party,* urging the working people to join efforts in fighting the economic exploitation, the basis of racism, and to work for a new society in which they would no longer be 'cheap labor,' but their own masters. One of the latest leaflets was called: *Why They Hate the Communists.* It explains why the communists are being hounded by the present regime. Another leaflet circulated recently marked the 70th birthday of the party's Chairman Yusuf Dadoo; it carried his photograph and a short biographical sketch.

Even the authorities and official organs of the press have to admit that the clandestine literature is having an impact on the working people. At a trial of two journalists charged with preparing and circulating the party's propaganda material, the judge called the garage with the printing machine a 'propaganda factory.' According to reports in the official press, the party's leaflets and other clandestine publications are influential in organizing strikes, mass action and manifestations by working people in various towns.

In view of the developments in the South of the continent, the South African communists seek to do their utmost to circulate even more extensively and regularly their clandestine leaflets, newspapers, journals and books, to raise the level of agitation, and to establish the party's theoretical propositions in the propaganda work, so helping broad masses of people to understand the programmatic goals and tactical tasks of the communists and of the whole liberation movement.

Despite the fierce terrorism and persecution, there are many staunch fighters in the country who are prepared to carry on this work. The *African Communist* quoted these words from a speech delivered from the dock by Raymond Suttner, one of those involved in the underground apparatus. He said:

'The work that I have done for the freedom movement made rigorous demands. It was not pleasant to spend my spare time licking envelopes, duplicating, typing, sticking on stamps. It is true that I need not have done this. But this was the course I had honestly concluded to be the best way of contributing to our future. The goals for which I worked warranted whatever sacrifices were required.'

DOCUMENTS

Soviet Union

New steps to strengthen the economy

In pursuance of the decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU on the need to improve economic administration, the CPSU Central Committee adopted a resolution on the further improvement of the economic mechanism and the tasks of the party and state organs.

Noting the successes in the country's economic and social development achieved as a result of the party's scientifically grounded policy, the Central Committee emphasizes the need for gearing to an even greater extent the whole of administrative and planning activity for raising production efficiency and quality of workmanship, obtaining higher economic returns, and ensuring fuller satisfaction of the growing social and personal requirements. It is important, the resolution says, to ensure rational use of all the available resources, to concentrate on intensive growth factors, and make broader use in production of scientific and technical achievements and advanced experience.

The CPSU Central Committee thinks it extremely important further to enhance the role of the state plan, the five-year plan in the first place, as a major instrument in realizing the party's economic policy, in balancing plans and orienting these to an even greater extent upon the solution of social problems. It proposes greater concentration of resources for the fulfillment of state goal-oriented programs, and an improvement in the system of plan indicators in order to induce work collectives to raise labor producitivity, make the utmost use of the fixed assets, and save material resources. It also points out the need closer to tie in the solution of long-term and current problems, and also the problems of sectoral and territorial development, and to take fuller account of consumer interests in setting production targets.

Steps should also be taken markedly to increase the effectiveness of economic instruments and stimuli, to make material inducements directly dependent on the efficiency and quality of the work, on the fulfillment of plan targets and production performance.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a Joint decision, On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Effect of the Economic Mechanism on the Drive to Raise Production Efficiency and Quality of Work, which formulates concrete measures aimed to improve planning, maps out ways to increase the efficiency of capital investments, and enhances the role of economic calculus, economic instruments and incentives.

The CPSU Central Committee has invited all the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, the mass media and propaganda agencies widely to explain the substance of the decisions on the improvement of the economic mechanism, showing that better management and planning, greater efficiency of social production, and higher quality of work are necessary conditions for further improvements in the Soviet people's material well-being.

Britain

Proposals on inner-party democracy

The Executive Committee of the CP Great Britain has issued a report by a Commission on Inner-Party Democracy, set up on the decision of the latest CPGB Congress. The Committee notes that the document contains proposals for a further development of inner-party democracy, which will help to improve the CPGB's work, to extend initiative at the grass-roots, and in local and regional organizations, and also to establish closer ties between the party and the people.

'A central feature of our program,' the report says, 'is the concept of a broad democratic alliance of all the social forces and movements, led by the working class, which will wrest power from the monopoly capitalists and begin the construction of a democratic socialist society. In building the alliance, we seek to win over all who are struggling, or can be won to struggle against exploitation, oppression, attacks on democratic rights, bureaucracy and the deterioration in social conditions and the quality of life.'

The Commission notes the need for a broad public discussion of the problems facing the Communist Party, and urges the broadest possible use of the experience of the communists' fellow-fighters for the common goals. 'The enrichment of the party's internal democracy,' the document says, 'is one of the vital factors in the struggle to strengthen the party's ability to unite and lead all the potential forces which can be won for socialist change.'

The report reaffirms the right of all CPGB members to take part in the formation of party policy both during the between congresses. While recognizing that different views and opinions are bound to emerge, the Commission firmly declares that 'the party should continue to maintain its opposition to factions.'

Noting the weak points in the party structure, the Commission emphasizes the need for their elimination in order to achieve party goals in the new conditions. 'The Communist Party,' the document

says, 'works in a developed multinational, multiracial society with complex problems expressed in manifold ways to people in different areas, strata and occupations. Each committee of the party therefore has to find the most effective way of relating the strategy and policies of the party to the actual conditions and the needs of the people it is aiming to win.'

The report says that the CPGB leadership's activity should be given wider coverage in the party press, which will be most helpful for the work of party organizations.

In publishing the report, the CPGB Executive Committee recommended that local organizations should study and discuss the propositions it contains. The report of the Commission on Inner-Party Democracy is to be put before the next CPGB Congress.

1. *El Caribe*, May 17, 1979.
2. *Constitucion de la Republica Dominicana*, Santo Domingo, 1966, p. 35.
3. *Hablan los Comunistas*, No. 48, May 18, and 25, 1979.

---

viewpoints

Maoist policy and China's future

Satiyadjaya Sudiman
Member, leadership of the CP Indonesia,
CPI representative on *WMR*

Thirty years ago the postwar generation of the communists of my country hailed the triumph of the Chinese revolution. It served as an example and reaffirmed the significance of internationalist solidarity in the struggle for national and social emancipation. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the defeat of German nazism and Japanese militarism created favorable external conditions for the development of the revolution in China. The military hardware transferred gratuitously by the Soviet Union enabled the Chinese communists to arm their forces and consummate the revolution. Material assistance from the USSR and other socialist countries — industrial, mining and transport equipment, specialists, and help in training skilled workers — allowed China to make impressive advances during the very first years after the revolution.

Together with progressives throughout the world, we took delight in every achievement of the Chinese people, sincerely admired their modesty, industriousness, and perseverance, and regarded them as an ally in the struggle for peace, socialism, democracy and progress. We were bound together by class kinship.

With pride and hope we watched China lay the foundations of a society whose aim was to build socialism in the specific conditions prevailing in that country. The means of production belonging to the bourgeoisie, were nationalized, cooperatives were set up in the countryside, the old state apparatus was replaced by a new one and so on.

The triumph of the reveolution in China strengthened the international positions of the forces of socialism, peace and national liberation. It was a heavy blow to imperialism and reaction, and gave a further impetus to the national-liberation struggle in Asia and Africa. The Chinese communists-internationalists made a considerable contribution to socialism, the international working-class movement, the anti-imperialist struggle, and the struggle for peace in Asia and the whole world.

However, these achievements and the far-reaching social reforms in China itself were imperilled when, behind a facade of 'revolutionary' verbiage, Mao Tse-tung and his group broke with socialism, renounced the principles of proletarian internationalism, and aligned themselves with the enemies of social progress and peace.

The Maoist policy culminated in the denunciation of the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance with the USSR and the armed aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. These actions were lauded in the camp of reaction. The exponents of anti-communism and anti-socialism hypocritically tried to persuade the world that the communist 'ideals have now been unmasked, and the notions of a humanist world, of an eternal peace under the banner of socialism have been dispelled.'[1] It seems to me, therefore, that an examination of the Peking leadership's concepts of war[2] should be followed, without any claim, of course, to giving an all-sided picture, by an analysis of key elements of Peking's foreign policy such as its attitude to détente and peace, to neighboring countries, to existing socialism and to the revolutionary movement.

What characterizes communist foreign policy? First, the fact that it proceeds from the close bond between the cause of the working class fighting for the social emancipation of all working and oppressed people and the cause of peace. At the dawn of

the communist movement Karl Marx called upon the communists to fight for a foreign policy which would be part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. He gave a picture of the future when the old world with its economic poverty and political madness would be replaced by a new world, 'a new society, whose international rule would be *Peace*, because its national rule will be everywhere the same —*Labor*.'[3] Frederick Engels consistently upheld the humanist ideals of the communists and in an article headed 'Can Europe Disarm?' denounced the arms race unleashed by the exploiting classes.[4]

Beginning with 1917, the picture of the future world drawn by Marx and Engels began to be translated into reality. The word *peace* appeared on the banner of socialism the day the new society was born. The principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems were in the main formulated by Lenin in his speech on the Second Congress of Soviets (October 1917) and in the Decree on Peace, which was one of the first acts of the Soviet power.

The years went by. On the basis of a scientific, Marxist-Leninist analysis of the socio-economic changes that had taken place in the world, the international communist movement drew the conclusion of the 1957 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that the obtaining situation and the new world balance of strength were making it possible to avoid another global war. In keeping with this conclusion, the communist and workers' parties in power in the socialist-community states initiated energetic and meaninggul steps to stengthen peace and international security.

What about Peking? As early as at the 1957 Meeting Mao Tse-tung made a statement far removed from the stance of the other participants. 'Can we envision,' he said, 'how many lives a future war will claim? Possibly, one-third of the earth's population . . . But it will be not so bad even if half perishes . . . if half of mankind is destroyed, there will still be the other half . . . and within 50 or 100 years the population will grow by even more than that half.' True, he signed the Peace Manifesto adopted at the meeting. But soon an unparalleled militarist campaign was launched in China in order to persuade the people that what they wanted was not peace but war because if most of the world's population perished in a nuclear catastrophe enough Chinese would survive to rule the world.

In order to slow down and thwart the process of international détente, the Peking leaders have done (and are still doing) everything to convince people that any step toward disarmament is 'useless' and 'futile.' While arming themselves, they advocate an intensification of the arms race in the USA and NATO, an expansion of the U.S. military presence in Asia, the Pacific, and the Indian Ocean, and the reinforcement of the U.S.-Japanese security treaty, and oppose SALT-2. They have not said a word against the neutron bomb.

Peking's policy of militarization and whipping up war hysteria is mirrored in the stance of the Chinese delegation at the UN General Assembly. Suffice it to recall some facts. At the 26th UN General Assembly Session the Chinese representative spoke against convening a world disarmament conference; at the 27th session he attacked the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and a ban in perpetuity on nuclear weapons; at the 28th session he took a stand against the Security Council permanent members reducing their military budgets by 10 per cent and using part of the released funds for aid to developing nations; at the 29th session he opposed the adoption of a definition of aggression; at the 30th session he took issue with the proposed treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear tests and also with the resolution banning modification of the natural environment and climate for military or other purposes inimical to mankind; at the 31st session he came out against the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations; at the 32nd session he condemned the declaration on deepening and consolidating détente. At the same session the Chinese delegation refused to vote on draft resolutions on general and complete disarmament, banning the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass annihilation, banning chemical and bacteriological (biochemical) weapons, and so on. Finally, at last year's special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, the Chinese Foreign Minister repeated that China would go on increasing its armaments.

This list is, of course, incomplete. But it is enough to justify the conclusion that the group in power in Peking is not interested in peace and détente, which are easing mankind's advance to a society of social justice.

Let us now consider the essential question of the attitude toward neighboring states. The emergence and strengthening of the socialist world system were accompanied by the mapping out of a fundamentally new foreign-policy orientation. In contrast to the imperialist policy of strength, annexations and indemnities, conquest, plunder, and the unbridled exploitation of foreign territories and wealth, it provided for, among other things, renunciation of force in international relations and respect for existing frontiers and for the sovereignty of all nations, big and small. This policy was hailed and welcomed by broad international opinion and enshrined in the ten points of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, whose results were approved by the communists of Europe and other continents.

During the initial years after the victory of the people's revolution the Peking leadership adhered to this policy course, which was enunciated in the Pancha Shila (five principles of peaceful coexistence). One can still hear declarations to the effect that China does not want 'an inch of foreign soil.' But in the so-called historical maps published in China one can see that the Maoist territorial ambitions embrace the Soviet Amur and Maritime territories, Sakhalin, part of Kazakhstan

and Central Asia, the Mongolian People's Republic, Korea, part of Afghan territory, part of India, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, Kampuchea, Laos and more than 200 islands in the East China and South China seas. The total territory claimed by Peking is larger that the territory of China itself.

Further, the Peking leaders do not confine themselves to declaring their territorial claims. It is a fact that Peking is in occupation of 36,000 square kilometres of Indian territory. And it is a fact that China invaded the Paracel Islands and that provocations are continuing along its frontiers with Vietnam and Laos.

In its far-reaching hegemonistic and geopolitical plans Peking is counting heavily on the Hoa, the ethnic Chinese residing in neighboring countries, including roughly four million in my country, Indonesia. Many of them were born in these countries, grew up, received an education, learned a profession and married. Among the majority of them nationalistic sentiments would obviously have died away if they were not deliberately kept alive and fanned by Peking. The main stake is on ethnic Chinese capitalists who have grown rich exploiting the local population. The facts indicate, as was noted in a statement on February 19, 1979 by the Communist Party of Indonesia, that the Peking leadership 'is using the ethnic Chinese bourgeoisie as agents of their policy in Indonesia and other countries.' Naturally, these agents are rabid enemies of revolutionary transformations and progressive social reforms. On the pretext of infusing 'patriotic feelings,' the Peking leaders are stirring great-Han chauvinism among the Hoa and recruiting agents, spies, and provocateurs in the Chinese communities.

Can this be called a communist policy? There can only be one reply, and it is 'No!'

Internationalism is the cornerstone of communist policy. The answer to the question of what camp you are in — the camp of revolution or the camp of counter-revolution — is given by your attitude to the USSR, the entire socialist community and the revolutionary movement.

Time was when China's leaders in fact showed their fidelity to proletarian internationalism and friendship for the USSR and the other socialist-community states. But since the early 1960s Maoism has been going over to an increasingly undisguised anti-Soviet and anti-socialist foreign policy, drawing closer to the forces of reaction, to world anti-communism, and shamelessly accusing the USSR of 'hegemonism,' 'social-imperialism,' and so on. While spearheading their attacks at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and going to all lengths to undermine their unity, the Peking leaders call upon the imperialist circles to harden their policy toward socialist states, strive to disrupt the efforts of these states aimed at consolidating world peace and security, and attempt to obstruct social progress.

This line of action was evident at the first and second sessions of the National People's Assembly, at which emphasis was laid on a further escalation of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, renunciation of the class approach to analyzing world developments, and deeper hostility for the entire socialist community. At one of these sessions it was declared officially for the first time that the formation 'of the broadest possible front of struggle against superpower hegemonism (read: against the Soviet Union), was the cardinal task of China's foreign policy.'

Underlying this foreign-policy platform is the notorious theory of the planet's 'division into three worlds,'[5] which had been included in the text of China's new Constitution and is the plank for the formation of a global anti-socialist superbloc of all the imperialist powers and China. This was proclaimed as the 'common strategic aim of the peoples of all countries.'[6]

The capitalist press lost no time in noting this identity of anti-communist aims of the PRC and the imperialist powers. Springer's reactionary *Die Welt* euphorically carried a banner headline reading: 'China and America Will Not Tolerate a New Cuba in Asia.'[7] While attacking the USSR and the rest of the socialist community the Chinese leaders do not conceal their desire to obstruct social changes, embodied since long ago by the USSR for the peoples of the world, and now embodied for the peoples of Asia by revolutionary Vietnam, which, like Cuba on the American continent, is showing the working people of its region the true road to liberation from colonial and social oppression. The Peking rulers are doing their best to prevent a genuine revolutionary development of the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle, for they see this development as a threat to their own hegemonistic plans.

That explains why they are openly aligning themselves with the fascist reactionary regimes in Chile, Zaire, the Middle East, and elsewhere, vigorously helping counter-revolutionaries and splitters of all stripes.

It would be interesting to trace how, in parallel with Chinese foreign policy's departure from communist ideals and aims, the imperialist powers reappraised their attitude to Peking. It will be recalled that the principal objective of imperialist foreign policy since World War II has been to halt 'communist expansion.' But at the close of the 1960s and in the early 1970s the policy pursued by the USA and other imperialist powers toward China began to change. This change went hand in hand with China's departure from the socialist community and the international communist movement and with the consolidation of its political and ideological unity with the anti-socialist and reactionary forces.

It is precisely in response to this switch in the policy of the Peking leadership that the imperialist powers are reassessing the 'strategic threat' from China, once regarded as a dangerous potential enemy but now becoming an ally of imperialism in the realization if its political and military schemes. Britain, Japan, France, the FRG and the USA are directly or indirectly participating on a growing

scale in the gigantic program for China's accelerated armament.

Nobody doubts the general anti-Soviet and anti-communist orientation of this imperialist aid for Peking. But it would be the height of absurdity to entertain the thought that the USA and NATO have decided to put *communist* China 'on its feet.' Imperialism would not have given a cent for this. For it the China card makes sense only as an anti-communist card. Imperialism is interested in it only to the extent the present Chinese leadership's policy comes into conflict with the policy of the working class, is alien to Marxism-Leninism, does not meet the interests of socialism and the national-liberation movement, and comes into conflict with the interests of the progressive forces and the struggle for peace.

I would not have mentioned this had this been purely China's internal affair. But the point is that the Peking leaders are set on forcing their adventurist policies and anti-Soviet course on revolutionaries of other countries, and this has inflicted colassal harm on our entire movement. In the mid-1960s, for instance, the Maoists pushed some leaders of our party and state into political isolation and adventurism, which cleared the way for a counter-revolutionary coup, for the switch of power into the hands of extreme reaction and imperialism. Hundreds of thousands of communists and their sympathizers were massacred. Hundreds of thousands of others were thrown into prisons or concentration camps. Indonesia's social development was retarded for decades. Some time ago we saw a similarly horrifying example of the export of Maoism in Pol Pot's Kampuchea, where three million innocent men, women and children out a population of eight million were exterminated. This gives us the right to denounce Maoism in the sharpest terms.

But our criticism of Maoism does not mean we are alienating the Chinese people from socialism. It is the Maoists and not the Chinese people who have alienated themselves from the socialist perspective by their adventurist, chauvinistic, and militarist policy, by counterposing themdelves to all the forces fighting imperialism. For that reason we regard criticism of Maoism as a duty to the Chinese people, as a concrete expression of the struggle for a socialist China.

The military gamble of the Chinese reactionaries in Vietnam failed ignominiously. However, will China's ruling circles learn a lesson from this?

On the one hand, the Peking leaders' statements that 'Vietnam must be taught another lesson,' their refusal to prolong the Soviet-Chinese treaty, their opposition to SALT-2, and their advice that the NATO countries and Japan should arm show that they are continuing their efforts to whip up the threat of war. On the other hand, it is obvious that the present leadership has to reckon with that segment of public opinion which understands that the road of peace is the only realistic way of resolving the Chinese people's own problems. An expression of this is, evidently, the statement that China is prepared to negotiate an improvement of relations with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union, as the Soviet leaders have declared time and again, is prepared to have normal government-to-government relations with China and hold talks on all questions of mutual interest. But the other side, too, has to show a similar readiness to have normal relations. I believe that a serious and positive Soviet-Chinese dialogue would help to advance the cuase of peace and security in Asia and the whole world.

A system of security in Asia, naturally, cannot be built overnight. Speaking realistically, this will evidently take quite a lot of time and require considerable effort on the part of all the interested countries. But it is evident that despite the complexity and contradictory nature of the situation, the determining tendency, both for the world as a whole and for the Asian continent, including the ASEAN states, is toward a steady growth and strengthening of the forces of peace, national independence, and social progress. Whatever the Peking leaders do against peace they can only delay but not halt this process, in which, we are confident, China will resume the place rightfully belonging to it.

1. *Frankfurther Allgemeine*, April 24, 1979.
2. *WMR*, No. 7, 1979.
3. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Works*, Vol. 17, p. 5.
4. Ibid., Vol. 22, pp. 385-415.
5. For details, see Walery Namiotkiewicz, 'The chauvinistic content of the "Three Worlds Theory",' *WMR*, November 1978, p. 74.
6. *Jenmin jihpao*, March 7, 1978.
7. *Die Welt*, June 21, 1978.

Recent History of the Labor Movement in the United States

Editor: B.Y. Mikhailov D.Sc

Volume One: 1918-1939. 553 pages. Cloth $9.50

Volume Two: 1939-1965. 616 pages. Cloth $10.95

Two volume set $18.50

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

The parameters of state enterprise

Gleb Smirnov, D.Sc. (Econ.)
Sector head, Institute of African Studies,
USSR Academy of Sciences

We continue our analysis of the problems arising for the peoples in the former colonies and semi-colonies from their socio-economic backwardness and dependence on imperialism and the struggle for stable and progressive social development. In the recent period, some of these problems have also been considered collectively at international conferences and seminars held with *WMR* participation by research groups[1] and a number of articles written by leaders of fraternal parties and Marxist scientists. The article below deals with the socio-economic aspects of the state sector of the economy in countries taking the socialist orientation.

State enterprise, the existence of a state sector in the economy, is one of the typical features of social life in developing countries. It is the most solid (and under undeveloped capitalist relations, the sole) material basis for eliminating backwardness and attaining economic independence. State enterprise, which is more progressive than the private capitalist organization of the productive forces, meets the national interest and creates conditions for conducting an independent, anti-imperialist domestic and foreign policy. It has assumed especially extensive proportions in the socialism-oriented countries.

State-sector problems have been analyzed and discussed on many occasions, but an analysis of the economic practices of socialism-oriented countries requires some additions and corrections on these key questions: the content of the concept, the socio-economic nature of the state sector, and the principles for determining its economic efficiency.

There are two aspects to the question of the content of the 'state sector' concept. The first refers to the correlation and interaction of the basis and the superstructure, and the second, to the approach to be taken in defining the role of the state sector in the economy.

The initial multisectoral basis, which is more or less similar in type in Asian and African countries, engenders a broad spectrum of political superstructures with different orientations, ranging from the socialist to the pro-imperialist. All these regimes develop state enterprise in varying degree, and this inevitably has an influence on the basis structures. However, it is only in the socialism-oriented countries that the emergence of the state sector entails the formation of elements of the economic basis adequate to a revolutionary-democratic political superstructure. Here the forms of collective property — state and cooperative property — gradually, over a long historical period, begin to determine the main features of social relations.

When considering the social nature of the state sector in developing countries, we believe that it is not enough to take into account the class nature of the state, as some do.[2] State enterprise springs from the superstructure, but its social substance can be established only by regarding it as having both a basis and a superstructural character, through a concrete analysis of the interaction of the 'state sector — state' system with all the other elements of the economic basis.

Students of the state sector in developing countries usually bring out only some elements of this interaction,[3] leaving aside the channels, directions and scale of its influence on socio-economic processes. But the point is that the 'relations' of the state sector, a part of the economic basis, and the revolutionary-democratic state, a political superstructure, are highly intricate and diverse. At the early stages of non-capitalist development, the political superstructure operates mainly as the active and definitive side in these relations. But as the state sector is strengthened, it also begins to exert an influence on the 'behavior' of the superstructure.

The manifestations of this influence are fairly diverse. The state sector, if it is sufficiently developed in the branches of material production, and in the sphere of circulation, provides the economic basis for introducing elements of planning into the economy, and as practice shows, the concrete content of national planning is determined by the nature of the state's economic policy. But there is also a reverse influence. The administration of its own property confronts the state, first, with the need gradually to extend this administration to the whole of the country's economic life (mainly by indirect regulation) and second, the need to democratize this administration, which, for its part, produces a tendency to democratize the whole of social life.

Furthermore, the development of the state sector leads to a growth of the working class, while the size and economic strength of the bourgeoisie undergoes relatively little change. It is true that there is a simultaneous increase in the number of officials and technocrats, who frequently have anti-democratic views, but a definite and growing part of this stratum in the socialism-oriented coun-

tries comes from the midst of the working people. With social change running on these lines, some favorable conditions are created for enhancing the political influence of the working class and spreading its ideology.

The state sector in developing countries is sometimes used as a term to designate state enterprises (including mixed and those controlled by the state) in the production sphere and in the sphere of circulation. I think that it should also include elements of the so-called social infrastructure: schools, housing facilities, medical institutions, nursery schools and so on. After all, the state's restructuring of social conditions for broad masses of people is an important component of progressive social development.

Like some other analysts, I also believe that the financial basis of the state is an organic element of the state sector. This means the financial resources mustered and used by the state to extend its entrepreneurial activity and develop the social sphere of the economy. These resources, produced by the state's entrepreneurial activity (earnings of enterprises, bank credits) and its administrative and regulative activity (taxes, tariffs, deductions) constitute an aggregate monetary fund of state accumulation which determines the possibility for a further build-up of production capacities and establishment of facilities in the social infrastructure.

Thus, in defining the 'state sector' concept in the context of the socialism-oriented countries, one has to reckon, I believe, with these three points. First, the state sector is not just a result of the switch from private to collective form of economic activity. It is also an intricate interaction and interlacing of two types of activity by the state, as a national institution: entrepreneurial and administrative. Furthermore, the state sector ranges not only over the production but also the social sphere of the economy, and this, together with the much larger scale of the state's entrepreneurial activity in production, is a feature which distinguishes socialism-oriented from capitalism-oriented development. Finally, the parameters which determine the role of state enterprise in the system of social reproduction include, together with the size of functioning capital, the size of funds for economic and social development (above all, accumulation funds) which the state marshals in other sectors of the economy. Let me stress that this conversion of the state's financial funds into the production funds of the state sector is a direct expression of the interconnection of superstructural and basis phenomena.

A consideration of these points helps to find an answer to the question of the socio-economic nature of the state sector in the socialism-oriented countries. It is well known that neither the transition from private property to state property, nor a change in the national 'color' of capital, does anything to change the relations of production which determine the nature of the state sector. But the establishment of a state sector on the basis of assets owned by foreign monopoly capital does not mean only a change in the national form of property, as L. Georgiev believes.[4] Foreign-monopoly and state-monopoly capital give way to national state capital, which is not monopolistic. That is why even in the capitalism-oriented countries, nationalization of foreign property means not only a weakening of the positions of the imperialist monopolies, but also a transformation of the social nature of the economy meeting the interests of the local bourgeoisie, mostly the small and middle bourgeoisie, and frequently also of other strata of society. The capitalist nature of property remains unchanged, but the extent to which it is used for the purposes of exploitation is undoubtedly reduced.

The establishment of a state sector itself limits to this or that extent the relations of capitalist exploitation and hampers private capital in extending its field of activity and functioning opportunities. The exceptions are the instances in which the state nationalizes only loss-making enterprises, invests only in sectors which private capital finds unprofitable (like transport, communications and other facilities in the economic infrastructure without which material production cannot develop) or goes into 'partnership' with private capital, for which it guarantees a favorable investment climate.

There are different views of the socio-economic nature of the state sector in the socialism-oriented countries. The first is that it is a state-capitalist sector. However, this ignores the revolutionary-democratic nature of the regime and the corresponding orientation of its economic policy. Another and more widespread view, to which I myself subscribe, is that the state sector in these countries is transitional.[5] The substance of this transitional nature is that the quantitative and qualitative growth of the productive forces within the framework of the state sector goes hand in hand with a marked modification of the relations of production and their gradual approximation to the socialist type of relations.

The concrete content of this transitional nature can be discovered only by analyzing the real impact of the 'socialism-oriented state — state sector in the economy' system on the reproduction of social relations. Up to now, this has not been adequately studied.

The state sector covers the broadest range of industries and types of activity, including those which were or could be a sphere for the profitable investment of private capital. This applies above all to industry. Thus, the share of the state sector in Algeria's manufacturing is 90 per cent, and in Tanzania, over 50 per cent.

The state uses the financial system (development budgets) and bank and credit instruments to redistribute accumulations in its own favor. This usually also entails some expanded reproduction of private capital (both national and foreign) but the faster growth of the state sector is here the basic and crucial factor. Its transformation into the main channel of growth of the productive forces and a material basis for the revolutionary-democratic power is the key feature of the socialist orientation in the socio-economic sphere. If the state sector

does not, directly or indirectly, serve the reproduction of private capital, it tends to lose its initial features of state-capitalist enterprise.

The establishment of a powerful state sector works marked changes not only in property relations. Of even greater importance, perhaps, is the restructuring of the relations of exchange and distribution with an eye to limiting their exploitive element to the utmost. It is true that it is especially difficult to draw a distinction between the role of the state sector and the economic policy of the state as a whole. This aspect of the problem has been studied least of all. The relations of exchange and distribution in a multisectoral society as highly diverse and intricate, which is due not only to the confused nature of the system of primary distribution but also to the repeated redistribution of various components of the national product and income. Still, three main lines of the influence exerted on these by the state sector in socialism-oriented countries can be brought out.

The first line is its direct involvement in the formation of the working people's incomes and consumption. Particular importance here attaches to the scale of employment, which depends, among other things, on the state's investment activity; to the wages and working conditions at state enterprises (as compared with private enterprises), and the formation and development of the social infrastructure as an independent part of the state sector, and as the corresponding subsectors within the individual production units and other organizations. The second line relates to the state sector's economic and financial ties with private capitalist enterprises at home and abroad, and the third, to its relations with small-commodity and semi-subsistence farms. The most important factors here are the terms (prices, charges, and so on) for the supply of state enterprises with raw materials, energy, etc., on the one hand, and for the marketing of their output, on the other; the state sector's involvement in marketing the output of other commodity producers (expulsion of private commercial middlemen); concentration of export and import operations in the hands of state agencies; the terms on which the state banking system extends credits to state and private enterprises and the opportunities for doing so.

Let me also point out the various groups of indicators showing how the state sector influences the relations of exchange and distribution within the framework of the overall economic policy. First of all, there are the data relating to the social structure of incomes and consumption, showing the changes in personal income levels in separate groups of the populations, the steps being taken to narrow the gaps in remuneration between the various categories of industrial and office workers, the introduction of a guaranteed minimum and maximum wage at state enterprises and offices, and the changes in the level and structure of personal (individual) consumption in various sections of the population, the poorest and the richest sections in the first place.

The second group of indicators shows the formation of social consumption funds: state appropriations for the development of the social sphere, including the social infrastructure, free medical services, primary, secondary and higher education, pensions, and so on.

The third group of indicators applies to the reproduction of capital in the state and private sectors of the economy. This can be judged from the size of the bank deposits made by the two sectors, from the distribution of credits between them, and especially from the volume of gross capital investments in these sectors.

It is impossible here to present the relevant data for all the socialism-oriented countries. By way of example, let us consider Algeria, which has a fairly long record of socio-economic transformations. Back in 1964, the Algerian state established a minimum wage rate for agricultural workers, which has since then been repeatedly raised. The gap between the highest and lowest levels of remuneration for wage workers in industry and the services has been markedly narrowed down, and a wage ceiling has been established for state employees.

The state has assumed the main responsibility for economic development. By the beginning of the first four-year development plan (1970-1973), its share of the total investments in the conomy had reached almost 90 per cent, and since then it has never dropped below that mark. A sizable share of the state's gross investments goes into the social sphere and into the formation of social consumption funds. Under the first four-year plan, 15-20 per cent of all goods and services produced in the country was used for these purposes.

So, the state sector in socialism-oriented countries should not be fully identified with the state-capitalist sector in countries following the capitalist road. The most important point here is that its development does not extend, but limits the possibilities for the reproduction of private capital and capitalist production relations; it covers both the production and non-production spheres of the economy; it is the state that sets up the social funds of personal consumption, which meets the interests of the working masses; the development of state enterprise helps, directly and indirectly, to raise the living standards of the bulk of the population, on the one hand, and to reduce the incomes of the exploiting strata of society, on the other.

But it would be wrong to assume that the development of the state sector leads directly from the multisectoral economy to social property in the means of production, the main element of a socialist or pre-socialist economic system. While limiting the activity of private capital, the conversion of the state sector into the chief factor of economic growth does not lead to a total elimination of such activity, which is partially maintained for the development of the national economy. Moreover, the state sector cooperates with national and foreign private capital, which seek to gear its development to their own interests. State-supported small-commodity production constantly generates capitalist enterprises.

In these conditions, higher managerial personnel are sometimes tempted to use state property and their own prerogatives for personal gain, something that can lead to a degeneration of the state and economic apparatus into a bureaucratic bourgeoisie and, to changes in the nature of the state sector.

The possibilities of using state property for the benefit of private capital, the tendency among some members of the economic leadership to adopt bourgeois attitudes, the coalescence of their interests with those of the national and foreign bourgeoisie are largely due to the fact that the socialism-oriented countries have close ties with the developed capitalist countries, receiving from them the bulk of their economic and technical assistance, setting up mixed companies with the participation of foreign capital, etc. In other words, in their socialism-oriented economic development the former colonies and semi-colonies still remain within the system of the world capitalist economy. In these conditions, the state sector could evolve in the direction of state capitalism or could even to some extent be 'eroded' through reprivatization. Such relapses, as a rule, occur when the political leadership of some country departs from the socialist orientation, as happened in Egypt.[6] At the same time, active subordination of the state sector to the interests of private enterprise provides a socio-economic basis for such a departure.

In protracted competition with the private sector on the domestic and often on the foreign market, state enterprises frequently find themselves at a disadvantage, because they should, generally, provide better working conditions, incur sizable social expendiutres which are much larger than those of private capital, etc. As for the state sector's advantage in the struggle against private capital, these include balanced development and also, undoubtedly, the extensive opportunities for marshalling financial and material resources and using these with greater efficiency.

Of course, the state sector's close ties with the private sector and with foreign markets, which develop haphazardly, under the impact of the laws of capitalist competition, is bound to affect the use of the planning principle in its administration. In these conditions, planning is largely based on prognostication of the course of ungoverned economic processes, so that the concrete targets set before the state sector sometimes have to be heavily modified. Thus, a change in the external market outlook inevitably entails a review of plan forecasts of imports and exports, state budget revenues, state investments, etc. In spite of all that, planning is an integral feature of the state sector. With increasing emphasis on the directive element, planning in the socialsim-oriented countries, covers not only the economic, but also the social sphere, the reproduction of social relations.

One of the hardest problems facing the socialism-oriented countries is to ensure efficient operation of the state sector. What makes this problem even more difficult, in particular, is that the theoretical issues connected with its solution have still to be fully elaborated. Here I shall consider only some of the general issues.

In my view, one should draw a distinction between the *economic* efficiency of the state sector (to be more precise, of production within its framework) and its efficiency from the standpoint of the strategic tasks of socio-economic development (let us designate is as *social* efficiency). The former is determined by comparing the results and costs of production. In the conditions of commodity-money relations, such a comparison can in practice be made only in a value form. It is also obvious that the value indication of economic efficiency in the state sector must yield a simple (quantitative) instead of a multiple characterization. Let me note in this context that it is wrong to think, as many do, that for the state sector, in contrast with the private sector, efficiency expressed in terms of profit on advanced capital is of secondary importance, while the main aim is to accelerate development, boost output, overcome backwardness and so forth.[7] Those who think so obviously confuse the aims and means of economic development.

The higher the economic efficiency of the state sector in socialism-oriented countries, whose purpose is to do its utmost to achieve the above aims, the more successful it will be in this endeavor. Neglect of economic efficiency inevitably undermines the state sector's competitiveness with respect to private capitalist enterprise. the criterion for assessing the economic efficiency of the state sector is another matter. Of course, the state cannot confine itself to looking to the volume of profit on advanced capital. It should be interested not only in business profit, but also in the surplus-product in value form obtained from capital investment, i.e., the rate of profit in the economy as a whole.

To ensure rapid economic growth, expand the volume of production and strengthen independence, this rate of profit has to be maximized in planning the development of the state sector. In my view, the rate of profit in the economy as a whole agrees with the socio-economic content of the state sector in socialism-oriented countries and can well serve as a criterion of economic efficiency. It derives from the very nature of expanded reproduction and makes it possible to assess every economic decision in the light of the extent to which it meets the needs of progressive development.

1. See, in particular, 'The role of the public sector in developing countries,' *WMR*, December 1977; 'The revolutionary process in the socialism-oriented countries of Africa,' January 1978; 'The agrarian question and the peasantry's role in developing countries,' December 1978 and January 1979; 'Restructuring international economic relations and the people's anti-imperialist front,' May 1979.
2. See 'Nature of the state sector in Asian and African Countries,' *WMR*, October 1973, p. 18.
3. See, for instance, *WMR*, December 1977, p. 58.
4. *WMR*, July 1977, p. 132.
5. This view was clearly formulated by Adel Haba, CC member, Iraqi CP, in *WMR*, December 1977, p. 62.
6. See Nagib Kamal, 'Scenario of capitulation,' *WMR*, March 1979, p. 135.
7. See, for instance, *WMR*, December 1977, p. 66.

Sweden under monopoly rule

The following interview with Carl Henrik Hermansson, member of the Board Executive Committee, Left Party — Communists of Sweden, was taken by Rodny Öhman, member of the *WMR* Editorial Council and representative of the Left Party — Communists of Sweden.

Q. There has been wide comment in the country, including the social-democratic and bourgeois mass media, on your latest book on Swedish monopoly capital.* Yet, your earlier works on the same subject were passed over in almost total silence with the exception, of course, of the progressive press. What caused this interest?

A. Indeed, my earlier books, in which I analyzed the process of concentration of production in Sweden and the mainsprings of the power of the financial and industrial monopolies, were mostly ignored by the mass media controlled by the bourgeoisie and the social democrats. They only cases where they were mentioned were motivated by a hankering to brand the analyses in them as 'communist propaganda.'

However, I would not say that the response to the book you've mentioned was entirely unexpected. The point is that interest in studying the process of production concentration has heightened significantly. The problem brought up in my book now holds the attention even of the government apparatus. Take, for instance, the Central Union of Swedish Trade Unions. Although the social democrats cooperating with the capitalists are predominant in it, yet it, too, has started a campaign for the creation of a Wage Workers' Front against the growing power of the financial magnates. Even the non-monopoly bourgeoisie has begun talking of the dangers of concentration to both state power and the power of private capital.

Thus, it may be said that present-day social realities are being recognized to a greater extent than ever before. One of these realities is the aggravation of capitalism's internal contradictions, and this bears out the Marxist analysis of the development of monopoly capitalism. Hence the heightened interest in books on industrial monopolies and financial barons written from Marxist positions. They simply cannot be ignored any longer.

Q. Could you outline the present tendency toward a change in the correlation between small and large enterprises in Sweden?

A. I'll try to answer your question by using the situation in the sphere of employment as an illustration.

In Sweden, as in other capitalist countries, the number of large factories is growing steadily. Whereas in 1931 there were five or six workers per production unit, their number rose to 7-8 in 1951, and to 11-12 in 1972.

This was accompanied by a growth of the proportion of large production units. From 1951 to 1972 the aggregate proportion of people employed at small enterprises (employing up to 10 persons) dropped from 31.3 to 22 per cent of the total work force, while the overall number of people working at large enterprises (employing over 200 persons) grew from 30.7 to 34.5 per cent.

Further, there has been a substantial growth of the number of production units employing more than 500 persons. In 1951 there were 365 such units employing a total of 392,000 persons, while in 1972 their number rose to 633 with the number of persons employed increasing to 807,000. In terms of percentage of the total, we get the following picture: 27.3 per cent of the nation's work force was employed at enterprises employing over 500 persons in 1951 and 36.3 per cent in 1972.

Q. Has the enlargement of enterprises changed their character?

A. Yes, quite dramatically. Many small enterprises that had formerly been independent have now become suppliers for the big firms, in many cases providing only services and manufacturing no products of their own. Many of them have signed contracts on lease, supplies, or credits, and found themselves dependent in varying degrees on big enterprises and banks.

As regards the large factories, many now combine several production units. The enlargement and also the merging of enterprises give rise to concerns combining tens of factories and employing many tens of thousands of factory and office workers.

Q. The merger problem you have mentioned is attracting considerable attention. What are the tendencies in this area in recent years?

A. The main tendency is a noticeable activation of the process itself. I have the statistics of the State Prices and Cartel Commission, which show that of the 3,500 mergers registered in the course of 26 years (from 1946 to 1971), more than half were effected during the last five years of that period (from 1967 to 1971). In 1975, for instance, there was a record number of 828 mergers.

Let us look at the dynamics of this process from another angle, namely, from the angle of employment. We find that the enterprises that had merged during these 26 years employed about 400,000 persons, while the companies that merged in the period from 1969 to 1976 employed upwards of 430,000 persons.

Q. Could you give examples to show the mechanism of the merging of enterprises?

A. I believe there are two main orientations in

---

*C.H. Hermansson, *Kapitalister I: Monopol*, Stockholm, 1979.

the concentration of production. The first is the creation of a trust or a concern through the acquisition of several enterprises. This is illustrated by the Beijerinvest concern, which in 1969-1976 purchased 39 enterprises in different branches of industry with a work force of over 11,000 persons. Beginning with the acquisition of the Kol Och Koks and the Beijer Bygg joint-stock companies, the Beijerinvest concern became one of Sweden's largest industrial and trade enterprises. Moreover, it is closely linked to one of the two huge commercial Swedish banks: Svenska Handelsbanken. Incidentally, the chairman of the Bank's Board of Directors, Tore Browaldh, is a Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors of Beijerinvest.

There is another orientation. I am speaking of the seizure of new spheres of production by 'old,' relatively large concerns. Take the case of the Electrolux Company, founded in 1919 by Alex Wenner-Gren, the 'vacuum-cleaner king.' In 1969 this concern, which had until then confined itself to the manufacture of vacuum-cleaners and household refrigerators, was in control of about 70 companies in 32 countries. These employed about 28,000 persons, including at least 12,000 in Sweden. After it set its sights on expansion, Electrolux acquired another 41 enterprises in 1969-1976 with a total work force of 20,000 persons. This took it beyond the framework of the manufacture of household electrical appliances. In 1972 it purchased the Facit Company, the sole manufacturer of typewriters in Sweden. It followed this up by swallowing a U.S. company, the National Union Electric Corporation. In 1976 its enterprises were employing nearly 71,500 persons, almost 47,000 of them outside Sweden. The ASEA Bank of the Wallenberg industrial and financial empire is the concern's largest shareholder. It holds 49 per cent of the shares in Electrolux.

Q. What is the role in the Swedish economy of giants such as these two?

A. You evidently mean the nation's 200 largest enterprises. In 1977 they employed 1,295,000 wage and salaried workers, or almost 30 per cent of the nation's work force, and had a turnover of 383,000 million kronor. However, this is a heterogeneous group. Moreover, a continuous process of differentiation is going on within its framework. For instance, in 1970 the turnover of one hundred of the largest enterprises comprised 86.5 per cent of the group's total turnover, in 1977 it rose to 89.6 per cent. This means that *nine-tenths* of the turnover of two hundred of Sweden's leading enterprises is today accounted for by one hundred of the largest.

Some idea of the growing strength of these monopolies may be gleamed from the correlation between their turnover and Sweden's gross national product. In 1970, when the turnover of the 200 largest enterprises amounted to 114,000 million kronor, the GNP was equal to 162,000 million kronor. Seven years later, in 1977, the turnover of these enterprises reached 383,000 million kronor, exceeding the GNP, which was estimated at 352,000 million kronor.

Q. What is the attitude of the bourgeois parties and the state apparatus to this growing concentration of production and capital?

A. In Sweden, the rate of concentration of production and capital, and thereby of economic power is growing so rapidly that even the bourgeois parties find they have to come out against it, even though this is only speech-making. As for the political practices in government, in parliament, and in administration, they go to all lengths to encourage the intervention of the capitalist state apparatus in the economy, thereby further accelerating concentration.

Q. What forms does state intervention in the economy take?

A. During the past half-century state intervention in the economy has passed through two stages.

The first stage saw mostly indirect intervention in the form of tax benefits, subsidies, and direct investments in capitalist enterprises. Since free porridge of this kind goes to those who have the biggest spoons, the big enterprises were the main beneficiaries of this policy. They benefited by the system of tax-free investments. Further, they benefited from subsidies for measures against water and air pollution, from subsidies for the building of warehouses, and from deductions and subsidies for investments. Even taxes were levied in such a way as to benefit the larger and more capital-intensive enterprises.

In the same period, there were some cases, albeit on a smaller scale than in other countries, of the state taking over various enterprises. Of course this was not prompted by philanthropy or concern for the working people. Mostly unprofitable enterprises requiring new investment which their owners were reluctant to make were bought from private capital. For instance, capital was invested in the nuclear industry to compensate for the high initial expenditures and guarantee against the serious risks that the development of this industry entails.

Q. State participation in private capitalist industry persists to this day. What distinguishes the second stage?

A. Quite true, state participation in private capitalist industry continues to be practised. More, it is spreading. In 1977 direct state investments in capitalist enterprises reached the sum of 9,000-10,000 million kronor. To this we must add the special privileges on various taxes, as well as subsidized loans and guaranteed credits. On these two items the budget allocations in the 1977-78 fiscal year amounted to 1,000 million and 35,000 million kronor, respectively.

A new development is that now the state is penetrating the economy directly on a growing scale. This is achieved through nationalization, as a result of which the state becomes the co-owner of private capitalist enterprises. Sometimes this takes the shape of helping in the merger of enterprises.

There are industries in which the state is particularly active. In the shipbuilding industry, for example, it controls the country's largest docks. Some big textile mills and garment factories are operated by a

state concern. The Svenskt Stal Company, half of whose shares belong to the state, runs the largest iron-and-steel plants. The state encourages the merging of factories producing special grades of steel.

Q. What is its influence on the power of the financial-industrial groups?

A. The monopolies have unquestionably grown stronger. They have rid themselves of unprofitable enterprises, which in the long run has released capital for more profitable ventures in Sweden and abroad. As the co-owners of the Svenskt Stal corporation, the financial monopolies were able to gain control of the Norrbotten Järnverk iron-and-steel plant that had earlier belonged entirely to the state.

To enhance their influence the financial monopolies use the ramified and steadily expanding system of links between private capital and the state apparatus. Whatever the spokesmen of Swedish social-democracy say, Sweden is now a state-monopoly capitalist country with all the accompanying intrinsic features.

Q. Evidently, analogous processes of concentration are taking place in parallel in finance capital?

A. Of course. This is most strikingly illustrated by the fact that whereas formerly we used to speak of the '15 famiies' controlling Sweden, today some members of that group have lost their influence, while others, notably the Wallenbergs, have greatly strengthened their position. I would say that no other financial group in the capitalist world is so predominant in the economic life of its country as this family.

The foundation run by Knut and Alice Wallenberg is the basis of its industrial empire. The shares of all the enterprises owned by the Wallenbergs are estimated at 650 million kronor. If we count the family's personal property worth 245 million kronor, we shall find that its wealth at the current exchange rate amounts to 895 million kronor. On the stock exchange all the enterprises of the Wallenberg empire are estimated to be worth more than 20,000 million kronor.

Q. Doesn't this amount to nearly half the total value of all the shares registered on the stock exchange?

A. To be exact, 45 per cent. Then consider that the Wallenbergs control many of the largest Swedish enterprises: LM Ericsson, Electrolux, SKF, ASEA, SAAB-Scania, and Svenska Tändsticks AB, to mention a few. One of the largest commercial banks, Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken, has found itself under the wing of the Wallenbergs.

It is significant that in the Swedish work force the proportion of wage and salaried workers employed at the Wallenberg enterprises is steadily growing. Between 1963 and 1977 the number of persons employed by these enterprises grew from 159,000 to 207,000. A point I should like you to note is that the number of wage and salaried workers employed at the Wallenberg subsidiaries abroad is likewise growing. It increased from 102,000 and 212,000 during the 1963-1977 period.

Q. Is this external activity a hallmark of all the Swedish concerns?

A. It is now the overall tendency of the development of Swedish capitalism. One indication is that while employment fell by 85,000 in Swedish industry in 1965-1977, it grew by more than 120,000 at the subsidiaries of the Swedish concerns abroad. As early as 1974 these subsidiaries employed a total of 325,000 wage and salaried workers.

Q. Would you say a few words about the export of capital?

A. It has increased dramatically during the past decade. In the early 1960s direct Swedish investments in industrial enterprises abroad amounted to roughly 150 million kronor, while in the 1970s they exceeded 1,000 million kronor. In 1976 Swedish capitalists invested 2,600 million kronor abroad, while in 1977 they invested 3,400 million kronor. A growing share of Swedish capital is being channeled to the developing countries. In 1976 nearly 20 per cent of all direct Swedish investments abroad went to these countries.

This process, too, brings to light the dominant role of the big enterprises, for most of the investments are made through them. They employ most of the work force used by Swedish concerns abroad. At their subsidiaries abroad the largest Swedish industrial corporations employ more wage and salaried workers than in Sweden.

Q. How does this foreign investent activity affect the situation in the country?

A. Let me say only that while the big capitalist corporations export capital, the state agencies and municipal councils have been more and more frequently compelled to look for large credits, foreign credits as well, to cover their budget deficits.

Q. Since you have shown the growing activity of Swedish monopoly capital in the nation's economy, let us now consider some related questions. In particular, is this activity politically expressed?

A. In recent years there has been a mounting tendency on the part of individual capitalist groups to act jointly on the political scene. The Swedish Association of Industrialists is increasingly becoming a center of attraction of the bourgeois political forces. It is coming forward more and more frequently with various political initiatives aimed at consolidating the position of the bourgeoisie and capitalist practices. This was seen quite clearly this year in the election campaign. In order to win support for its views and for its candidates, who champion its interests, the Association did not stint funds for advertising in the press, campaign tours, exhibits, the publication of brochures, articles in newspapers, and so on. It has published a propaganda brochure even for children.

Q. In other words, the monopoly circles are using their growing economic power to consolidate their positions. What should be the response of the working class to this threat?

A. First, it should not succumb to this pressure. We communists have offered the working people a

positive alternative to bourgeois policy. It is given in our Program for the 1980s, which stresses that the basic orientation of the new policy should not be collaboration with the financial magnates, which has been practised so vigorously by the social-democratic governments, but consistent action against their domination.

Realization of this policy requires effective action by the majority of the working people. The working-class movement has not merely to win a majority in the parliament. It has to bring in a fundamentally different kind of government that would pursue a radical working-class policy. Some of the measures envisaged in our program can be carried out in the period between the elections of 1979 and 1982, and others in the course of the 1980s. One of these measures, as our talk has shown, is the nationalization of the Wallenberg empire as a key step toward the abolition of monopoly-capital power.

Revolution: the ways to it

These are cardinal problems for the communists and all other democratic, patriotic forces of Guatemala, Costa Rica and El Salvador — three Central American nations.

HARBINGER OF COMING BATTLES

Carlos Gonzales
General Secretary, Central Committee,
Guatemalan Party of Labor

The Guatemalan Party of Labor was founded 30 years ago. During the past 25 years it has been functioning underground. These have been years of tragedy for our people, when successive reactionary, pro-imperialist dictatorships turned violence into state policy and an instrument of administration. Repressions were intensified following the military coup of 1963 when the fascistization of the regime commenced. Since then more than 30,000 Guatemalans have been killed or 'listed missing.'[1] Nineteen members of the GPL Central Committee, including General Secretaries Bernardo Alvarado Monzon and Huberto Alvarado Arellano, scores of activists, and hundreds of rank-and-file party members, were brutally slain or fell in battle.

The Guatemalan communists have never lost their faith in the masses, in their revolutionary potential. This is borne out by the facts. In March 1973 when the armed struggle against the dictatorship was crushed and the revolutionary movement found itself divided, the GPL Central Committee declared its firm conviction that the mass struggle would inevitably be resumed in the immediate future. As early as 1973 there was a wave of strikes and actions by large groups of the population against the high cost of living, poverty and repressions. Resistance to the tyranny continued to grow.[2] The class battles became particularly bitter in 1978.[3]

The semi-fascist dictatorship continues to escalate its repressions. However, it can no longer prevent the spread of the mass struggle sparked by the deepening socio-economic crisis and is therefore having recourse to demagogic subterfuges, holding forth on 'peaceful dialogue,' 'democratization,' and a 'great social pact of peace.' In order to deceive the population and world opinion, it periodically conducts general 'elections' under slogans calling for democratic reforms but in fact signifying nothing more than the passage of power from the hands of one group of reactionaries to another. As a result of last year's elections the government headed by the ultra-reactionary Movement for National Liberation[4] was replaced by a government headed by General Romeo Lukas Garcia, who relies on a new political coalition that champions the interests of big exporters of agricultural produce, finance capital, industrialists and merchants linked to U.S. imperialism and multinational corporations. This coalition is grouped around the Institutional Democratic Party[5] and the Organized Aranist Center.[6] The so-called Revolutionary Party,[7] which adopted an undisguisedly reactionary posture as early as 1966, joined them as a 'new force.'

The removal of the MNL from power was due to the continuing 'modernization' of an economy under a deformed and dependent capitalism. The bourgeois-landowner oligarchy and the U.S. imperialists can now do without the MNL, which speaks for the conservative groups that are being ousted (with fierce resistance) by the 'new' forces seeking unchallenged economic and political supremacy.

However, the assumption of power by the Lukas Garcia government, which is weak and torn by internal contradictions, should not be viewed outside the mass struggle and without taking into account the role that is played, in particular, by our party in the nation's political life. Back in 1974 the GPL urged the democratic forces to fight for the removal of a government that consisted of the most reactionary elements, and this made it possible to create the conditions for the spread of the popular movement. This aim has been partially achieved, but we are aware of the danger of the present situation.

We do not exclude the possibility that the contradictions among the ruling élite may lead to fascism as the response of the regime and imperialism to the upsurge of the mass struggle. This is the principal danger today and it compels the democratic circles to step up their fight to bring down or isolate the most reactionary and diehard elements in the government, to press for the final removal of MNL supporters from power. More, it is vital to combat all the gambles and provocations

that may enable reaction and imperialism to drive the people into even greater calamities.

In the present situation, the Political Commission of the GPL Central Committee warned, 'We are witnessing, on the one hand, a further intensification of putschist tendencies on the part of the economic groups that have lost their privileges, and, on the other, a radicalization of non-proletarian elements among the middle strata, who are, because of their suspicion of the masses, prone to adventurism and succumb to the subterfuges and provocations of reaction and imperialism, which see them as a means of diverting the masses from the struggle, of confusing and dividing them.'[8]

In this context one can understand the role our party has to play under these conditions. The GPL is the main achievement and vanguard of the working class. Since its foundation it has been heading the people's struggle for democracy, social progress, and a higher living standard, against capitalist exploitation. In order to attain its revolutionary objectives it is striving to apply Marxism-Leninism creatively to the realities of our country.

In the course of three decades it has accumulated extensive experience of struggle and drawn invaluable lessons; time and again it has withstood the ferocious assaults of the class enemy; it has been steeled in struggle, waged from deep underground, and is today prepared ideologically, politically, organizatinally and militarily for new class battles, which, we are certain, will end in victory for the people. This is demonstrated by the advances made by the popular movement, especially in 1978, advances that are unquestionably linked to the activities of the GPL, which is winning growing prestige among the working people.

In its struggle for its declared strategic objective — an agrarian people's anti-imperialist revolution with a socialist perspective — the GPL has used the most diverse forms of action, including military action. This was the reason that in its ranks there arose right-revisionist tendencies, whose proponents do not understand the significance of armed struggle, and also leftist, adventurist elements who recognize only the non-peaceful way of revolution and ignore the role of the masses.

The GPL is combating both right and 'left' deviations. Factional activity, which undermines the party's internal unity, cohesion and discipline, the Leninist style of leadership, and the principle of democratic centralism, and which threatened to bring anarchy, is suffering defeat. In the sharp ideological and political internal struggle the party is gathering strength and uniting around its Central Committee, Political Commission and Secretariat. In this struggle we constantly recall Lenin's words that 'the farther removed we are from sectarianism, the petty circle spirit, and considerations of place and position, the more must we strive to have differences among party members discussed calmly and on their merits and not to let these differences interfere with our work, disrupt our activities, impede the proper functioning of our central institutions' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 7, p. 148).

Factionalists have attempted to seize leading positions in the party, but upon meeting with failure they have gone over to open divisive activities, which, it can be foretold, will inevitably come to grief. This was stated in a report to a plenum of the GPL Central Committee in October 1978, at which it was stressed that 'there can be no reconciliation for the sake of formal, instead of political unity . . . Everything speaks in our favor. We have to move forward, and we shall advance not only in our aspiration to play a more significant role in the people's struggle but also in solving the nation's problems, but to do this we must strengthen our internal class unity in the face of any right or "left" petty-bourgeois deviations and distortions alien to the working class and its vanguard.'

The GPL considers that the factional activity in its ranks is the result of a conspiracy of those who had in the past been opposed to an armed struggle and those who laud this form of struggle today.

To absolutize the spontaneous movement of the masses in the revolutionary struggle, and this is precisely what the right revisionists are doing in their efforts to impose their dogmatism on the party, means to rely entirely on 'Providence,' which was a hallmark of the utopian socialists, who did not comprehend the revolutionary role of the working class as the main locomotive of history and did not understand its need for its own political party to organize the struggle for power and lead the revolution. On the other hand, to underrate the spontaneous aspect of the mass struggle means to ignore the objective factors inducing these masses, who are under the threat of death from starvation, to demand respect for their rights. In no case has a Communist Party been formed before the masses in some measure realized the need for it as a force linking scientific socialism to the working-class movement. In the final analysis, absolutization of spontaneous elements of the people's movement degenerates into liquidationism.

We Guatemalan communists believe that a further escalation of repressions and terror is inevitable, for this is the staff of life of the Lukas Garcia government that has been imposed upon the people. We must therefore prepare ourselves for even greater trials. In any case, developments will depend in large measure on the role that the popular movement plays. The more actively the masses join in the revolutionary struggle, the more difficult it will be for the military dictatorship to strike at the revolutionary democratic and progressive forces with impunity.

The top priority task of the popular movement is now to secure an end to the fascist terror. By stepping up the struggle the popular forces can isolate and crush the most reactionary elements in the government. The criminal policy of these elements is aimed not only at continuing repressions and terror. By slaying and kidnapping patriots and democrats, they are trying to provoke the revolutionary progressive forces and the legal democratic opposition to actions that would lead to their isolation. This is an insidious plan of the ultra-rightists

designed to compel us to resort to adventurism, to divert us from our efforts to organize a powerful unitary mass movement for bringing the broadest popular forces together and thereby preventing the isolation of the government and the paramilitary fascist groups serving it.

Broad international solidarity, which would powerfully stimulate the Guatemalan people who are waging a struggle in such difficult conditions, is needed in order to put an end to the atrocities and crimes of the reactionary military dictatorship.

Despite the counter-offensive mounted by the repressive apparatus, the high level of maturity reached by the popular movement in both town and countryside makes us confident that there will be a further upswing of mass action, especially in view of the fact that the country is experiencing a severe economic crisis, the burden of which falls squarely on the shoulders of the working class, the poor and small peasants, the middle strata, in fact, the entire working population.

As regards the more long-term prospect, much will depend on the balance of strength between the popular movement and the ruling classes. Everything indicates that the positions of the local reactionaries and imperialism, which are rent by contradictions, are daily becoming weaker. They are finding themselves in growing isolation in the country and increasingly discredited on the international scene. The popular movement, on the contrary, is gaining strength, broadening out, and making increasingly more radical economic and political demands. In October 1978 it acquired an anti-government orientation. How far the balance of strength will be favorable for the revolutionary, democratic and progressive circles will depend on the breadth acquired by the actions against the dictatorship.

In this situation our party calls for united action by the broadest democratic forces, having in mind the prospect of forming a wide front of struggle in which all revolutionary, anti-imperialist, democratic and progressive circles will unite around the minimum program of vital demands put forward by the Guatemalan communists.[9] This program contains the following points:

respect for the right of workers, peasants and students to organize;

higher pay for blue- and white-collar workers, measures against the high cost of living, and the granting of land to peasants;

an end to repressions and the disbandment of the paramilitary groups operating on assignments from the fascist reactionaries;

legalization of public organizations and respect for human rights;

a halt to the transfer of our natural wealth and resources to imperialism, and defense of sovereignty and national independence.

As regards the longer-term, decisive significance will attach to the non-peaceful road of revolution. This is the guideline set by the Fourth GPL Congress (1969). As was noted in the statement of the Political Commission on the 29th anniversary of the GPL: 'We regard the revolutionary process as a long struggle that will manifest itself in diverse forms and methods depending on historical circumstances, popular support, and our ability to proceed with and raise this process to the highest level.'[10]

Further, we should like to outline the GPL's stand on some present-day international issues.

In our view, the cardinal question of world development today is that of war and peace. Existing socialism is the main force in the struggle of the peoples against imperialism, against its policy of aggression and a race for arms, a policy of provocations and threats.

This policy of imperialism and its allies has time and again aggravated the international situation. Here they are getting a helping hand from the leadership in Peking. It is subverting efforts to establish peace and peaceful coexistence and promote friendship and cooperation among nations, and kindling flashpoints of tension in the world. It has acted against the national-liberation struggle in Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and Afghanistan, sent troops 'to pacify' the heroic and invincible people of Vietnam, bought cotton from the Somoza regime that oppressed the Nicaraguan people for more than 40 years, and supports fascist and reactionary dictatorships in Latin America, including Guatemala.

All this contrasts strikingly with the consistently internationalist policy pursued by the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, a policy that meets the interests of peoples fighting for national independence, democracy, peace and socialism, against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid.

In this connection, we Guatemalan communists feel it is necessary to underline the significance of socialist and communist construction today, the growing influence of the socialist world community, of socialism on the international situation, and the increasing solidarity of all revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces.

We pay tribute to the efforts the Soviet Union and other socialist-community states are making to improve the international climate. Their unswerving Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, their policy of friendship and mutually beneficial cooperation between nations helps us to advance in the bitter struggle for the liberation of our people. We warmly welcome the realistic course set by the USSR and other socialist countries toward the settlement of conflicts and outstanding issues in the world by negotiation. This course is definitely not a sign of weakness. On the contrary, it is the result of a meaningful policy conducted to ensure the security, independence, progress and welfare of nations.

A contingent of the revolutionary, democratic and anti-imperialist movement in the world, our party considers that a greater effort must be made to achieve a further deepening of the détente, to spread it to the whole world, and back it up with a military détente.

The GPL highly values its fraternal, comradely

relations with the parties of the socialist countries. Their successes and achievements inspire us to fight unremittingly for the liberation of the Guatemalan people.

Our party is emphatic in urging unity and cohesion in the international communist and working-class movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. True to the behests of Georgi Dimitrov, it holds that a principled attitude to the USSR and other socialist countries is the basic criterion of internationalist duty. This is the spirit in which we are trying to educate all members of our party and of the Patriotic Working Youth of Guatemala.

We face the future with optimism.

Socialism and communism are confidently paving the way for themselves in the world and showing the nations the road to the future. The working class of the developed capitalist countries is becoming an increasingly influential and prestigious force. The national-liberation movement is advancing from one victory to another. In Asia, the Political Commission of our party's Central Committee noted in March 1979 in a statement on the criminal intervention of the ruling Peking clique against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the heroic Vietnamese people have inflicted another defeat on the aggressors. Factors of the utmost significance in Latin America are the consolidation of the Cuban revolution and the recent victory of the Nicaraguan people, who deposed the bloodthirsty Somoza dictatorship, a victory that is beginning to influence the struggle of the peoples of our continent, particularly of Central America. The communist and workers' parties of the Latin American continent are making considerable headway despite all obstacles and despite the difficult conditions in which many of them are fighting.

We are firm in our belief that victory will be ours.

1. Statistics compiled by the Guatemalan Peace Committee indicate that the punitive agencies committed 1,180 political murders in the period from July 1, 1978 to February 28, 1979. In the course of the first few months of this year, savage treatment was meted out to leaders of the legal democratic opposition Dr. Alberto Fuentes Mohr and Dr. Manuel Colom Argueta, and also to the trade union attorney and well-known university lecturer Professor Manuel Andrade Roca.

2. See *WMR*, September 1974: Miguel Rodriguez, 'Twenty-five trying years.'

3. The largest mass actions were the strikes by employees of state institutions in February-March (they paralyzed over 60 per cent of the government offices and services and compelled the authorities to increase pay and pledge to refrain from repressions against the leaders of these strikes); the huge May Day demonstration and rally; a demonstration involving thousands of people, who protested against the mass murders in Panzos; the general strike in October that showed that the people were mobilized, organized and united (this strike forced the municipal council to reverse its decision to double city transport fares); the large demonstration in protest against the murder of Oliverio Castaneda, President of the Association of University Students. Massive strikes, demonstrations, and other protest actions were held this year despite the escalating repressions.

4. Serves the interests of the bourgeois-landowner oligarchy and is closely linked to foreign monopolies. Preaches undisguised anti-communism.

5. Expresses the interests of the big bourgeoisie, the landowners, and the ruling reactionary military.

6. A political group of supporters of the former president Arana Osorio. It is now registered under the name of Authentic National Center.

7. Represents the pro-imperialist and petty opportunist bourgeoisie.

8. *Nuestras Ideas*, No. 2, April-June 1978.

9. An indication of the efficacy of GPL policy was the formation in February 1979 of the Democratic Front Against Repressions in Guatemala, which unites widely representative people's and democratic organizations.

10. *Verdad*, No. 223, September 1978.

THE PERSPECTIVES OF THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

Arnoldo Ferreto
Member of the CC Political Commission and Secretariat, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica

In the latest general election in Costa Rica, the National Liberation Party (NLP), which advocates social democracy and is affiliated to the Socialist International, was defeated for the first time in years. The election was won by Unity, a coalition of four bourgeois reformist parties. Below is an interview with Arnoldo Ferreto by our correspondent.

Q. What does the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica think of the changes that have come about?

A. We communists consider that the NLP defeat and the transfer of power to the Unity coalition is a step back for the country. While the new goverment is heterogeneous in composition, the rightist trend is still the dominant one. In estimating the situation, however, it's essential to remember that Costa Rica has long-standing democratic anti-imperialist traditions and champions peace and détente. The Constitution and the laws are respected (to the extent that this can be done under capitalism) and a general election is held once in four years. The political parties operate legally, the army is banned by law and we have fairly well-developed democratic institutions. Solidarity with peoples fighting against fascist and reactionary military dictatorships is expressed openly at every level, including the government.

The President of the Republic, Rodrigo Carazo, is compelled to proceed prudently enough so as not to alienate the masses, which would foredoom his coalition in the next election. On the other hand, he must reckon with the parties which are backing him and whose right-wing demands more repression in reply to the people's growing struggle.

Q. What are the social and economic problems facing Costa Rica today?

A. Our country is one of the most developed not only in Central America but throughout the region. However, it is afflicted with the fundamental contradictions and difficulties typical of most of the small countries of the continent. First of all there are the limitations of the home market due to the popu-

lation's small size (2.1 min) and its low purchasing power. Inadequate consumer demand prevents the rise of up-to-date large-batch production, the modernization of economic structures, and the intensification of accumulation processes.

The domestic economic situation has lately been characterized by a decline in the growth rate of the gross national product (GNP) and increasing dependence on foreign finance. In 1977, the GNP grew by 8.3 per cent and in 1978, by only five per cent, according to data released by the Central Bank.

The salient feature of economic life is inflation, which has reached a high rate in the mid-1970s. This year it could be as high as 10 per cent. The colon, our monetary unit, used to be one of Latin America's stablest currencies. Since 1960, it has been devalued by 50 per cent and is on the threshold of a further devaluation.

The general cause of the inflation is low productivity and, as a result, the inadequacy of financial resources, which makes for budget deficits. The situation is worsened by the inadequate diversification of exports, sharp fluctuations in foreign trade earnings and the decline of world prices for Costa Rica's staples, coffee and sugar.

The Central Bank has estimated that whereas in 1950 one had to sell 1.1 tons of coffee abroad to buy one jeep, in 1974 one had to sell twice as much. And while in 1950 one had to export 2.1 tons of coffee to import one tractor, in 1974 one had to export 3.7 times as much. At the same time, almost all hard-currency earnings from coffee sales are spent for paying interest on the external debt, which last year rose to 1,050 m. dollars.

The economy is also affected by the worldwide increase in the price of oil, which Costa Rica lacks. The prices of imported U.S. goods go on rising. It is not only necessities that are becoming more expensive but also services like electricity, water supply and transport. Bank interest is soaring. The latest annual budget, which amounts to 7,00m. colons, has a deficit of 2,000m., covered chiefly with credits. The country is thus going through one of its worst crises ever.

Q. What is the regime doing to find a way out?

A. The great difficulties facing the country call for emergency measures, but the government has shown itself to be totally incapable of easing these problems, to say nothing of solving them. That is why it has used dodges like the notorious 'national dialogue' idea suggested by President Carazo. Among those invited to participate in the dialogue was the United People bloc, which comprises our party, the Costa Rican Socialist Party and the Revolutionary People's Movement. An invitation was also sent to our parliamentary group and to the trade union organizations led by the communists. But the 'dialogue' was not to be, for following the President's call Labor Minister Estela Quesada sharply attacked our party and working-class organizations on television. All democrats and contingents of the working-class movement, including those not influenced by us, were deeply angered by the move. We asked Carazo to disavow his minister's utterances. The United People took a similar stand. But the President backed Quesada. We protested by refusing to join in the 'dialogue.' Besides, its terms were unacceptable to us. What we wanted was real discussion, or, in other words, a public, unhampered and democratic analysis of the nation's problems. We didn't like the idea of a meeting which was expected after a brief debate to appoint committees (as it actually did) that would operate within a framework set by the President to put forward a series of proposals of little importance.

Q. What are the possibilities of achieving trade union unity and the main demands of the working-class movement?

A. The Labor Minister is undoubtedly right in saying that over 90 per cent of the strikes 'are organized by communist trade unions,' and that 93 per cent of collective bargaining and agreement signing is done by organizations which are under our influence. She says the whole working-class movement is controlled or led by 'subversive forces' (that's what she calls the left-wing parties) and this poses a 'danger' to constitutional order.

However hard our enemies may try to throw a false light on the working class, it is its struggle that safeguards this order and democratic freedoms generally. Hence one of our main tasks is to strengthen and unify the working-class movement.

Our party is drafting the statutes of a trade union federation that will have a broader basis than the existing one. The General Confederation of Costa Rican Workers (GCCW), led by us, is the country's biggest. It comprises about 80 per cent of organized workers and is affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions. Another center, the Costa Rican Confederation of Democratic Workers, is a member of ORIT (Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers), which maintains the closest relations with America's yellow unions. There are also several small federations of the most diverse orientations. If we succeed in uniting the more militant contingents of other organizations with the GCCW, the country will by the end of this year have a new trade union center representing over 90 per cent of organized workers.

As regards the workers' demands, they want above all else an end to the growth of prices and service charges and a wage rise. This is a natural reaction to the policy of the government, which tries to put the whole burden of the crisis on the working population. However, the workers do not confine themselves to the struggle for higher wages. They advance a vast program envisaging national liberation, an agrarian reform and a further democratization of public life. This position is typical not only of the unions of workers but of those of civil servants, municipal employees and academic personnel, as well as of handicraftsmen, traders and other members of the middle urban strata. We fully support their struggle.

The communists are active in the countryside, where the greater part of the population lives. They cite specific examples to open the peasants' eyes to the inability of the reformist parties to change the

character of land-tenure by carrying out a far-reaching agrarian reform. Our party attaches great importance to the cooperative movement, not only as a form of association of peasants but as a method of educating them in a collectivist spirit. It defends peasant families squatting on uncultivated tracts owned by landed proprietors. Our work has already yielded results. Peasant organizations are opeating under our leadership in nearly all provinces.

Q. How would you comment on the level of the workers' political consciousness?

A. It's fairly high in the case of organized workers. But they add up to only 25 per cent of the working class. Most of it are people of peasant stock with a petty-bourgeois mentality as well as young people between 18 and 25 years of age who have no experience of struggle. One of our main tasks is to educate them in a class spirit. Banana plantation workers are relatively more advanced politically; they are better organized and more militant.

Q. What are the party's possibilities of winning the masses?

A. The masses are mostly under the influence of the NLP and the Unity coalition. The communists' fundamental task is to win them over. But it won't be easy. Our opponents command far greater resources and possibilities of influencing the population politically and ideologically. Besides, the bourgeoisie has considerable experience of political struggle, and where necessary it can show flexibility and make concessions. This is why large sections of the people still entertain illusions about the reformist parties. We must first of all help them shed those illusions. However, we don't always do this well enough. We must give credit to our adversaries for being often more competent than us. But in spite of all the roadblocks, our party is making headway in winning over the majority of the people. It is daily becoming stronger and its demands for radical changes in the country meet increasing support among the population. We scored a major victory in university elections, polling more votes than both the NLP and Unity, and gained a decisive influence in the banana plantations area.

The communists are sure that by the 50th anniversary of their party its ranks will have grown substantially and it will be a truly mass organization. This year alone we plan to admit a thousand new members, including 130 peasants and 375 wage workers (apart from industrial workers), and to form another 110 branches, 10 zonal committees and one district committee.

However, two factors hinder the party from increasing its influence on the masses and winning them over. First, it is the activity of various 'leftist' groups with their typical adventurism and high-sounding talk. Their tendency to skip indispensable stages of the revolution and make out the country's socialist objective to be almost on the order of the day certainly cannot further the revolutionary process or help the working people adopt a class stand. The second factor is the predominance of reformist ideas and currents which are all the more dangerous because our people have long been indoctrinated by reformists. It's by no means easy to convince them that reforms are no more than half-measures that can bring about no fundamental changes in the working people's condition.

And so our party's growth goes on against the background of sharp political and ideological controversies with 'leftists' and reformists, and much depends on how perseveringly and effectively we will uphold the working people's interests and democracy.

Q. What is characteristic of the revolutionary process in Costa Rica?

A. We consider that our country has the conditions needed for a peaceful revolutionary process. We draw this conclusion from the existence of several factors. Some of them are historical while others are economic or cultural. Developed democratic institutions, a major gain of the masses, can play a role of the first importance in this matter. But in pointing to this factor, we communists do not forget that Costa Rica has no safeguards against reactionary coups or fascism. We can only sleep with our eyes half-closed, so to speak, for there are more and more frequent attempts, inspired mainly by U.S. imperialism, to destabilize our political regime. The advance of the revolution along the peaceful way will decisively depend on whether we succeed in winning the majority of the people, and whether, in the event of success, we can prevent the bourgeoisie from putting up resistance and thus consolidate our victory.

At this stage, the party calls for a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. We can achieve this historic goal provided we neutralize certain sections of the bourgeoisie or compromise with them. That is why we say that the revolution will result from an alliance of the working class, poor and middle peasants, and the urban middle strata, which include a section of the bourgeoisie. As regards the United People bloc, we feel that it is a coalition still lacking solid support among the masses. Our party believes, therefore, that a broad alliance is needed that would also unite other progressive forces accepting in principle the program for national liberation, a radical agrarian reform and a further democratization of public life.

Early in this century Lenin proved the possibility and necessity of a continuous transition from a democratic to a socialist revolution (which is what subsequently occurred in Russia). We consider that this postulate of Lenin's also applies to present-day Costa Rica, for socialist transformations can also be carried out at the first stage of the revolution, as Cuba's experience suggests. Costa Rica stands out in this respect as a Latin American republic. It has nationalized the banks, railways, the electricity network, telephone and other communication services. We have an elaborate social-security system involving nearly 80 per cent of the population. The state is the principal purchaser and distributor of food products and builds the greater part of the housing. In other words, the public sector of the economy is extensive and is growing. We believe that it can become the basis for the transition to

socialist construction as the revolutionary process makes further progress. The communists are doing their utmost to win power with a minimum of violence and without bloodshed. To be sure, the circumstances may change abruptly and that would inevitably necessitate a different road and non-peaceful forms and methods of struggle.

THE OBJECTIVE PREREQUISITES OF CHANGE

Jaime Barrios
CC member, Communist Party of El Salvador

The Communist Party of El Salvador (CPS) has held its Seventh Congress in strict clandestinity. The CC Report summed up the work done by the party in the nearly nine years that had passed since the Sixth Congress (1970), dealt with the outlook for domestic political development and defined the long-term lines of our activity. The Congress adopted the new Party Rules and also 'Foundations and Theses of the General Line of the CPS.' The latter document is of extraordinary significance to El Salvador's communists and may be described as a program document. I would therefore like to dwell mainly on it.

The Theses, as I will call the document for short, divides the development of capitalism in El Salvador into periods from the standpoint of Marxist science. Capitalist relations began to develop at the turn of the 19th century, or when our country was still a colonial dependency of the Spanish Empire. The emergence of capitalism (which we call agrarian) was linked with the production and export of indigo for the textile industry of the Netherlands, Britain and other European countries going through an industrial revolution. It was on indigo plantations that the labor of semi-free peasants was used.

The second stage began in the 1850s and ended in the middle of this century. It was characterized by the rise of foreign capital in the Salvadoran economy.

As in the past, capitalist development was linked chiefly with agricultural production for export. Important social, economic and political changes occurred at that stage. The communal property of Indians and the *ejidos** were abolished, which turned large sections of the peasantry into proletarians. There appeared banks of issue and paper money and the construction began of railways, ports and the first telegraph and telephone line. National statehood was strengthened, the church was separated from the state, an army was formed, and authoritarian forms of rule were adopted. 'Socio-economic and political changes at the second stage . . .,' the Theses say 'considerably increased the internal objective prerequisites for subsequent capitalist development. But if viewed against the background of world capitalist development, these changes came relatively late; they laid no solid groundwork . . . for independent capitalist development . . . The inadequacy of internal prerequisites, on the one hand, and the entry of West European and U.S. capitalism into the monopolistic and imperialist stage of development, on the other, finalized the dependent character of "Salvadoran" capitalism.'

We date the beginning of the third stage from December 1948, when a group of army majors staged a coup. These military men expressed the interests of a section of the bourgeoisie seeking a diversification of the national economy, impeded earlier by the tyranny's conservative legislation. A new spur was given to capitalist development at that stage. The state helped industrialize the country, which involved El Salvador's joining the Central American Common Market (CACM). It encouraged the development of export branches of agriculture, speeded the electrification of the country, and set out to build a modern network of highways, telephone and telegraphic services and so on. There sprang up national monopolies that were dependent, like the state capitalist sector, on U.S. credits. The monopoly capital of the United States and other imperialist powers made deep inroads into industry and into banking. Foreign, primarily U.S., and domestic capital began to fuse and brought into being 'mixed' enterprises and other amalgamations. 'Thus, world capitalism,' the Theses say, 'ceased to be a purely external factor for the formation and development of "Salvadoran" capitalism; having "acclimated" itself, it became *at once an external and internal factor*.'

At the third stage our country was definitively included in the sphere of U.S. imperialist domination and assigned a place in the world capitalist system. This meant that while remaining an agrarian appendage and a market for European and American manufactured goods, it became a sphere of direct and indirect investment for state-monopoly and private international capital and a source of cheap labor used by multinational enterprises producing for export to the world market. At this stage the dependence of Salvadoran capitalism increased to the point of becoming irreversible.

On the basis of data on the growth and structure of the productive forces, the Theses draw the following conclusion: ' . . . El Salvador is one of the *countries with a medium level of capitalist development*. In the 1920s, Lenin classed in this category some peripheral European countries, Argentina and other countries. To be sure, now that dependence within the capitalist system is irreversible, while the scientific and technological revolution has widened the gulf between developing countries and developed capitalist countries and goes on widening it, the definition "country with a medium level of capitalist development" should not be taken to mean that there is a possibility of full development. It is used rather for comparison with more backward countries. Under the capitalist sys-

*Communal property, land owned by Indian tribes before the Spanish conquest of Cuzcatlan territory, now part of El Salvador. In colonial days, the Spanish Empire preserved this type of property alcng with others, which put a vast semi-slave work force at its disposal. The *ejidos* were lands adjoining settlements founded by Spaniards and owned by municipalities.

tem, dependent countries cannot end their "underdevelopment." '

The third stage of El Salvador's capitalist development was interrupted in 1969 by the CACM crisis. The vulnerable spot of this economic alignment was the fact that the bourgeoisie of Central American countries, which wanted to set up industries for the manufacture of items that had so far been imported, did nothing to extend the home market, for this implied carrying out structural reforms, first of all an agrarian reform, that is, altering the character of land-tenure.

There came the 'mature stage of the structural crisis of the production mode, which in the distinctive conditions of the political system existing in our country gave rise to a political crisis. The structural and political crisis, now mature, has lasted ten years and has yet to be overcome.'

'At present,' the Report to the Seventh CPS Congress pointed out, 'El Salvador is a dependent medium-developed capitalist country marked by sharp contrasts: on the one hand, there are private and state national monopolies and a financial oligarchy, and on the other, many pre-capitalist forms survive, particularly in agriculture. The country has long been under the heel of a rightist military dictatorship acquiring fascist characteristics.'

The Theses also make a deep analysis of the country's political superstructure, which has taken shape in the 48 years since the military dictatorship came to power. According to this analysis, the evolution of the dictatorship has passed through three distinct stages at which dissimilar forms and methods of rule were used.

The first stage lasted from December 2, 1931, to December 14, 1948. In that period the military dictatorship performed a counter-revolutionary function; it did all it could to guarantee the landed oligarchy full control of the economy. Its methods were authoritarian and repressive.

At the second stage an attempt was made to update the dictatorship, to give it the semblance of a representative democracy. We call this stage an 'unstable and limited democratization process.' Why 'unstable?' Because it has been broken off more than once. And why 'limited?' Because the regime has tried to block the growth of the revolutionary, popular, anti-oligarchic, anti-imperialist movement and the struggle for socialism.

The dictatorship entered the third stage of its evolution, still on, as a result of the Salvadoran-Honduran armed conflict (July 1969), which broke out when antagonisms between CACM countries sharply increased. That war added to El Salvador's economic difficulties by increasing social tensions and differences in the ruling quarters. The structural crisis reached its highest point and led to a new political crisis of the rightist military dictatorship which it has been unable to cope with so far.

The third stage is characterized by the dictatorship's complete renunciation of the policy of 'limited democracy,' by stepped-up repression, the suppression of civil freedoms and an upsurge in the people's movement.

Never since the military dictatorship took over have the popular forces desisted from their struggle. The formation of an organized popular movement quickened after the dictatorship chose limited representative democracy (1948). The movement has been gaining strength year after year, expanding its political actions. In 1971, the National Opposition Union (NOU) was formed. Between 1972 and 1977, the NOU-led struggle of the masses resulted in a marked polarization of political forces, which came out especially during elections. Using the opportunities offered by 'limited democratization,' the NOU won two presidential elections but the election returns were falsified. 'The majority of the people satisfied themselves by experience that the "elections" were a cover for the rightist military dictatorship, which was compelled to hold them under pressure from the popular movement. However, it resorted to undisguised fraud.' Against the background of this polarization of forces and the crisis of the "democratization" model there appeared numerous armed popular organizations. The Catholic church, which gave the bourgeois and landowner oligarchy and the military dictatorship above all 'ideological' support in pacifying the masses, primarily in the countryside, has sought an alliance with the working people, especially with the peasants, ever since the early 70s.

The ruling classes, the military hierarchy and imperialism were forced to set out in search of a new model of rule, such as would enable them to preserve a dependent capitalist system. They opted for a corporative (fascist) state. In Latin American conditions this is nothing but a 'dependent fascism' with its peculiarities. 'Dependent fascism,' the Theses say, 'is largely a "military fascism," a modern form of counter-revolution in Latin America and hence in our country as well.' However, the 'fascist project' is failing in El Salvador, as the CC Report to the Seventh CPS Congress notes. 'In spite of the fact that the state, above all the army, is still controlled by fascists, their attempts to devise an economic framework providing for the establishment of a corporative state are in an impasse.' The economic crisis has taken a sharp turn for the worse owing, among other things, to the massive drain of foreign and domestic capital, whose owners are alarmed by the revolutionary situation maturing in the country. The fascists cannot count on the backing of the bourgeoisie as a class, for part of it favors democratization. The people's courageous resistance and international condemnation of the terrorist government under General Romero, who came to power unlawfully in 1977, are increasing from day to day. The Catholic church is campaigning for human rights. The masses are becoming more and more active, which is seen primarily in the growing strike movement of the working class. The unity of the revolutionary movement championed by our party is well on the way to materializing.

The opposition, as well as some influential economic groups and even a section of the army,

advance an alternative to the rightist military dictatorship by calling for a new democratization. This alternative is most dangerous to the top rulers, for a new democratization at a time when structural contradictions have been aggravated to the utmost and there is an unprecedented upswing in the revolutionary movement would be inseparable from social and economic reforms for the working people's good. A new 'limited democratization' would not be enough to end the crisis. To win broad democracy in El Salvador, it is indispensable to overthrow the present regime.

It follows from the foregoing that El Salvador is experiencing two deep crises: a structural one, which is typical of dependent medium-developed countries, and a crisis of the political system. And this means that the crisis involves both the basis and the superstructure. The revolution is becoming an objective possibility and is not merely a pious wish of revolutionaries. 'In other words,' says the Theses, 'the revolution in El Salvador has entered a historic stage and will become a reality if we win the standing of a vanguard that can chart and implement a correct line and confidently lead the social forces of progress, primarily the working people, to victory.'

The Theses contain the following precise definition of the revolution in El Salvador: 'The revolution maturing in our country is socialist in substance but it must have its prologue, or beginning, in the form of an *anti-imperialist democratic revolution*. It is not a question of two revolutions but of one, socialist revolution, except that it must necessarily be accomplished under explicit anti-imperialist democratic slogans. Only in this sense may and must *the revolution maturing in our country* be described as *an anti-imperialist democratic revolution*.'

The Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of El Salvador set very difficult tasks whose fulfillment is bound to encounter numerous roadblocks. However, the party's solid political and ideological unity and clear-cut line of action provide favorable conditions in which the working class and people of El Salvador can unfold their struggle for democracy, social progress and socialism.

---

the press

Who orchestrates the Labour Party's policy?

Lewis Minkin, *The Labour Party Conference. Study in the Politics of Intra-Party Democracy.* London, Allen Lane, 1978, 426 pp.

The relationship between the annual conference of the Labour Party (attended by delegates from Constituency Labour Parties and affiliated trade unions) and the Parliamentary Labour Party[1] (consisting of members of Parliament) is one of the big issues of British politics.

Lewis Minkin's book is a meticulous examination of the processes and power relationships which mould the Labour Party Conference decisions. The author is a lecturer in government at Manchester University and has a background of activity as a trade unionist and member of the Labour Party. His book is the outcome of extensive research and is copiously documented. It is of considerable value to those interested in the British Labour movement, especially for the light it throws on the complex factors and structures which contribute to maintaining the dominance of the right-wing leadership in the Labour Party.

The crux of the problem examined by the author is, speaking in the most general terms, that the right-wing leaders of the Labour Party have always feared the potential strength of the left in the Labour Party Conference, and therefore, while striving to win support for their own policies in the Conference, have in practice increasingly ignored decisions with which they did not agree. Since the Parliamentary Labour Party has in general been to the right of the Conference, it has argued that the Parliamentary Labour Party should have the decisive voice, particularly in the election of the party's leader.

The left, on the other hand, has always argued that the Conference decisions should be binding on the leaders, including the Cabinet when a Labour government is in office. In recent years a strong movement has developed in favor of the election of the party leader by the Conference.

Written in a dispassionate style; the strength of the book is in its detailed, almost microscopic, treatment of the preparations for, and management of, the Labour Party Conference in the period 1956-1970 (first under Hugh Gaitskell's leadership and then Harold Wilson's).

Minkin examines the crisis of the Conference sovereignty when, in 1960, Hugh Gaitskell and the right wing were defeated on nuclear disarmament. Gaitskell declared then that he would 'fight and

fight and fight again' against the Conference decision on unilateral nuclear disarmament.[2] The repercussions of his defiance strengthened those who argued that the Parliamentary Labour Party should be independent of the Conference.

The tensions between the Labour government and the Conference persisted during the period of Harold Wilson's leadership. Commenting on Wilson's interventions in the 1966 Conference, Minkin writes: 'It was clearly a matter of rejecting the authority of the party over the policy of the Labour government' (p. 295). Continuing his analysis of the government and Conference relations, he says: 'The Wilson governments suffered an increasing range of defeats which came to a peak in 1968. No Labour government . . . had been so extensively rebuffed by its own party Conference. It was not just the range of reverses. It was the depth of opposition. In 1968, on prescription charges, not a hand could be seen raised in support of government policy, and on incomes policy legislation[3] the majority of five to one indicated the depth of trade union hostility. The government's public response to these defeats served only to exacerbate the situation. There was not the slightest verbal concession to the authority of the Conference. It was not surprising therefore that rank-and-file activists became increasingly dismayed at what appeared to be "élitist members of Parliament" treating Conference decisions with "cynicism" ' (p. 297).

Minkin contests the view that effective political power in the hands of the Parliamentary leadership is now a permanent and immutable feature of the Labour Party. He argues, and communists would agree with him, that such a view does not take into account the complex character of the Labour Party, containing, as it does, forces which can assert the authority of the Conference. Here he refers to the key positions of the trade unions and to the fact that the Conference elects the National Executive Committee, the composition of which has been changing in a leftward direction and can change further.

Having established the feature of the Labour Party, which makes it unique among social democratic parties in Western Europe, namely its trade union base, in which the affiliations of the unions provide the dominating voting force, he treats the relationship of the trade unions to the leadership of the party, starting with the situation of the postwar majority government of Attlee.

'But gratitude felt toward a government seen as fulfilling labor's great social ambitions,[4] a cold war fever which saw all left-wing opposition as an aid to the success of Soviet communism, and shared perceptions of the limits of socialist advance,[5] all contributed to a tight alliance between major ministerial figures and major trade union leaders, who, from 1949, organized and coordinated every major vote at the Conference. . . . This hard core of trade union leaders provided a unique element in the party's history — a "praetorian guard," setting their faces against any advance of the left, real or imaginary' (pp. 24-25).

While there were strong opponents from the left in a number of unions, including the engineers, the party leaders could count on the bloc vote of six big unions and invariably won the majority of votes.[6]

What then broke the 'tight alliance' between the party leaders and the leaders of the trade unions, whose votes were swung behind right-wing policies? Minkin traces changes in the voting patterns of the various unions and in particular the political changes in the Transport and General Workers Union under the leadership of Frank Cousins.[7] Combating the idea that the change in that union was solely due to the personality and views of Frank Cousins, Minkin points out that the 'springboard of change had more than a personal base' (p. 94). He refers to the militant sections within the union and the left base that had been established in the period before the ban on communists holding office had been imposed by Arthur Deakin.[8] (Though he omits any reference to the strengthening effect for the left when this ban was lifted during Cousins' leadership).

In his conclusions Minkin makes an assessment of the shift in the Conference and the National Executive Committee in the 70s. He notes a shift to the left at the annual Labour Conferences, though he makes a reservation that 'it is easy to overlook the forces which restrained and inhibited the shift' (p. 344). As for the National Executive Committee, Minkin writes: '. . . the policy-making initiative on the NEC shifted to the left. . . . Left-wing candidates slowly increased their strength on the NEC to a point where in October 1974 they were marginally the strongest force. By January 1975 the chairmanship of the two major policy sub-committees was taken by Ian Mikardo (international policy), a hardy annual of the Parliamentary left, and by Antony Wedgwood Benn (home policy), a senior parliamentarian whose socialism had moved so far to the left after the 1970 election that he rapidly became publicly identified as the spearhead of left-wing policy making' (p. 336).

Minkin is well aware of the fact that the new alignment of forces is fluid and that everything has not been in an ascending left direction, for he brings out the complexities and the factors which impede advance.

There is, however, a major weakness. The author's vision is so concentrated on the internal processes that the impact of movements and struggles on policy does not emerge as an integral element in the decision-making process; although there is a reference to the influence of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the powerful opposition to proposed government legislation on wages by the trade union movement.

He does not address himself also to the problem of developing the unity of the left. For this is central to making further changes in the balance of forces both inside the Conference and in the Parliamentary Labour Party, thus helping to bring about far-reaching consequences in the policies pursued by Labour governments. It is a problem which stretches beyond the walls of conferences and the Houses of Parliament. It is bound up with struggles

in work places, in all the organizations of the labor movement, and with the strengthening of the Communist Party as an indispensable force in the movement for social change.

Betty Matthews

1. This faction traditionally elected the party's leader from among its membership. — *Ed.*

2. The national Labour Party Conference under enormous public pressure passed a resolution recommending to the future Labour government a policy of nuclear disarmament. This resolution was opposed by the then Labour parliamentary leader Hugh Gaitskell. — *Ed.*

3. The Prices and Incomes Act, which had been prepared by the Wilson goyernment and came into force in July 1968, provided for a further wage and salary freeze. — *Ed.*

4. At the time when democratic sentiments and sympathies to socialist ideas were spreading after the victories over fascism and reaction, the Attlee government, which had come to power in 1945, was compelled to fulfill its pre-election promises to nationalize some of the industries and reorganize social insurance and health services, which was a major gain of the British working people. — *Ed.*

5. Meaning a 'socialist way of development' as understood by the Labour (i.e., social-reformist) Party. — *Ed.*

6. Every trade union delegation at the Labour Party Conference has a number of votes equal to the number of union members for whom dues are paid to the party. The six largest unions which supported the party leadership in 1948 had a voting strength of 3,029,000 out of a total trade union vote of 4,407,000. — *Ed.*

7. Frank Cousins was the union's General Secretary from 1956 to 1964 and from 1966 to 1969. — *Ed.*

8. On December 21, 1947, Labour Party Secretary Morgan Philipps sent to the trade unions a circular on behalf of the Executive Committee, which demanded that union leaders should expel communists from all trade union posts and that Labour Party and trade union members should refrain from any contact with communists. Arthur Deakin, who at that time was General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union (until Cousins was elected to that post in 1956), was one of the most diehard right-wing union leaders who made up the above-mentioned 'praetorian guard.' — *Ed.*

Zionism: substance and practices

Ideologiya i praktika mezhdunarodnogo sionizma (Ideology and Practices of International Zionism), Moscow, Politizdat, 1978, 271 pp.

Written by a team of Soviet philosophers, jurists, and historians (edited by Academician M.B. Mitin and others), this book offers a critical analysis of Zionism's ideological concepts, bares its reactionary roots and class nature, shows its close ties with the imperialist financial-industrial oligarchy and exposes its activities on the international scene.

The founders of scientific communism were the first to bring the substance of Jewish nationalism to light. We are given a close insight into their views on the so-called Jewish question, which is widely used for mercenary purposes by proponents of the apolitical religious dogmas of Judaism. In a polemic with Bruno Bauer, who published a series of papers in connection with the discussion of the problem of the 'emancipation of Jewry' in the 1840s, Marx noted in an article headed 'On the Jewish Question,' in which he used the example of the bourgeois Germany of his day, that the Jewish community sought separation because it was '*in religious* opposition to the dominant religion.'[1] He wrote that the Jew counterposed 'his imaginary nationality to the real nationality . . . seeing himself as a member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the chosen people.'[2]

In his analysis of Judaism, Marx wrote that the foundation of the Jewish religion was: 'Practical need, egoism . . . *The god of practical need and self-interest* is *money* . . . The *chimerical* nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the merchant, of the man of money in general.'[3] All this found fertile soil precisely in bourgeois society.

The authors show that, as the ideas of scientific socialism spread and the Jewish proletariat joined the working-class movement, this in many cases 'separated them from Judaism and directed them toward the only possible solution of the so-called Jewish question and all the other social ulcers of bourgeois society, in other words, toward the road of revolutionary struggle' (p. 21). Moreover, with the development of science generally, religious dogmas lost their strength and 'Judaism . . . began to lose its influence rapidly' (ibid). The Jewish bourgeoisie felt the need to reform and renew its ideology that was based on the idea that the Jewish people had a 'special mission.' This was what gave birth to Zionism at the close of the 19th century.

Appearing at a time when the abolition of the capitalist system as such had been placed on the agenda of history, Zionism endeavors to adapt Judaism to the requirements and objectives of the big bourgeoisie, consolidate the Jewish social lower strata on the basis of the illusory idea that the Jews are a 'chosen people,' and give credibility to the idea of a 'global Jewish nation.'

The authors note that following its emergence in the bourgeois society of Western Europe, Zionism soon turned its attention to tsarist Russia 'where medieval restrictions were still in force for the followers of Judaism and the rabbinate was still strong in the Jewish communities' (pp. 21-22). In all but name the Zionists acted hand in glove with the autocracy when they strove to separate the Jewish lower classes from the working-class movement and prevent their participation in the revolutionary struggle. In Russia the Bund (a petty-bourgeois, nationalistic organization consisting mainly of Jewish craftsmen) was a convenient vehicle for the dissemination of Zionist ideas. Lenin categorically denounced Zionist leanings of the Bund, exposing its national-chauvinist program demands for national cultural autonomy.

In the broad sense of the word, as the book shows, present-day Zionism is seen as the chauvinistic ideology and reactionary practice of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, of the Jewish financial-industrial oligarchy. In the narrow sense, it is the official ideology and policy guideline of Israel's ruling circles. The cornerstone of this ideology is the widely publicized concept of a 'global Jewish nation.' Taking Marxism-Leninism's propositions on the national question as their point of departure and making a searching analysis of this concept, the authors prove its total untenability. 'History has made it abundantly clear,' the authors write, quoting *Al-Ittihad*, the newspaper of the Israeli communists, 'that from the national angle the Jewish communities in the different countries are part of the nations in which they live. They have been integrated entirely with these nations economically and politically' (p. 41).

A word on the Zionist assertions about a separate 'Jewish race.' Anthropological and other studies have confirmed that the Jews are not a separate race. One cannot speak of racial homogeneity even in Israel, although an Israeli nation is being shaped there.

When researchers analyze Zionist ideology and practice they justifiably consider the substance and purpose of anti-Semitism, for the expounders of Zionism constantly maintain that Zionism is nothing more than a response to anti-Semitism. Marxist-Leninist science has proved, the authors note, that anti-Semitism 'is an element of the class struggle in exploiting society at its capitalist stage' (p. 54). In his article 'Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an "Independent Party"?', Lenin noted the link 'that undoubtedly exists between anti-Semitism and the interests of the bourgeois, and not of the working-class sections of the population' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 333-34). He enunciated the working-class party's negative attitude to both Zionism and anti-Semitism because both trends are deeply hostile to the proletariat, to the interests of all working people, and are aimed at undermining the internationalist unity of the workers of all countries. A study of the original documents written by Zionist chieftains, who at the time did not intend to make them public, helps to establish the fact that Zionist ideology regarded anti-Semitism as 'useful to Jewish individuality' (p. 59). As early as 1905, Zhabotinsky, a Zionist ideologue who knew what he was talking about, declared that 'as a motivation for Zionist agitation, anti-Semitism, especially where it is "made a principle," is extremely convenient and useful' (p. 60). The authors recall that the Zionists 'cooperated with the anti-Semites in the tsarist secret service,' with the Russian whiteguards, and with the nazi and fascist stormtroopers in Germany and Italy (pp. 64-65).

The claim that Zionism is a socialist movement is convincingly shown as absurd; Zionism is a social-reformist movement, and this has been repeatedly noted in Marxist literature, in particular by spokesmen of the Communist Party of Israel (pp. 69-70). An instrument of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, Zionism is 'rabidly hostile to the working people of all nationalities, of all countries, including Israel' (p. 238).

This book exposes Zionism's ideological subversion against socialism. Through the mass media in the capitalist world, which it can use or which it controls, international Zionism viciously attacks the socialist-community states, chiefly the Soviet Union. The statistics given in the book indicate that Zionist centers influence roughly 80 per cent of the U.S. and West European news agencies, which bring out more than a thousand periodicals. Moreover, the Zionists use many radio stations in Israel, the USA, and Western Europe (p. 97). Some 20 international Zionist organizations (p. 103) engage in undisguised brainwashing of the Jewish communities in socialist countries with a certain measure of success. Their hypocritical appeals for 'reunification' in the 'promised land' and their chauvinistic slogans about an 'integral Jewish state' are, as L. Shapiro, First Secretary of the Jewish Regional Committee of the CPSU, wrote, least of all concerned with the destiny of Jews.[4] The book gives an account of the operations of the Zionist centers, of their close links to the secret services of Israel, the USA, and other capitalist countries. The subversive role of international Zionism was seen, for instance, during the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968-1969.

Considerable attention is given in the book to the Middle East problem and, in this connection, to the actions of Israel's Zionist rulers, who, in collusion with imperialism, come forward as the enemies of world peace and security. The wars unleashed by them against Arab countries have demonstrated the aggressiveness of the two reactionary forces. The book quotes statements by Zionist leaders about their intention to launch aggressions in order to create a 'Greater Israel' extending from the Nile to the Euphrates. The authors show that through Jewish immigration the Zionists are seeking to change the demographic situation on the territory of what used to be Palestine.

The authors' analysis of Zionism's policy of aggrandizement in the Middle East leaves no doubt about its racist character, and reaffirms that in October 1975 the UN General Assembly's Third Committee was justified in adopting a resolution declaring that Zionism 'is a form of racism and racial discrimination' (p. 51). This is seen distinctly, among other things, in the Zionists' attitude to the Arab people of Palestine, whose existence they do not recognize. Innumerable facts are cited in the book about the organized terror against the Palestinian Arabs and the seizure of their land. In 1954, as a result of this terror, more than one-third of the Jewish population of Israel was living on a territory from which Arabs had been expelled. Over 30 per cent of the new Jewish immigrants were settled in urban areas formerly inhabited by Arabs. All Arabs have been expelled from Jaffa, Haifa, Akra, Lydia, Beisan and Majdal, while the number of Arabs living in many other populated areas has diminished drastically. Some 10,000 shops, enterprises, and other businesses have been confiscated from the

Arabs. At the close of 1967 a total of 1,700,000 Arabs were exiled. Subsequent years brought the Arab people of Palestine further hardship.

The authors give irrefutable facts of violations of elementary norms of international law by the Zionists. This is seen, for instance, in their unabashed interference in the affairs of socialist countries on the pretext of 'defending' Jews, or in other words, their demonstrative non-recognition of jurisdiction over these Jews by the countries in which they live. Evidence is given of other subversive actions by the Zionists on the world scene and of their influence in the Socialist International. The authors name various organizations that form a ramified network operating in individual countries and on an international scale.

In conclusion it must be noted that this exposure of Zionism's reactionary character and subversive activities will unquestionably be received with interest by the world community and especially by the progressive forces in the forefront of the struggle against Zionism.

Salem Khalil

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1975, p. 147.
2. Ibid., p. 147.
3. Ibid., p. 172.
4. *Kommunist*, No. 10, 1979, p. 35.

Facts and fairy tales

The prices of gasoline and some other goods have been increased in some East European countries. The fairly typical press comment here is: 'Socialism is not immune to economic crises either.' Is that not so? *Harold Fillow* (Great Britain)

Those who like Mr. Fillow have read only the comments in the bourgeois press in the West would apparently benefit from learning about the assessments and explanations given to the price increases by the mass media in the socialist countries.

Replying to citizens' questions on Hungarian TV, Minister of Finance Lajos Faluvegi said the chief reason for the measures taken by the state was the growth of world prices for raw materials, oil in the first place.

The Czechoslovak newspaper *Rude Pravo* also says that the price increases were largely caused by *external economic factors*, and explained that the world prices of raw and other materials, fuel and power have been growing much faster than had been expected. It recalled that domestic sources could not meet the growing requirements, so the country has to import energy and raw materials. Although Czechoslovakia obtains the bulk of these within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance on much more advantageous terms than those available on the world market, prices have still been going up.

Another objective factor behind the higher price of some foodstuffs (like wheat), according to the press in Hungary and Yugoslavia, for instance, is the unfavorable weather. Over the past several years, the cereal crop has been below expectations. This has led to larger imports of cereals, the prices of which have also gone up in the past few years.

The socialist economy is not an island. The socialist countries have always advocated extensive development of international mutually advantageous trade and economic ties. Precisely because of this policy, from 1971 to 1977, trade between the CMEA countries and the industrialized capitalist countries went up, in current prices, roughly 3.4-fold, to 43.7 billion roubles. It is quite clear that with the present world outlook the growth in the prices of oil, raw materials and manufactures necessarily has an effect on the socialist countries' foreign-trade balance. Take Hungary, where 27 per cent of the GNP is realized through foreign trade, a third of which is with Western countries. In view of the fact that in 1974 alone, the prices of the manufactures imported by Hungary from the capitalist countries went up by 40 per cent, one will easily see that this has created grave difficulties for Hungary. One-third of Czechoslovakia's material production is also oriented upon foreign trade.

One could ask this question: were not these difficulties produced by the fact that these countries' imports tend to exceed their exports, which is known to worsen the balance of payments? No, the exports of both Hungary and Czechoslovakia have not been growing to a lesser extent than imports, *Rude Pravo* said: 'But in that case, it is not a matter of quantity, but of the financial effect which is lower than that required to cover our import needs.'[1]

Of course, the socialist countries do reckon with the fact that the complication of the world economic outlook, especially the current energy crisis, tends to create various problems. In particular, this applies to maintaining the attained high level of consumption of oil and oil products and ensuring a steady growth of power capacities.

One must specially emphasize that the blame for the energy crisis, now that we have mentioned it, falls on the plunderous imperialist policy pursued by the multinational oil monopolies, which have been robbing the oil-exporting countries for years. Many commentators in the capitalist and the socialist countries, analyzing the causes of the current energy crisis, reach the same conclusion that it has been largely and artificially caused by the oil monopolies. According to the International Energy Agency, whose members are 20 oil-consuming countries, this year the demand for oil and oil products has run at only 4-5 per cent above supply. 'There is no doubt,' one Soviet commentator wrote in this context, 'that the world extraction of oil now makes it possible to meet the available demand. It is another matter that between the oil-producing countries and the buyers of liquid fuel there are

middlemen in the form of the oil monopolies, — typical transnational corporations that will use any difficulties in the energy field to spiral prices and obtain additional profits. They are chiefly to blame for the flare-ups of the "petrol famine," the shortages of fuel and the nervousness among the public.'[2]

Summing up what has been said, one will easily see that the measures to adjust prices in the socialist countries were dictated by the impact of the external market.

The press in the East European socialist countries, commenting on the increase in prices for some manufactures, has also listed a number of *internal economic* causes.

The socialist states have to take into account the objective economic laws and in accordance with them make various correctives in their economic activity to ensure continued economic growth and rising living standards for the working people. It would be absurd to assume that in the socialist economy no use is made, say, of the price mechanism to stimulate its development, and that prices are established once and for all. The range, quantity and quality of goods have changed, and this causes changes in prices. The use of the price mechanism makes it possible swiftly to respond to changes in the outlook, to guide consumption and give it a social orientation. But in the socialist countries the function of adjusting this mechanism is undertaken by the state, which does not leave the price formation process to the play of the elements as this is done under capitalism. It is this policy that explains the adjustment of the correlation between retail prices and wages made by the other socialist countries. Besides, the Hungarian *Nepszabadsag* wrote, the further adjustment of the price system in Hungary, including the retail price system, is an organic part of the program aimed to enhance the efficiency of the whole Hungarian economy. The paper noted that the price system which had existed in Hungary no longer met modern demands. It gave the following example: the price of electricity in Hungary had not changed in 15 years.[3] In Czechoslovakia, *Rude Pravo* recalled, the prices of fuel and energy remained virtually unchanged since 1953. But while the correlation between wages and prices in that period had been justified, the paper explained, after wages had more than doubled, the old price of fuel no longer induced its economical use.[4]

This was also emphasized by Hungary's Minister of Labor Fereno Trethon in the above-mentioned broadcast on Hungarian television. He drew attention to the fact that, because of the obsolete price system, consumption in Hungary was not always rational, and was sometimes even wasteful.

The newspapers, radio and TV in the socialist countries of Europe stress the need for an assiduous and solicitous attitude to the property of the people, on the one hand, and the need to enhance efficiency and labor productivity, on the other. The growth in our living standards depends on the growth of production and labor productivity, *Rude Pravo* writes, emphasizing that 'we can live only as we work.'[5]

The bourgeois press, in its biased commentaries on the price increases in the socialist countries of Europe, has said nothing about two important facts.

First, over a long period prices in these countries have been mainly stable (whereas in the capitalist countries they have been growing from year to year). Second, while increasing prices, the state simultaneously provides compensation measures with respect to the incomes of the population. Take Czechoslovakia. Why were the prices of children's goods raised in that country? This was done, in particular, because these prices were much lower than those in most of the other European countries, so that 30 per cent of the children's goods was being bought up by foreign tourists. The state was forced to raise these prices, but at the same time, to safeguard the interests of its own citizens, it increased the allowances for children.

The press in the socialist countries emphasized that the price increases, which according to the Hungarian *Magyar Nemzet*, have naturally not made 'anyone dance for joy,' do not modify the overall tendency of rising living standards. In this connection, *Nepszabadsag* noted that the steady rise in living standards in a basic feature of the socialist system.[6] Although, of course, over a definite period of time this rise will be slower than was initially envisaged in the current economic development plans.

Mr. Fillow says that the price increases in the socialist countries were seen by commentators in his country as an expression of economic crisis. Let us recall, then, the typical features of an economic crisis. There is a sharp drop in production, enterprises are closed, there are mass redundancies, which swell the permanent pool of the unemployed, there are bankruptcies, and there is a marked decline in the working people's living standards. (These are only the main features). Have any of these been in evidence in the socialist countries? No, on the contrary, the statistics indicate that their planned economy has on the whole been developing alon a steady upgrade. Thus, from 1951 to 1978, national income and industrial output in the CMEA countries grew three times as fast as they did in the developed capitalist countries. But the figures do not tell the whole story. In some capitalist countries the rate was even higher in periods of boom. But that is the whole point: only in boom periods! An organic defect of capitalism is that it cannot maintain the rate it has attained: it is boom today, and bust tomorrow. But in the 1970s, there have been virtually no booms in the capitalist countries. The crisis has become chronic. In the socialist countries, economic development is stable.

That is why those who have announced some kind of economic crisis in the socialist countries are juggling the cards, to put it mildly. *A.I.*

1. *Rude Pravo*, July 23, 1979.
2. See *Pravda*, August 18, 1979.
3. See *Nepszabadsag*, July 24, 1979.
4. See *Rude Pravo*, July 23, 1979.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Nepszabadsag*, July 24, 1979.

New books

Zapadnaya Evropa v sovremennom mire (Western Europe in the World Today), in two volumes, Moscow (Mysl Publishers); Berlin (Dietz Verlag), 1979; Vol. 1, 364 pp.; Vol. 2, 317 pp.

This large work, an example of successful cooperation between scientists of socialist countries, has been written jointly by Soviet and GDR scholars and is devoted to Western Europe, one of the three main centers of inter-imperialist rivalry. The first volume presents a study of the formation of this center, the relationships and contradictions between the West European states, the region's socio-economic problems, and the specific features of the class struggle. The second volume deals with the economic and political relations of the West European states with the USA and Japan, with other capitalist countries, and with developing nations. It gives an analysis of various aspects of neo-colonialism. The development of relations between Western Europe and socialist countries is studied in considerable detail.

Giulio Carlo Argan, *Un' Idea di Roma* (Thoughts of Rome), Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1979, 160 pp.

In this book an intellectual discusses the acute problems that he encountered in his capacity as mayor of Rome, particularly the dismal state of housing, transport, communal services, finances and unemployment. He writes of the need for improving Rome's economy and the general situation in the city, noting that the city owes its problems to the 30-year administration by the Christian Democrats.

Paul Bourgues *Les salaires sont-ils responsables de l'inflation?* (Are Wages at the Back of the Inflation?), Paris, Editions sociales, 1978, 182 pp.

This study of the various theories spread by the monopolies, bourgeois media and the reformists to the effect that the inflation now gripping the capitalist world was triggered by the allegedly excessive demands of the working people for higher pay is based on the extensive experience of the trade union movement and offers indisputable scientific arguments giving the lie to this conclusion. Bourgues shows that there is only one objective of these theories, namely to justify the austerity policy pursued at the expense of the people, by cutting expenditures on social requirements.

N.A. Petrovichev, *Vazhniy faktor vozrastaniya rukovodyaschey roli KPSS* (An Important Factor of the Growth of the CPSU's Leading Role), Moscow, Politizdat, 1979, 159 pp.

Petrovichev shows the inter-relationship and interdependence of the CPSU's growing role as an objective law of the party's development with the effectiveness of its organizational work as a major subjective factor determining this process. Petrovichev gives a comprehensive picture of the role and policy of the new type of workers' party, the Communist Party, in social development and writes of the sources of its strength and prestige, its links with the people, its numerical growth and organizational structure, the activity and initiatives of the communists, and the style and methods of administering the economic and cultural life of a developed socialist society, and of state and public organizations. He underscores the internationalist character of the CPSU, which is a contingent of the world communist movement.

Prawa czlowieka w systemie kapitalistycznym (Human Rights Under Capitalism), Warsaw, Kziazka i Wiedza, 1979, 215 pp.

On the basis of international documents on human rights and also the constitutions of some capitalist countries and the admissions of bourgeois periodicals, the authors show that in the capitalist world human rights are both limited and nominal. They cite facts about violations of even these truncated rights recorded in laws, which provide no guarantees for their full implementation.

N.K. Sarkar, *Social Structure and Development Strategy in Asia,* New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1978, 298 pp.

Sarkar brings out the reasons for the slowing down of the relatively rapid development of the Asian nations that have won independence since the Second World War, and refutes the specious arguments of bourgeois economists that this is due to a cutback of imports, increased production, and protectionism. Noting that in these countries the main obstacles to growth are social differentiation and inequality springing from the capitalist mode of production, he offers the conclusion that real progress is possible along the road of socialist development.

B. Sumyaa, *Feodalyn azh torokh yosnoos sotsialist azh torokh yosond* (From Feudalism to Socialism), Ulan Bator, Ulsyn hevlel, 1979, 135 pp.

Mongolia moved all the way from medieval feudalism to living socialism in the lifetime of a single generation. The author generalizes this experience and draws attention to fundamental changes in the life of the Mongolian people. He shows how the People's Revolution in 1921, accomplishes under the impact of the ideas of the Great October Revolution in Russia, made a start on the transformations in Mongolia and led to the creation of the conditions for shaping the socialist way of life.

Periodicals from the USSR

- ☐ SOVIET UNION (English, French, Spanish or German) Pictorial Monthly. Photo-series on Soviet life. / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SPORT IN THE USSR (English, French, Spanish, German) Photos, drawings, diagrams in monthly edition, highlighting sports world in the Soviet Union, systems of training, records etc. / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SOVIET LITERATURE (English, Spanish or German) Contemporary Soviet authors, literary criticism. / **$9.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SOVIET WOMAN (English, Spanish or German) Illustrated monthly about the life and work of Soviet women. / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ CULTURE AND LIFE (English, French, Spanish) Illustrated monthly, with news of Soviet theatre, music, art, film, sports. / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ TRAVEL TO THE USSR (English, French) Illustrated bi-monthly on tourist attractions in the USSR. / **$5.00** a year / (6 issues)
- ☐ INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (English or French) Monthly journal on world economic and political affairs. / **$9.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SPUTNIK (English, French) Monthly pocket-size digest of the best articles, photo-series, etc. from the Soviet press. / **$7.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ FOREIGN TRADE (English, French) Information on trade and economic relations of the Soviet Union and other countries / **$18.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SOCIALISM, THEORY AND PRACTICE (English, French, Spanish) A digest of the political and theoretical press / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ FAR EASTERN AFFAIRS (English, Russian, Japanese) Deals with contemporary problems of the countries and peoples of the Far East and South-East Asia. / **$9.00** a year / (4 issues)
- ☐ UKRAINE (English) Illustrated. / **$3.00** a year / (4 issues)
- ☐ NEW TIMES (English, French, Spanish) Weekly analysis of world affairs. Carries supplements with government documents. Airmail direct. / **$7.00** a year / (52 issues)
- ☐ SOVIET FILM (English, French, Spanish) Illustrated monthly. Features about Soviet and foreign films, actors, producers. / **$6.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ SOVIET MILITARY REVIEW (English, French, Spanish) Illustrated military-political monthly. / **$12.00** a year / (12 issues)
- ☐ MOSCOW NEWS (English, French) Weekly tabloid. Free supplements. Airmailed. / **$7.00** a year / (52 issues)
- ☐ NEWS FROM THE UKRAINE (English) Weekly tabloid. / **$6.00** a year / (52 issues)
- ☐ SOCIAL SCIENCES (English, French, Spanish) Quarterly. Philosophy, history, politics, law, sociology, psychology, and archeology. / **$9.00** a year.
- ☐ ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY (English, French) / **$6.00** / (6 issues)

Progress Subscription Service

71 BATHURST ST., 3rd FLOOR, TORONTO, ONT. M5V 2P6

20% Off for New Readers Only

OFFER EXPIRES DEC. 31, 1979

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

Prov .....Code .....

Cheque enclosed for $ .....

I would like to make a gift subscription

of the following magazine .....

..... to;

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

Prov .....Code .....

Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

World Marxist Review

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England

Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada

Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon

New Horizon Publications,
14 Tamakloe/Kelani Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban

Al-Thakafah Al-Jadidah,
Al-Saadoon Street,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Baghdad, Iraq

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckách, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

FLEMISH EDITION: Inatituut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrief
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR

Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
Menandru 66, Athens, Greece

People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hirlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, Fö u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya,
Punjabi and Tamil

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia

Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR

Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador

Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama

Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantaclaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlart, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'o xuât nhâp,
kháu sách bào 32, Hai Bà Tru'ng,
Há-Nôi, Vietnam