

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

August 1981, Volume 24, Number 8 \$1.00



Alliances / 1

**Central
America / 57**

**'Re-industrialization'
in the USA / 50**

**The national & the
international / 30**

Nicaragua / 60

Vietnam / 53



WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

August 1981, Vol. 24, No. 8

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 Cyprus: concerning international and national 'supra-class' alliances
E. Papaioannou
- 7 Hungary: the question of interests under socialist democracy
V. Benke
- 14 Emergence of a new type of civilization
R. Richta
- 20 Malta: an unsinkable aircraft carrier? No, a ship of peace
A. Vassallo

The party

- 24 FRG: freedom of opinion illusions blasted
G. Deumlich
- 28 Fighting in the forefront against the nuclear threat

Exchange of views

- 30 The international and the national in the working-class movement
International theoretical conference
- 50 USA: who benefits by 're-industrialization'?
S. Shaw

Viewpoints

- 53 Vietnam: the constitution of a victorious people
Truong Chinh
- 57 Why has the situation in Central America sharpened?
- 60 Nicaragua: defending the revolution
A. Sukhostat

Facts and figures

- 68 Freedom for the people of South Africa
E. Pahad
- 69 Terrorism elevated to official policy
F. Mougahid
- 71 Peking's territorial claims
S. Maung
- 73 Neofascism: a real threat
S. Ullrich
- 76 Stop massive dismissals in the Sudan
A. Salem
- 77 The present through the prism of history

Book reviews

- 77 Despite 'refutations' of Marxism
M. Matous
- 79 In defense of the April advances
D. Lopes



Concerning international and national "supra-class" alliances

Ezekias Papaioannou,
General Secretary, Progressive Party of the
Working People of Cyprus (AKEL)

Large-scale problems which affect all nations and agitate the whole of mankind have emerged and are being exacerbated in the present epoch. These are above all problems caused by the arms race and the growth of international tension, something that increases the terrible danger of war. Then there are the demands which spring from mankind's social heterogeneity, the differences in social system and levels of economic development, that is, the demand for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, a new international economic order, etc. Finally, there are the general democratic tasks (removal of fascist regimes, racism and apartheid) and the contradictions emerging in man's relations with nature (pollution of the environment, the danger of depletion of energy and raw material resources).

All the classes and social strata, parties and social movements now have to take a stand on such global problems. An identical political stand on concrete issues is frequently taken by people with a different class status and differing views: communists and bourgeois democrats, internationalists and progressive nationalists, atheists and believers, that is, members of diverse political and ideological trends.

That is an important trend of our day which creates an objective basis for joint action and cooperation between various political forces, which the communists believe to be a necessary condition for success in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress. A call for such cooperation is contained in the Final Document of the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe.* This fundamental line was most emphatically stressed at the congresses of several fraternal parties. At the 26th congress of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev declared: "We will actively support all steps useful to peace and democracy. In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with social democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all the dem-

ocratic and peace-loving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace."

The importance of such joint action is recognized in many political circles, but there is a difference of views on the conditions on which such action should be carried forward. AKEL, like other fraternal parties, is prepared to cooperate with all the democratic, progressive movements, while retaining its class stand and without foregoing the principles of Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the experience of revolutionary practice.

Summing up our experience of participation in broad democratic movements, we take account of the fact that it has significance not only for our own country. Of course, AKEL is a small party compared with those whose membership runs to hundreds of thousands and even millions. But compared with the total population of Cyprus or with other national political organizations, one will easily realize that it is a large and influential party. That is why other countries would also benefit from the lessons of our experience and an analysis of the sources of our successes.

One of these important lessons is that the communists' approach to the terms for cooperation does not always meet with understanding. Many anti-imperialists are under the influence of the bourgeois reformist ideology, whose adherents spread mistrust for the goals and tasks we set ourselves when taking part in joint action. And this naturally requires of us greater activity in the ideological struggle and skill in explaining to the masses our notions of the ways along which various forces come to hammer out identical positions and become aware of their common interests. It is also important to give timely rebuffs to the distortions or mistaken interpretations of the communists' views of the social meaning of joint action, of their possibility and historical limits.

The bourgeois reformist falsifiers' main assertion is that we want our allies to abandon their own and to adopt our programmatic goals. Marxism-Leninism is frequently presented as "class reductionism," as over-simplification

*WMR, August 1976, p. 1.

mechanically reducing complicated and multifaceted social phenomena, processes and problems to the antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Under the cover of such "explanations" bourgeois propaganda puts the "red" label on people or forces who are involved in the anti-imperialist struggle but whose goals and convictions are nowhere close to those of the proletarian party.

One cannot say that the massive propaganda campaign being conducted in this spirit has had no effect. Within the framework of joint action by the national-patriotic forces of Cyprus, some people, even those sympathizing with the communists, believe that our political methodology allegedly puts too much emphasis on class factors, that it is unwarranted on our part to seek to involve the popular forces within the orbit of the class choice: a stand for the interests of the proletariat, of the world revolutionary movement and of existing socialism. Now and again, one also comes across open attacks on AKEL's consistent stand and attempts to make us abandon our principles, to "fit" into the bourgeois political system, and to become an organ for subordinating the working class to national and international capital.

In standing up for proletarian interests and goals and striving to secure support for these on the part of the working class and broad strata of other working people, we do not seek to impose our choice on anyone. The basis of this stand is provided by the intricate dialectics of class alliances, agreements and joint action expressive of the interests of the whole people, the dialectics explained by Marxism-Leninism.

When speaking of the class choice, the communists have above all in mind the elaboration by the parties of a political platform on the various issues. Its concrete character makes it possible to show what the various forces stand for. But that is only one aspect of the choice. Its second aspect is clarification of one's place in the pattern of social and political forces: together with whom and against whom, with which allies and against which chief enemy. The experience of joint action gained by AKEL and also by many other fraternal parties shows that this is the only acceptable approach to political blocs ensuring equality of the sides.

At the same time, we must emphasize that the standpoint of the parties cooperating with us on one issue may not coincide with our views on other problems. The advocates of the national sovereignty of Cyprus, for instance, do not necessarily have to be democrats, while the champions of democracy do not always have socialist goals. That is something we reckon with. So the concrete character of cooperation

is expressed in the fact that, while acting together with the communists on this or that issue, some anti-imperialists, because of the limitations of their political notions, may be hostile to us or, at best, neutral, on other issues. The peace champion chooses his ally in the world class conflict only on the issues of peace, and does so in the light of his own interests above all, without accepting the standpoint of the other class on this issue.

But is that an impediment to cooperation? Of course not. The objective basis for the political alliances and coalitions between communists and democratic forces is their common anti-imperialist approach on the issues providing the field for their cooperation. From the standpoint of fulfilling the task which is of common interest, the limited nature of the anti-imperialism of the non-proletarian parties and movements and differences on other issues are unessential. Now and again it is, of course, hard to overcome some ingrained bias against one's partners. But the communists constantly demonstrate good will and readiness to reach mutual understanding. This will be seen from the experience of popular fronts and mass movements in various countries.

Today, the contradiction between anti-imperialism and imperialism is the main factor in the political demarcation of the world forces. The stratification of parties and movements on this line, far from fully coinciding with the class division, in effect appears as society's division into democratic and opposed reactionary forces. Whichever of the diverse problems agitating broad social circles in our day one considers — be it the problem of peace, national liberation, democracy and social progress, to say nothing of transition to socialism — everywhere their positive solution runs up above all against resistance from imperialist reaction.

But the anti-imperialism of democrats in their approach to the particular issues is not always consistent. Does this close the opportunities for cooperation with them? We believe that the important thing here is to reckon with the line of evolution: after all, it may be either a movement from neutrality to active struggle, or a loss of earlier held, more resolute positions. In this context, there is a need to draw a clearcut distinction between the embryonic anti-imperialism of some and the inconsistent anti-imperialism of others. We support the steps which help to deepen the anti-imperialist tenor of the movement and to involve in it new forces, however inadequate their revolutionary democratic potential may appear to be, from the standpoint of the abstract approach to the

"purity" of this category. But one cannot remain neutral in face of back-sliding trends. We seek to explain to the masses in parties and movements with such trends that the retreat from consistent anti-imperialism cuts across their vital class interests. To the people "on top" who induce such an evolution we say that the communists do not regard cooperation as an end in itself but as a means, a way for solving common problems, and that our party has no intention to cover up with its authority, which it has won over long years of consistent struggle for the people's cause, the vacillations of politicians sacrificing it to their own requirements.

In this context, special attention should be given to the struggle against the influence of anti-communist notions. The communists do not require that other parties should give up their own class motivation and adopt the world view of the working class. But that does not mean that they can take a tolerant attitude to the anti-communist frame of mind being implanted in the social consciousness. From our standpoint, such a frame of mind is a serious impediment on the way to joint action. The communists of Cyprus act on the assumption that such survivals in the consciousness of the democratic forces are not an independent class stand but the result of protracted influence by bourgeois propaganda. Explanation of the class nature of anti-communist notions and political goals for which these notions are being spread helps the masses to become aware of their own interests from the standpoint of the class and of the whole people.

Another trick used by bourgeois reformist ideologists in their efforts to prevent political agreements between communists and other anti-imperialist circles is to falsify the idea of a broad front. This idea, our adversaries claim, means that the communists seek to use their allies as a way of attaining their own political goal, the take-over of power, while the issues over which the struggle proceeds are allegedly altogether indifferent for the proletarian party. An effort is made to present the communists as politicians who do not seek to convince their allies or fellow-travellers of the need to make a choice on the cardinal issues of the class struggle, but as politicians who seek to dupe them. Our party has repeatedly provided a convincing response to such attacks. Let us consider only two of its aspects.

First, Marxist-Leninist methodology rejects the pragmatic approach to the struggle for the immediate interests of the working people, for the democratic goals of the masses. The content of the tasks to be fulfilled by common effort, is not a matter of indifference to us. The working

class carries on the struggle for peace not only because in time of peace it is easier for it to bring about the revolutionary transformation of the society, but also because it regards war as a crime against mankind and does not believe that there is any reasonable alternative to the policy of peace. Similarly, the working people regard democracy, political liberties, their participation in the management of production and social self-administration under capitalism as values not merely because they are factors favoring the advance of the class struggle but also because they are social gains. No one can doubt the fact that in our country AKEL is involved in joint action with national patriotic forces not for tactical reasons but because of its deep commitment to the social emancipation of the people and to the liberation of part of the territory of Cyprus from foreign occupation.

The communists are active and concerned participants in broad anti-imperialist movements. This will also be seen from the fact that they have put forward many constructive initiatives in the struggle for solving the cardinal problems of our day. The most indicative example is the numerous peace proposals of the socialist countries' communist and workers' parties, notably the CPSU, as set forth anew in the documents of its 26th congress. In many capitalist countries, the communists have an important role to play in the mass movement for the working people's rights and against the decline of democracy. Our party's authority and influence on the political development of Cyprus are determined by the fact that it has put forward and pursued the most consistent national-patriotic, democratic program.

Second, the masses cannot be deceived or coerced into joining the struggle for socialism, into advancing toward a socialist revolution. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine regards the transformation of the society as a result of conscious creative action by the working people. Lenin said that the revolution is not the product of a party decision, and that the masses themselves create it by their slogans and their efforts (*V.I. Lenin, Coll. Works, Vol. 27, p. 135*). This of course implies a leading role for the party, which enlightens, organizes and directs the working class and the other social contingents, trains and leads them into the attack against the old society. But the party does not have any ax of its own to grind, it does not "use" the masses, but helps them. In contrast to any bourgeois party, we do not regard the question of power as an end in itself, which allows the conclusion of any deals and unprincipled bloc-forming, but merely a condition for realizing the interests of the people. Consideration and defense of these

interests at every stage is the main thing for the Marxist-Leninist party, which gives expression to the awareness of the masses and carries on its activity in order to realize their key aspirations.

The communists make no secret of their own class goals and tasks. Since the *Communist Manifesto*, they have acted openly and have disdained to conceal their views and aims.* We are carrying on a struggle not only for peace, democracy, national freedom and social progress, all of which have become the demands of the whole people, but also for socialism. That is why the communists are working to make socialism a goal and task for the whole people, with our most important political attitudes being well known to the masses in any conditions, even when there is an effort to win over allies or there is joint action only on some particular issues.

The communists of Cyprus have been acting precisely on this fundamental Marxist principle. By openly proclaiming our programmatic goals, we do not at all frighten off the masses or divulge our plans to the class enemy. It is an ideological challenge to it and, simultaneously, a means for releasing the working people from the influence of bourgeois ideology by explaining the perspectives for and the ways and means of joint action. Even a temporary suspension of ideological struggle would mean the party's ideological disarmament and loss of its own face before its class, before the people. This would doom it to impotence in the future. Ideological principles cannot be held in store for a rainy day, for when the crunch comes.

Nor do the communists of Cyprus conceal their internationalist positions. In the worldwide class contest, our choice was made 55 years ago, at the beginnings of our party, and since then we have not betrayed it on a single occasion. We love our people, but we are not indifferent to the problems and successes of our class brothers and sisters in the capitalist and the socialist countries. AKEL's consistent internationalism has won for it high prestige and trust among the working people of our country.

Our success in last May's parliamentary elections, among other things, shows very well that this principled approach is well grounded and effective in practice. The elections were a battle of tremendous importance for Cyprus. They were held in a tense political atmosphere. In order to win votes, the extreme rightists resorted to every possible means: demagoguery, the fanning of chauvinism and anti-communism, blackmail and psychological pressure. But the

victory went to the democratic forces. The returns clearly showed that our people stand for a peaceful, just, democratic and mutually acceptable solution of the Cyprus problem. It wants to see its homeland sovereign and territorially whole, a federal and demilitarized non-aligned state. Almost 70 per cent of the electorate came out against the policy of the extreme rightists, and for democracy. AKEL won the greatest number of votes as compared with the other parties (almost 33 per cent). Making our class stand known to the electors, we outlined the realistic goal of winning a relative majority in the country's legislative body. Having in the main solved this problem, AKEL has been given a real opportunity for now becoming — in cooperation with other forces — the basis and guarantor of a united democratic and patriotic front.

This victory will also have a positive effect in promoting the efforts to bring the two communities on the island — the Cypriot Greeks and the Cypriot Turks — closer together, and the electoral struggle by the progressive, democratic and patriotic forces in the Turkish community in Cyprus.

The establishment of broad fronts implies consideration of the multifaceted and contradictory interests of allies in the struggle. In other words, there is a need to look for mutually acceptable political goals and to work out the ways of attaining these.

Collective decisions are not in any sense a spontaneously shaping vector of differently oriented forces, let alone a mechanical sum-total of class interests. They are a platform promoting unity and presenting a realistic goal at the given stage. Thus, during the period of struggle against fascism, defense of bourgeois democracy and not transition to socialist democracy, was the stand taken by all the parties and organizations within the Resistance Movement. On the issue of peace, demagogic calls for "averting war through instant worldwide revolution" or "ensuring peace through a revolutionary war against capitalism" cannot, of course, provide a common platform. The communists have put forward a different slogan: peaceful coexistence of states with opposite social systems, and international détente. From this follow mutually acceptable conditions for peace which do not directly affect the class character of power in any country.

Such platforms also reflect the requirements of social progress. The principles of peaceful coexistence for which the peace fighters stand, do not signify a freeze or perpetuation of the present state of international relations. The communists and all the other progressive

*K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 137.

forces seek to bring about their democratization and development of equitable cooperation between states with non-interference in each other's internal affairs; they support the demand for the establishment of a new international economic order; they oppose imperialism and neocolonialism, and stand for the peoples' freedom.

But the search for and elaboration of mutually acceptable and realistic platforms are, of course, only the beginning which needs to be followed up with practical action. That is the kind of action which ultimately helps to resolve the cardinal issue of the class choice: either the goals of the international working class, socialism, the forces of national liberation, peace and democracy, or those of imperialism. Everyone is inevitably faced with this issue, which sooner or later induces a choice, a definition of stand. The scale of contemporary problems, most of which can be solved only through joint action, likewise provides a stimulus to such a choice, ruling out some "third way" as a reasonable policy.

Hopes of taking up an "intermediate position" — somewhere in between the forces of reaction and progress, the advocates of war and the advocates of peace, imperialism and socialism — and also the notions about the "adequacy" of an anti-imperialism distanced from the socialist countries, and even about it being "not reprehensible" to be in confrontation with them, will still frequently be found in democratic movements. Such views are based on erroneous notions about the non-class character of general people's, general democratic and general human problems, of the struggle for their solution, and are a serious impediment for the class choice.

A section of the anti-imperialists is influenced, for instance, by the assertions of bourgeois reformist "theorists" that class problems tend to be pushed into the background of world politics and their role in the life of contemporary mankind reduced because of the growing importance of national and state factors. The reformists say that the "decline" in the importance of class problems is due in particular to the fact that many of these have already been settled. Thus, there is no return to colonial empires. No one will deny this fact. But what is the conclusion that is drawn from it? Here it is: the distribution of poverty and wealth in the modern world is allegedly class-based only in terms of origin, historically, because colonial exploitation has been ended. Now, it is said, this is a non-class problem of relations between the industrialized "North," and the underdeveloped "South," a task of redistributing the

material and spiritual potential between the "rich" and the "poor" countries. In this way, the present-day class, anti-imperialist content of this problem is being obscured and glossed over.

On the other hand, bourgeois reformist ideologists try to instil into the minds of inconsistent anti-imperialists that the class principle dividing the society and the world is giving way to "global" factors, which increasingly unite mankind and give it a common destiny, regardless of social system. Among the prerequisites dictating the need for a supra-class unification, there is talk of trends toward the extension of international cooperation in tackling the problems of scientific and technological revolution, industrialization, urbanization, public health, education, production standards, everyday conditions, and consumption. They also point to the emergence of the problems and dangers of a planetary character: the threat of a thermonuclear war, hunger, the shortage of food, the depletion of natural sources of raw materials, the energy crisis, the destruction of man's natural habitat, etc. All of these are, indeed, serious problems, but they are not valid arguments for a supra-class unification of mankind, because they have class roots and are the inevitable corollary of capitalist development.

The main thing that is lost sight of in this kind of reasoning is the ever greater *internationalization of the class struggle*. Such is one of the leading and long-term trends of our day. How is it expressed in concrete terms?

First of all, the class struggle in the world arena has been growing and intensifying. Together with the emergence of new problems, qualitatively new tasks also confront the working class. Above all there are the problems of disarmament, the need to resist the aggressive blocs of imperialism, action in defense of peace jointly with the democratic, anti-fascist and progressive forces. There is also the struggle against the effects of capitalist integration and the activity of transnational corporations. There is the need to stand up for the demands of the developing countries for a new international economic order. These are, of course, only some of the main problems which are common to all the anti-imperialist movements, to say nothing of the numerous aspects of day-to-day international affairs. As a result, there is an immense enlargement of the circle of problems in the class contest, in which all social strata and groups, all political forces are variously involved.

Today, it is not only antagonistic classes, not only the states with opposite social systems, but the two socio-economic formations — the

socialist and the capitalist systems — that are the protagonists of this contest. Every sphere of mankind's social activity has now become an object of the class struggle. Failure to reckon duly with this fact in tackling, say, global problems would mean confining oneself to abstract, extra-class calls for "an alliance of all" against the common dangers. But the whole point is that through these global problems also runs the line of class demarcation: capitalism, as a system, does not provide the means for their solution. Socialism alone does so. Nor is this merely a matter of perspective: existing socialism already has a constructive program and the material prerequisites for eliminating many of the negative factors of global importance.

In this context, one must most definitely emphasize that no political force can advance in the solution of cardinal problems in the vital interests of the peoples, of the whole of mankind, unless it cooperates with the socialist states, with the ruling communist and workers' parties. The very notion that it is possible to stand up for peace, liberation and social progress in isolation from them, or even in defiance of them, notions which are being implanted in the minds of participants in some democratic movements, are unrealistic. These develop into utopias setting unattainable reactionary goals and harming the struggle for the fulfillment of vital social tasks.

That is why one could say that for the working people of the capitalist world, for all genuine democrats the key point of the class choice consists in *cooperation with existing socialism*. In explaining this point, we specifically emphasize that we speak of *cooperation*, and not of *alignment*, with socialism. Failure to understand this distinction results in a situation in which some democrats who do not accept socialism as the perspective and the future, or who do not agree with methods of the revolutionary transformation of capitalism, now and again deny the possibility of cooperating with the socialist states in solving democratic and inter-ethnic problems, and fulfilling the tasks of ensuring peace.

Finally, the internationalization of the class struggle also creates new conditions for carrying it on in the national arena. Of course, the political movement of the working class has its beginnings above all within the framework of individual countries, and the peculiarities of the present epoch do not modify this Marxist proposition. But internationalization increasingly ties in national class struggle with its international context. The successes scored by the working class in fulfilling its tasks on national soil have always aroused fierce resis-

tance on the part of the internationally allied bourgeoisie. The working people's forces of solidarity have grown immensely and now make it largely possible to neutralize the aggressiveness of imperialist reaction. This induces ever more actively not only the proletariat but the other national forces as well, to define their stand in the world class contest.

The breadth and intensity of this contest and the size of the political contingents involved in it on both sides also tend frequently to produce the opposite reaction: a conscious urge to evade a consistent class choice. . . . This kind of policy is connected above all with the class interests of the parties, for which an objective possibility of unprincipled maneuvering is provided by the arrangement of social forces. We think that to say nothing about this objective opportunity would be to hamper the struggle against such maneuvering.

The policy of maneuvering proceeds from the assumption that in the interests of social progress on national soil it is possible on some issues to rely on imperialism. Sometimes, spokesmen for democratic circles suggest "using" the contradictions in the international class struggle for national purposes. These assumptions are short-sighted: the pragmatic strategy opens up the possibility of a subordination to imperialist influence of the forces which have lost their class bearings and which conduct such a policy. The urge to fence off social and political development in any country from the international class struggle sooner or later develops into alignment with reaction not only on a world but also on a national scale and facilitates its subversive action. Thus, maneuvering is, objectively, also a class choice, but not a choice in favor of democracy, national liberation or social progress.

Can there be success from the policy based on isolation from the internationalizing class conflict of the epoch? The positive and the negative experience of various revolutionary and democratic forces shows that the answer is no. Any attempt to take a "neutral" stand in this conflict, whatever the form of this neutrality, is ultimately futile and doomed.

The objective interests of progressive, democratic and people's liberation movements make it necessary to strengthen solidarity with the communists. The most consistent fighters against imperialism, they help these movements in the anti-imperialist struggle and give them disinterested assistance. This unity is an assurance of fresh successes for the forces acting in a united front for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

The question of interests under socialist democracy

Valeria Benke

CC Political Bureau member,
Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

In considering the experience of socialist construction in Hungary, I distinguish an aspect that is of special significance for Marxist theory and practice, namely, the inter-relationship of interests and socialist democracy. I shall try to show how this question, formerly underrated, has gradually begun to play a key role in our political life, in decision-making.

As everybody knows, the socialist revolution leads to the elimination of conflicting class interests. Public property in the means of production clears the way for the possible appearance of common interests of the working classes and strata. But this is precisely only a possibility comprehended by us not at once, but step by step, from the lessons of day-to-day practice. We saw that the social division of labor, the apartness of economic units, and also the tension between requirements and resources for meeting these requirements, resources that depend on the development level of the productive forces, make it imperative to reckon with the fact that the different classes, sections and groups have their own interests and also with the fact that individual interests and the interests of society do not always coincide directly. Thus, in a socialist society the system of interests and also their priorities and mutual influence play and will continue to play an important role.

I

When the building of the new society had only commenced, we thought that the development of socialist relations would be much faster and much more simple than was actually the case. This is explicable, for the knowledge we now possess cannot be obtained without adequate experience. We thought that with the establishment of rule by the workers in alliance with the peasants and with the support of the intelligentsia and with a community of interests as the point of departure, we would make rapid progress. In many respects, the nation's development was indeed very dynamic, although there were impediments: the impact of the economic and international situation of the cold war years, the inherited economic difficul-

ties, and pressure from hostile forces in and outside the country. We took all that into account. But we expected that the obstacles, in any case the internal obstacles, would not be very great. Policy was based on the premise that since the whole of society was interested in ending economic backwardness and in economic growth that could ensure a more rapid rise of the living standard, this aim coincided entirely with individual aspirations as well.

In the early 1950s economic policy in Hungary suffered seriously from voluntarism. There was also the impact of a certain dizziness with the successes of the initial years of the people's power, and also of the fact that we did not adequately take account of the limitations of our potentialities and the internal relationship of interests in a socialist society that had only just begun to take shape. We simplified the situation: from the actual community of basic interests, which was in the main recognized by the majority of the people, the misconceived conclusion was drawn that there was a total coincidence of all other interests, including those that were in fact very dissimilar. The party underestimated non-antagonistic but nonetheless tangible contradictions. It reckoned with two basic categories of interests — social and personal, linking the former with the maturity level of the socialist consciousness. We therefore wrote off the symptoms signalling a non-coincidence of interests to subjective causes — bureaucracy, a wanting consciousness among the people, and so forth.

This approach had some negative consequences. Although the achievements of the first five-year plan (1950-1954) were in fact impressive, socialist development slowed down. Lack of attention for the day-to-day concerns of workers and peasants and other grave errors by the political leadership were used by counter-revolutionaries in 1956.

After the mutiny was put down, our party was reorganized. Now policy began to be formed with the clear understanding that social interests cannot be realized to the detriment of personal interests, and that the direct, day-to-

day needs of people cannot be ignored for the sake of long-term interests. If this course is not followed socialism will sooner or later be in jeopardy. This is inevitable. Social interests do not exist "by themselves," in isolation from personal interests, and for that reason in implementing both the former and the latter we strive to coordinate them as closely as possible.

Political experience, the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, and studies by the social sciences helped us to obtain a better understanding of the actual interaction of interests in a socialist society. The debates over the economic methods helping to run production more smoothly brought us to the conclusion that personal and social interests cannot be linked directly. To enable a person's actions, dictated by his or her personal opinions, to conform to society's all-embracing interests these two groups of aspirations must be combined by a mediating mechanism. An important role is played in this mechanism by the interests of social groups, of collectives (for instance, production facilities, cooperatives, and so on), commodity-money relations, and material incentives. On the basis of the experience it had acquired, the party began to introduce elements of indirect economic regulation and solidly rely on the material incentives of production collectives and, in them, of individual persons. This led to the reform of economic management in 1968.

A major element of that reform was the widening of the independence of production facilities within the framework of a planned economy with the view to encouraging initiatives and making more rational use of the resources entrusted to these facilities by society. This yielded results and resolved one more problem: the range of goods began to suit consumer requirements better. Management reorganization brought group interests into bolder relief. This gave rise to clashing reactions, meeting the disapproval of many people. Some felt that by reckoning with group interests we were opening the possibility of realizing them to the detriment of society. But the special interests of production facilities had made themselves felt in the past as well, also when in principle they might have been harmonized with social interests. The well-known examples here are the drive for quantity regardless of quality, higher costs, and irrational utilization of funds, materials, and live labor. The formation of interest, which would unerringly orient enterprises and individuals and induce them to take the corresponding actions, continues to create quite a few problems.

For the development of a system of incen-

tives that most closely meets the interests of society as a whole and in the process of adopting the best possible decisions from this point of view, it is exceedingly useful to ascertain the actual inter-relation between various groups of interests. In decision-making bodies (including governmental and economic) there is always a clash of specific interests, regardless of whether this is realized or not. It is good when a disparity of positions comes into the open, for then the divergences can be easily identified. In that case, at all levels of public management the possibility appears of, in keeping with the interests of society as a whole, classifying, coordinating, recognizing or not recognizing specific interests, and thereby determining the destiny of their realization.

II

In the political system of socialism the role of state, public, and other mass organizations and movements, and their attitude to the party, to the power of the working class and to each other took shape in the course of a long process, which has not ended to this day. A feature of the political pattern in Hungary is that we have a one-party system. Interests are coordinated in a unique way: in their classification and synthesis — a process accompanied by conflicts — the leading role is played by the party, but organizationally this is formalized chiefly in governmental bodies. The trade unions, cooperatives, the youth league and other organizations perform the important function of articulating group or personal interests, while enterprises, offices and ministries take part in the realization of these interests.

In principle, various interests are expressed and harmonized most distinctly in the various public organizations and movements manifesting themselves in the relationship between them. If they in fact adequately reflect the stand of the relevant groups, for instance professional or territorial, the party gets, on this basis, the possibility of harmonizing them. It influences public opinion in such a way as to win its agreement and even active support for the subordination of specific, group interests to the broader interests of society. Let me illustrate: after discussing the question of the size of pensions Hungarian society acknowledged that they had to be increased, although people realized that this meant some postponement in raising wages and salaries.

Thus, in resolving contradictions as they arise, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party strives to orient all of society's forces on the attainment of the cardinal aims of socialism, to ascertain the actual relationship between in-

terests. In its practical work it takes the diversity of these interests into account and encourages a frank discussion of existing divergences. In reckoning with and coordinating requirements and seeking to harmonize them in its policy, the party proceeds from the primacy of the interests of society as a whole.

The communists can move to their aim successfully only if inner-party democracy is durable, and its institutions function in accordance with their designation. On this score the HSWP has the bitter lesson of the period when inner-party democracy declined, red tape, shouting, and commands became the style of leadership, and the activity of communists and the party's ability to function weakened. As a result, it could not fulfil its leading role effectively. The extension of party democracy remains a permanent requirement to this day. We feel that in the decision of any question of importance, the communists should have the possibility of stating their views, while members of elected bodies should have the possibility of assessing the situation from the standpoint of the circles and groups represented by them.

Inner-party democracy is not the "internal affair" solely of the communists. Its development level or weakness strongly affect democracy in all elements of socialist society — at industrial enterprises, cooperatives, local councils, and also the party's links with the people. The strength of these links is of vital importance, for without the confidence and support of the people the workers' power cannot cope with its historic mission. To keep these links strong the party has to probe new problems quickly and respond to them in its practical work. Commitment to principle and firmness are important here, especially in cases when the situation, when the actual and not imagined interests of the people require the party to "go against the tide."

Our society is collectivist by nature; the welfare of each person, collective or segment is linked to the welfare of others, while the social advancement of any group depends on cooperation with all the other groups. This, properly speaking, is the objective foundation of socialist democracy. Labor brings people into society's life in such a way as to carry this link beyond the simple fulfillment of prescribed work and the remuneration received for it.

In our country democracy in production is an important lever that allows people, through their basic form of activity in society, in other words, through their work, to collectively form the conditions of work and life and their attitude to other people. When production democracy functions properly, people feel they

are not only members of a production facility's personnel but the actual masters of that facility. In keeping with the essence of socialist democracy, any decision concerning a collective should be made by the members of that collective or its representatives. It is, therefore, quite natural that work collectives should take part in the management of production facilities or in the distribution of incomes. In this area socialist democracy is much wider than bourgeois democracy.

The substance of production democracy lies in ascertaining personal and group interests, and expressing and coordinating them (in particular, through compromise) with the aim of achieving closer cooperation among people and collectives. Here priority is given to social interests, but the collectives have the right to implement their own interests provided these do not conflict with those of society.

As a result of the 1968 economic reform, production democracy in Hungary acquired a new quality. The impetus was given by the extension of the rights of enterprises, which we have already mentioned. We believed that their enhanced striving for economic rationality would involve the need for a more energetic championing of the interests of the people. For that reason, while giving greater independence to economic units we extended the rights of the trade unions as well. Over and above their classical function, that of safeguarding the interests of working people, they got the possibility of stating their views on the ways and means of improving the living standard and on basic economic issues. By participating in decision-making and thereby sharing the responsibility for them, the trade unions contribute to making production more efficient. In the fulfillment of these functions they are helped by regular conferences, at which the heads of branch trade unions and ministries and also the Council of Trade Unions and the government harmonize the guidelines of economic and social policy with the interests of the people.*

The Hungarian trade unions are coping with their tasks, but this does not mean that their activities, organizational structure, and forms of work have attained perfection. These continue to change and improve in such a way as to enable the trade unions to ascertain actual interests again and again and harmonize them for the benefit of individual collectives and of society as a whole.

How far the decisions adopted by the organs

*This is dealt with at some length in the article "On Behalf of the Working People," WMR, July 1981.

of production democracy are constructive depends largely on the local party organizations. It is a duty of the communists to see that group interests do not supersede those of society, that they are not implemented to the detriment of the latter. The party is responsible for the efficacy of this form of democracy, for the activities of industrial enterprises in their dual capacity of production units and collectives of working people.

In Hungary the socialist reshaping of agriculture was completed in the early 1960s. The peasants belonging to a given cooperative are a property owner and a work collective, which, in accordance to the law manages the cooperative independently. The interests of its members are expressed and realized on the basis of inner-cooperative democracy, which ensures members participation in decision-making and control over the fulfillment of decisions.

Until the mid-1970s the institutions of inner-cooperative democracy functioned essentially without modification. The highest organ of the cooperative was the general meeting, which elected its chairman and other officers by secret ballot and passed decisions on all basic questions. In other words, democracy was implemented directly, without the involvement of representative bodies. Through collective innovation the peasants created an effective system of material incentives and efficient ways of organizing work and distribution, which played a decisive part in strengthening the cooperatives and giving their members a sense of belonging to a collective and of responsibility for the work they were doing in common.

Hungarian agriculture developed rapidly, and within a short span of time the big socialist enterprises increased production substantially. At the same time, the ancillary husbandry, run by the family but linked to the cooperative by a thousand threads, was not forgotten. As a result, the population is well-supplied with food and the living standard is rising steadily. This gives a new dimension to the worker-peasant alliance, which is the foundation of our society's unity.

As a result of amalgamation during the past decade, the size of the producers' cooperatives have grown swiftly, while their number has halved. Whereas formerly each cooperative had between 150 and 200 members, today it has several times that number. It has become difficult or almost impossible to hold general meetings; with so many people such meetings would have increasingly acquired a veneer of formalism and for all practical purposes would have been unable to function. The direct de-

mocracy of the former methods of management became illusory and, consequently, these methods had to be modernized.

This work was accomplished in the latter half of the 1970s by a congress of producers' cooperatives and then codified legislatively. Now the competence of the general meeting embraces only questions for whose solution the cooperative members are sufficiently prepared and informed. If a problem requires an all-sided analysis on the basis of expert knowledge this is done either by a meeting of representatives or the management board. To prevent the transition to representative democracy from eroding grassroots initiatives, a larger role was given to teams, brigades, production departments, and so forth, who received the right to state their views or pass decisions on specific matters.

Amalgamation was accompanied by specialization, by changes in the organization of work, and by an enhancement of the responsibility borne by specialist executives. Today the cooperatives have a growing number of young people who had never run an individual husbandry, and more women who had never participated in social labor are joining them. The cooperatives are employing more and more wage-workers (specialists, machine operatives, and so on), who are not members. The pensioner stratum is growing. In the distribution of incomes a special role is no longer played by the share once contributed by the peasant, especially as two-thirds of those actively working have not turned over any land to the cooperative. On the other hand, increasing importance is being acquired by the personal labor contribution. The sense of "direct owner" is giving way to the social psychology of individuals. This is generating new, formerly non-existent group interests, while among the members of the producers' cooperatives and the people hired to work in them there is a mounting striving for equality, in other words, there are growing democratic requirements. For that reason the awareness of being collective owners, of bearing responsibility for the common work can and must be sustained and strengthened among the peasants. The immediate task is to find the optimal ways and means of coordinating the new specific interests arising as a result of the restratification of the cooperative farmers on the one hand, and the interests of the collective on the other, and to realize them in the best possible manner.

Since the early 1970s the conditions have arisen in our country for changing the character of interest representation in the local councils. The legal and organizational requisites for these changes were created by the laws on the

procedure of elections (1970) and on councils (1971). A wider possibility opened up for the councils of representing the interests of society as a whole and of articulating the interests of specific administrative units, the residents of individual localities or districts, of their electors more effectively. The law defines our councils as "organs of popular representation and self-administration and organs of state administration operating on the basis of democratic centralism."* In practice this duality creates its own contradictions and difficulties. Three groups of interest — national and two local — (collective and specific) — are coordinated in the councils and their executive bodies. Specific, personal and group interests, including the particular interests of individual localities, are represented not only by deputies elected to the councils from their districts, but also by political, public and other mass organizations, and this compounds matters.

Let us consider the example of a fairly widespread conflict. The local councils have the right to pass decisions on the development of the territory and population centers within their jurisdiction, but the funds for this come mainly from the state budget. What is asked by the localities is always more than society can allocate. Naturally, it is impossible to meet every specific interest; the crux of coordination is that some are recognized while others are not, i.e., priorities are established. We consider that those councils are unquestionably right that at their meetings clearly formulate specific interests and publicly assess them and establish priorities. But, regrettably, constructive discussions are not frequent at council meetings. Needless to say, an argument is not an end in itself, but there is likewise no sense in concealing divergences under cover of illusory agreement. However, to be fair I shall note that in order to avoid a conflict over local interest, the council unanimously asks for additional funds to have enough "for everything."

Why, one may ask, are discussions rare at council meetings? I do not have in mind cases where a conflict of specific interests in a draft decision has been settled beforehand — in this case everything is in order. But this is far from being the rule. Much more frequently draft decisions are "smoothed" and "settled" behind the scenes, sometimes by so-called informal methods, or worst of all, conflict situations are deliberately papered over. Also, there can be no discussion if the deputies are poorly briefed or are simply not interested in the question.

Thus, the reasons for the shortcomings that

arise when adopted decisions are carried out are rooted not only in faults of leadership and the technique of administration and not only in subjective errors, which are the usual excuse. No, the reason is also that interests are not properly identified, are not taken into account, or nothing concrete is said when there is no possibility for taking them into account. To end this practice it is necessary either to change the objective conditions generating problems or the participants in decision-making must be properly motivated.

The institutions of socialist democracy operate smoothly only if there are correct relations between the people, the representative bodies, and the specialists serving the apparatus. Reproaches are directed most frequently at the role of the apparatus. The usual grievance is approximately: "Specialists place executive bodies and work collectives before an accomplished fact", or "rank-and-file members and non-specialists in organs of authority find it hard to assess or improve a submitted project."

What is at the core of this problem?

Nobody questions the fact that there is an equal need for representative bodies and for the apparatus; moreover, everybody agrees that it is the business of representative bodies to pass decisions and verify their fulfillment, and of the apparatus to draft and fulfil them. The reasons for criticism are, first, that to some extent preliminary drafting limits freedom of decision-making and, second, the persons making these decisions are indeed not always sufficiently competent, especially if the drafts under discussion have been drawn up by experts. This equally concerns the institutions of production democracy in industry and at the cooperatives and — there is no denying it — the work of the local councils.

If we go deeper into the matter we shall find that the drafting of a decision is usually much more than simply preliminary work. All the advantages of professional knowledge of the range of problems in a given territorial unit make themselves felt. As a result, the drafts submitted for endorsement are in many cases based on one and the same pattern and rule out alternatives. In fact, they anticipate decisions and these are, in most cases, adopted with a minimum of amendments. What blame is to be imputed here to experts or the apparatus? It would seem that they had not exceeded their authority; on the contrary, we find a considered draft and sound knowledge — which is a merit. Yet a situation is created which conflicts with the principles governing the relations of elected bodies with the apparatus, for as early

**Magyar Kozlony*, February 19, 1971.

as at the preparatory stage experts weigh interests and determine their priorities, in other words, they in fact do what comes within the given elected body's terms of reference.

In resolutions of the HSWP Central Committee on the CC's style of work this problem is treated as follows: on the one hand, the drafts submitted for examination must contain information on differences of views on a given question so that the bodies considering it may knowledgeably adopt a correct stand and, on the other hand, members of elected bodies must be drawn more broadly into the drafting of decisions and into control over their execution.

This problem has yet another aspect, namely the role of the professional and non-professional element in management. It happens that while speaking on behalf of science, individual intellectuals or groups of intellectuals question the competency of party or state bodies authorized to pass one decision or another. As we see it, in view of the aggregate knowledge of the members of elected bodies it will be quite wrong to regard these bodies as unknowledgeable. As for socio-political matters, there are members of such bodies who may unquestionably be regarded as experts. Regrettably, the potentialities of elected bodies remain inadequately utilized.

Things are more difficult in the case of matters that come within the competence of work collectives. We should like them to take a more energetic part in drawing up and adopting decisions (within the framework of the demands made of production and management). However, true and effective participation may be counted on only when the problem directly affects the interests of people (and they are conscious of this) and when, I'll repeat this, they are adequately informed, prepared and competent. At present, work collectives take part chiefly in the adoption of decisions that directly concern working conditions (for instance, the organization of production or remuneration), in other words, relatively short-term decisions within the framework of a department or factory.

It seems to us that with the development of socialist social relations, the molding of a broad worldview among the people, the establishment of a closer link between social and personal interests, the growth of the competence of decision-makers, and the enhancement of the people's political culture, cases of professionalism being set off against democracy and of experts against non-experts will be more and more rare or disappear altogether.

III

The policy pursued by the HSWP has the wholehearted support of our people for it ensures them with freedom and with ever fuller democracy. It will be no exaggeration to say that our political aims and realistic program of socialist construction are agreeable to the entire nation. As regards the rate and methods of advancement we continue to discuss them with the participation of all sections of the population, try to formulate problems frankly, and look for constructive solutions meeting society's interests.

After the 1956 counter-revolution was crushed, the HSWP returned to Leninist norms, restoring unity in its ranks, the healthy foundations of party life, and collective leadership. By untiring, consistent efforts we revived the weakened links with the working class, with the masses, and regained their confidence. This was not easy to achieve, and there were moments when in choosing between real and false democracy we had to adopt dictatorial methods to safeguard the democratic revolution, for we realized that the mood of many people at the time was not in harmony with the real interests of the whole nation.

Our stand is that the masses may err, but in all cases the communists must know what they think. The HSWP has always held that the question of the rates and methods of socialist changes, of socialist construction, is among the most important and that under no circumstances can it be resolved in isolation from the situation, from the interests and thinking of the masses. Progress can only be achieved when the masses are convinced that the policy being pursued is correct. The understanding of this comes chiefly from political practice, from the masses own experience, and this is precisely what nourished confidence in the party and the patience that the people have shown and continue to show for the nation's leadership even in the present complex situation that sometimes makes it necessary to adopt unpopular decisions.

In the development of Hungarian society we have had and still get difficult situations when tension is generated and contradictions are aggravated by misguided prognostication, errors and shortcomings, or by external circumstances over which we have no control. In all cases the party closely follows reality and listens to the voice of the masses: it does not wait for somebody else to take the initiative but starts a frank talk about difficulties. It initiates discussion and seeks to find the best way out of every situation and to work out as quickly as

possible realistic solutions conforming to socialist principles.

For instance, precisely today we are faced with a problem of this kind: it is the problem of gradually countering the adverse influence of the world market on our economy. We cannot base our program, our social plans on illusions, and our propaganda does not have to embellish reality. A sober-thinking person does not look for miracles; the task is that as many people as possible should distinctly understand the actual potentialities of our society.

The masses can only be won by painstaking political work. We are convinced that the party's present policy enjoys confidence and support because in its favor it has the nation's achievements over the past period of more than two decades. To this day the party's words and deeds have not been at variance, and the people believe that the party will continue doing everything possible for their good in the present situation.

Of course, when there is some tension in society, an "open" policy aggravates debates. What is debated? Problems of distribution, economic issues, the advantages or disadvantages of various measures in price-formation and economic regulation, the style of work of administrative bodies, some phenomena in art, and so forth. What triggers debates? Chiefly a conflict of interests, although this is not always quite clear to the participants in the debates and to public opinion. But not all distinctions in opinions are necessarily due to non-coincidence of interests. A large role is played by views, tastes and habits. The infiltration of bourgeois ideas, shortcomings in the upbringing of young people and other reasons are also generators of debates.

Are such debates needed? Some of them could be done without, but in principle it is our view that discussions are necessary for the adoption of decisions in the interests of society as a whole. Socialist construction is an equation with many unknown quantities that cannot be shrugged off. The broader and more democratic a discussion is, the fewer of these unknown quantities remain and the probability of error is correspondingly reduced. A collision in this area is useful also because it helps to surmount bourgeois influences.

As I have already noted, discussions and the unbarring of social conflicts are not an end in themselves. The party by no means seeks conflicts and impassioned debates over trivialities or, much less, imagined problems. It benefits nobody when instead of making decisions there is endless "coordination," and considered action is superseded by "exchanges of

views on ways and means of fulfillment." Discussions are useful as long as they help to ascertain a problem and the ways and means of resolving it, to substantiate intelligent action. More, on the scale of the whole of society they are useful as long as they lead to the elucidation of the aims of socialism, which are in the common interest. Then action must follow.

Various, including misconceived, aspirations and attitudes are articulated in the course of debates. Among them there may be not only sincere delusions but also deliberate vilifications of socialism. The HSWP's stand and principles on this are immutable: we are against freedom for enemies of socialism. We have fought and will go on fighting them.

Is freedom of opinion thereby restricted? Certainly. Is this restriction necessary and justified? We believe it is.

The people's peace of mind is not a plaything. History has taught us that when hostile ideas begin to be spread they are soon followed by hostile actions. However, if one is to judge intentions solely from words it would be hard to see the actual demarcation of fronts: the enemies of socialism assure people that their purpose is no more than to "correct" the system, while bureaucratic and conservative elements are said to be champions of socialism. One encounters not only justified condemnation of real mistakes and shortcomings, but also pseudo-radical criticism, which, while ignoring actual conditions, barrenly and anti-historically runs a dividing line between our social practice and socialist ideals. Although we do not refuse to participate in them we do not exactly welcome debates started by daydreams, illusions, and unrealistic demands and notions. "Traditional" retrograde ideological streams, including streams with nationalistic undertones, are also surfacing in Hungary's cultural life. But it would be wrong to equate them to, for instance, the criticism of impatient and insufficiently experienced young people.

Of course, it cannot be considered that our social institutions are perfect; their activities still give much room for criticism. If it is borne in mind that there still are various anomalies in the behavior of people, flaws inherited from the former social system or generated by inadequately regulated economic relations, it is hard to condemn expressions of dissatisfaction head-on, even if they are excessively sharp. The communists themselves condemn these shortcomings.

It is not easy to assess criticism. Nevertheless, it must be assessed. A touchstone is the readiness of the critic to take a constructive part in the quest for a genuinely socialist solution of a

problem, to make a positive effort to counter conformism which springs into fashion from time to time.

The HSWP counters the abstract-illusory slogans of "total freedom" and "perfect democracy" with a realistic program of changes. This is where the way of the revolutionary parts from that of the utopian, who, dreaming of an "ideal socialism," dissociates himself from the socialism built in reality.

As before, the constantly changing situation in the world and our own domestic development pose new and difficult social questions every day. We communists and the Hungarian people, who are devoted to socialism, will answer these questions in accordance with the objective laws and norms of the new system.

We are convinced that human rights, freedom and democracy are really implemented precisely in a socialist society. This system asserts the power of the workers and serves the interests of the entire people, and for that reason it is more democratic than the bourgeois system.

Of course, nobody makes the claim that the level of democracy achieved in Hungary is now satisfactory — we still have a long way to go. Socialism is not only power serving the interests of the people, it is above all power used by the people. The measure of possible democracy is not determined by the good will or decision of one or several persons. It is rooted in objective social conditions, which, as a matter of record, does not mean that the existing forms of democracy and the achieved level of democratic development completely exhaust our present potentialities.

The level of socialist democracy is a very important indicator of the maturity of our society and its development is a paramount requirement. As we move forward, reducing the distinctions between classes and building developed socialism, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat gradually turns into a state of the entire people and elements of communist social self-administration germinate and grow strong.

Emergence of a new type of civilization

Academician Radovan Richta
Director, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,
Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences

The rapid acceleration of the advance of history is a fact that is incontrovertible and leaps to the eye. Every year we witness and are involved in the emergence of a host of social phenomena which earlier generations did not have to face in a life-time. It is becoming unquestionable that the new social system — socialism, the first stage of the communist socio-economic formation — is the chief motive force of this process.

Socialism carries with it profound changes which affect the very basis of social and human life. It sets in motion ever more substantial factors of the scientific and technological revolution and tangibly modifies the whole complex of living conditions for broad strata of the population. Gradually but perceptibly it transforms the structure of social requirements and values and establishes new relations among nations.

The shaping of the developed social society as a complex social system intensively transforms that which Marx and Engels called "this sum of productive forces, capital funds and

social forms of intercourse, which every individual and every generation finds in existence as something given."¹ Simultaneously, this process paves the way for the solution of the most burning problems of our day: the maintenance of peace, the mastery of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution for the benefit of mankind, the elimination of intolerable social antagonisms, and together with them of poverty and hunger over a large part of the globe, and the creation of conditions for developing the creative capabilities of the working masses.

With the emergence and spread of socialism, historical development goes beyond the boundaries of the civilization shaped by the bourgeois system and developing on the basis of its laws. It gives way to a new and higher civilization, with which mankind's future is connected. Leonid Brezhnev says: "The epoch-making importance of the October Revolution consists precisely in the fact that it paved the way . . . for the creation of a new type

of civilization in the world." One need not be a prophet to realize that the 21st century, which is at hand, will naturally become an age of its further extensive development.

Having risen from the stage of barbarism, mankind, according to Engels, then went through "three great epochs of civilization": the ancient period, which was marked by slave-holding, the Middle Ages which rested on serfdom, and the contemporary capitalist civilization, which is based on wage-labor and capital. Each of these was a major advance in history, but in all three the social basis of civilization continued to be "the exploitation of one class by another," so that every advance in production was "at the same time a retrogression in the condition of the oppressed class, that is, of the great majority."² Marx wrote: "The very moment civilization begins, production begins to be founded on the antagonism of orders, estates, classes, and finally on the antagonism of accumulated labor and actual labor. No antagonism, no progress. This is the law that civilization has followed up to our days."³

In contrast to the period of barbarism, thanks to the level of the productive forces attained and the new quality of their social-labor activity; men were able in the conditions of civilization to obtain a surplus product, however small initially, which constituted the social resources fund for development. It is the fruits of collective labor that ensured the constant progress in the further development of the productive forces and the material conditions of life, paved the way for science and art, and made possible the emergence of the institutions of sociopolitical life. But they also enabled a small minority to stay away from production activity and to appropriate the surplus created by social labor and so live at the expense of the rest. The majority, making the main contribution to the creation of this surplus or development fund, while being deprived of access to it, were forced to work for that minority. As a result, whatever the form of class antagonism, the whole of the earlier development of civilization constituted no more than an alternation of various systems of more or less covert slavery and social inequality.

The struggle for the means of development created by society — the main axis of life in the epoch of civilization — brought into the historical arena cupidity, a new and truly boundless human passion. "Naked greed has been the moving spirit of civilization from the first day of its existence to the present time; wealth, more wealth, and wealth again; wealth not of society, but of this shabby individual was its sole and determining aim. If, in the pursuit of

this aim, the increasing development of science and repeated periods of the fullest blooming art fell into its lap, it was only because without them the ample present-day achievements in the accumulation of wealth would have been impossible."⁴

In these circumstances, the system of man-made conditions of life in civilization was increasingly separated from the working people, its true architects, subsequently altogether to become an immense, terrifying and alien force having virtually the form of fate.

The antithesis between the free citizen of the ancient community (civis) and the barbarian, who was not a member of the community, an antithesis which proclaimed social-class inequality already implied the understanding that the mundane power which gives freedom and which helps to advance civilization springs from the social interaction of men. But this awareness lost sight of the true source of the development of civilization — social labor — so standing the real relations on its head. Later on, in the medieval interpretation, the emphasis in the civitatis dei (the city of god) was altogether removed from the earth and raised into the heavens above. When, at the dawn of bourgeois civilization, the enlighteners returned to the mundane interpretation of social development, they contrasted the status civilis (civilized state), which springs from social activity, and the initial status naturalis (natural state). That was when Mirabeau first used the term "civilization" to denote the complex of all the products and conditions of life created, transformed and cultivated in the process of human activity.

Later heralds of the bourgeois society, like Guizot, converted the concept of "civilization" and especially of "European civilization" into a supreme category of their own view of social development and simultaneously a subject of world history like Hegel's "world spirit." They said quite frankly that civilization rested on private property, and that it was the latter which "civilized the world."

Because capitalism carries all the internal contradictions of the exploitive society to the extreme form of universality, it is quite natural that impassioned criticism of civilization appeared almost simultaneously with the eulogies to it. In his *Treatise on Inequality*, Rousseau said that the processes which civilized mankind, also wrested them from the natural relations of equality and led the human race to destruction. Bourgeois civilization was most brilliantly exposed by Fourier, who brought out its unseemly hypocrisy by means

of which it covered up the contradictions of its own existence.

This critique was all the more important because as the deep-seated sores of the capitalist formation were revealed, the advocates of this "civilized system" increasingly referred to some kind of universal features of the development of civilization or strove to dissolve the antagonisms of the capitalist society in this broader category, or conversely, sought to justify its disastrous consequences and dead-ends on the plea that human history was fatally in decline.

This approach which was clearly at odds with the objective truth, was most widespread in the recent period, when capitalist society entered the stage of imperialism, presenting itself to the world as "barbarism . . . in the lap of civilization itself"⁵ or as "civilized barbarism" (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 388).

The advocates and champions of the old system, not daring to deny that present-day capitalism posed a threat to peace and generated unprecedented horrors, keep plugging the idea of the "end of Western civilization" or even of the whole of human civilization generally. There are more and more versions of the idea that Western civilization has entered into an "epoch of malaises" (H. Kahn), that it is in an "agony" reminiscent of the downfall of Ancient Rome (J. Chartenet), that industrial civilization on the globe could collapse (A. Toffler), or that any human civilization worthy of the name could be destroyed (V. Ferkiss).⁶ At the same time, there is a desperate search for ways out, either in the elaboration of a new "science of civilization" (M. Toda) or of a humanitarian theory reckoning with the "planet's finite dimensions" (A. Peccei), in the projection of a new and purely "technological civilization" (Ferkiss), the replacement of the universal civilization by a "plurality of civilizations" (M. Guernier), or the unification of the "developed Western civilization" with the primitive animistic culture of the "east" or the "south" (G. Higgin).⁷

But that which appears in the conclusions of the various bourgeois theorists and ideologists as darkness, decline, collapse, agony or end of civilization is actually no more than a vague presentiment or clear comprehension of the looming end of *bourgeois civilization itself*. And with it, of course, of every civilization based on class antagonism and progress realized to the detriment of its true architect, the working masses.

Marx and Engels showed long ago that it is wrong to set up the specifically bourgeois mode of production with its inherent uniformities of

development as exemplifying the general conditions for the growth of the productive forces and mankind's progress. In order to understand the true ways along which civilization develops, they said, it is necessary to consider every kind of material and spiritual production in their definite historical form, taking into account the specifics of that social system within whose framework wealth is produced and accumulated. Marx countered the reasoning of bourgeois theorists about some kind of universal conditions for the development of civilization with his analysis of the social-class substance of socio-economic formations as definite stages connected with the emergence of ever higher social principles of the historical process.⁸

In the light of this analysis, the decline of the bourgeois society does not at all signify the end of "human civilization generally." On the contrary, it is moving into a new and higher stage of its upward advance coinciding with *socialist development*. This civilization, taking shape on the basis of a new type of social relations, opens up before mankind truly gripping prospects because it is aimed to bring about the allround enrichment of the life of the working masses, "irrespective of any scale established in advance," because Marx said, it is oriented toward man as "an end in itself."

The new social system taking over from capitalism naturally reworks and transforms the social and material forms of life which it has inherited from earlier epochs. This time it is a matter of changing the whole foundation of social existence. For the first time in the millennia of mankind's civilized history, we are witnessing not just a replacement of one class polarization by another, one type of social antagonism by another, one form of progress at the working people's expense by another similar one, but the elimination of every type of class polarization, of every type of social antagonism, of all forms of social progress based on the deprivation of masses of people of their own development. Consequently, this is a change in the very foundation, on which civilization has rested up to now. That is why we say that socialism is a *fundamentally new type of civilization*.

Of course, despite all its radical distinctions, socialist civilization does not at all signify any "external intervention" in the historical process, or some kind of "break" wiping out the achievements of the past, as bourgeois ideologists have claimed in their efforts to intimidate the world since the time of the Paris Commune. The new civilization does not emerge away from the highroad of mankind's

development, but is, on the contrary, a law-governed result and law-governed continuation of that development. While doing away with the internal contradictions of the earlier epochs and the constraints and barriers which they have produced, it retains all the accomplishments of the past, investing them with new meaning and including them in the superior whole which is being created.

Within the framework of socialist civilization lives the lofty ancient idea of social freedom, of the heroic power and creative potentialities which spring from membership of the community (polis), but this idea has now been purged of its antithesis — slavery. Socialism retains the faith in the triumph of good and loyalty to the moral duty, which the Middle Ages bequeathed to the masses, but without the humiliating meekness in face of the secular and spiritual whip. The enlighteners' faith in human reason and their vision of cognition and transformation of the world have their continuation under socialism, but all of this is now based on a totally new ideological, theoretical and methodological foundation with the assertion of the truly scientific view both of the object and of the subject of the cognition of reality and of its transformation.

The socialist civilization brings out to the full the fine understanding of beauty of the natural principles and the greatness of the spiritual principles, which prevailed in the epoch of the Renaissance, but without the bending of humanistic values to the predatory laws of profit which are characteristic of the capitalist society. Finally, it brings out most forcefully the tendency toward the unlimited development of the society's productive forces which took shape in the epoch of the industrial revolution, but without the old urge of capital to secure this result by plundering millions of people, on the one hand, and worsening the natural conditions of human existence, on the other.

The civilizing mission of capital, Marx believed, consisted in the fact that it made the utmost use of human labor as the source of wealth, introduced relations of universal mutual dependence between people, and produced "the universal appropriations by the members of the society both of nature and of the social nexus itself." It is the "increase in the productive forces of social labor, and the socialization of that labor" that have, according to Lenin, provided the starting point for the new stage in the development of the civilization of the socialist epoch (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 3, p. 595).

Consequently, the new civilization is a

natural successor to the dynamic with which capitalism invested social progress. It borrows the higher forms of socialization and the intensive worldwide connections between people which capitalism is capable of creating, but "man's own social organization, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action."⁹

The Marxist-Leninist classics emphasize that the working people would not be able to control their social ties before they transformed and unfolded these, stamping their new content on every concrete form of human vital activity. It is clear that such historical tasks are exceptionally complicated. They cannot be instantly fulfilled to their full extent, nor can it be expected that they will be realized without complicated quest or that it will be possible to avoid in every case the longer and round-about way, from the standpoint of history. But on the other hand, a historical view of this matter will show that these tasks must and will be fulfilled by mankind because they map out the only prospect for its advance.

The old antagonistic social system, which in our day has assumed the form of state-monopoly capitalism, has long since been unable to ensure such an advance. What is more, it is carrying mankind's development into a dead end, from which there is no way out because capitalism increasingly converts the productive forces created by people into destructive forces, into a monstrous instrument for the destruction of civilization on the Earth.¹⁰

Being in the grip of the hopeless illusion that it can save itself in that way and stem the course of history, present-day capitalism is pushing ahead along this dangerous road, paying the price of a decline of social and cultural progress and presenting an ever greater threat to the future of the world. This makes it ever more obvious that only the new, socialist social system is capable of breaking the imperialist-created vicious circle and releasing the peoples from the existing "civilized barbarism." If people are not to be "deprived of the results attained and forfeit the fruits of civilization," Marx said, "they are obliged, from the moment when their mode of carrying on commerce no longer corresponds to the productive forces acquired, to change all their traditional social forms."¹¹

The emergence and development of socialist civilization as an insuperable process is expressed in numerous specific features of the new type of human community living which set it qualitatively apart from all the earlier ones. These features are now most pronounced in the

face of developed socialism in the USSR and are beginning to emerge in the other socialist-community countries.

The new civilization is the first one in history under which the life of all the members of the society is identical in social content and is based on socially useful labor. Extensive and mutual dependence of nominally free individuals emerges at the earliest stages of development and takes the form of a negative alliance of men who are no longer capable of living without the bond of universal social labor. Under socialism, this dependence acquires a positive content: the members of the society now act as free and equal participants of truly socialized labor who are conscious of their mutual responsibility.

The new civilization in principle excludes deep social contradictions between wealth and poverty, which have left such a deep imprint on the life of the capitalist society. Numerous economic and sociological measurements show that the differentials remaining in the European socialist countries between the strata of the population with the highest and those of the lowest incomes are many times smaller in their present contours than those in the industrialized capitalist countries.

Of course, at the initial stages of socialism the means acquired by labor remain relatively limited. But even here the new and incomparably more humane content of social ties already leaves a visible imprint on every type of relations among people. The power of universal cooperation, human collectivism and genuine comradeship is ever more visually embodied in man's material and cultural creations. Apart from everything else, this explains why even at the trying moments the people of the new world do not succumb to the sense of emptiness and futility of human existence in the "ice-bound universe of solitude," which are so characteristic of the present-day capitalist society.¹²

Socialism is not based on private but on social property in the means of production, and that is why in this civilization no class has a monopoly ownership of the development funds created by the society, and why there is no place here for relations among states in which the interests of a small group of countries are ensured through the slowed-down development of a great many others (on the tricky plea that it is impossible for everyone to have the same living standards as in the industrialized capitalist countries, because "the Earth is not rich enough for that"¹³).

For centuries, the propagandists of the bourgeois civilization have asserted that the

elimination of the private property and the self-seeking drives based on it would inevitably mean the end of all civilization, as this would also eliminate the "natural" inducement to work, the motive force of social development. But the socialist reality has blasted this thesis, by effectively substituting greed by the principle of work for the benefit of the society ensuring the development of every individual's capabilities.

The practice of existing socialism shows that free people who are socially secure, confident of the future, and not subjected to the pressures of external economic necessity can and do actually develop a higher and more intensive labor and social activity than those who are engaged in chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of private enrichment at the expense of others or who are forced to work under the threat of losing their means of subsistence. The struggle for conscious and disciplined labor dictated by the interests of the society and remunerated in accordance with its results, the struggle to overcome indifference and petty-bourgeois egoism is a key component part of the building of the new society.

In all earlier civilizations, numerous human interrelations rested on a spontaneously shaped division of labor which was expressed in developed exchange between individuals in the form of commodity production and money relations. Both invariably confronted man as fatal forces that were external and alien to him, forces that not only defied any control, but, on the contrary, entirely controlled the behavior of people themselves. Money, rather the sacred thirst for gold (*auri sacra fames*), became the highest principle, and virtually a synonym of the bourgeois civilization, a symbol, as Goethe's Mephistopheles aptly put it, which was weightier than all the majestic creations of the human spirit and the maxims of morality.

In the developed socialist society, these forms of relations among people also lose their elemental and supernatural force. Of course, commodity exchange and money are also used in the construction of the new society, but they are now converted into ever more manageable instruments of civilization purposefully serving the society: the commodity forms with their value expression are used as instruments of planned economic development, while money, remaining a medium of exchange and distribution, is stripped of its erstwhile sovereign domination of the society.

Simultaneously, there arises a fundamentally new element in man's relations with nature. Having established a system of "universal exploitation of natural and human proper-

ties," says Marx, capitalism has, step by step, been destroying the vital balance between the society and Nature. By contrast, as Engels predicted, people under socialism for the first time become the real, conscious lords of nature, because they now become masters of their own social organization.¹⁴

Instead of the haphazard and relentless plunder of natural resources, the socialist civilization decides on the purposeful and national control and management of the development of natural resources. The thrifty and rational use of natural resources, concern for the soil, the forests, the rivers, the air, and the flora and fauna are organic to the new society. It is the socialist community that is ever more vigorously initiating the humanistic line of the scientific and technological revolution, advocating a fundamental solution of global problems connected with the planned development of the world's natural wealth and a responsible approach of mankind's future.

The socialist civilization is the first civilization in history to be essentially governable and one which truly controls its own advance wherever it has enough scope for doing so. In other words, it is capable of attaining the goals that are in line with the long-term requirements of social development.

This capacity is based above all on the fact that the new system relies on a powerful social force — the working class in alliance with all the other working people — and that it overcomes the traditional mechanisms of progress connected with particular interests, enlarging the subject of control to the scale of the society as a whole.

Furthermore, socialism is capable of using the great transformative potentialities of science in every unit of social labor, both in its function of direct productive force (which is already inherent in the bourgeois civilization), and in the function of theoretical basis for the governance of social processes (which is specific to the new type of society).

Finally, socialism is able to achieve these results because the communist parties operate in that society as the leading force, organically linking the working class and the other working people with science. The communist parties, differing fundamentally from conventional political parties in the bourgeois system, are a totally new historical phenomenon, a living organism designed for the stage in which broad masses of people are transformed into an active subject of social and historical action.

The whole of past development of civilization was invariably attended with a sharp disproportion between the rapid progress of the

goods created by people, living conditions and the actual stagnation of the working people, the mass which created these goods. For these reasons, the very notion of civilization has long since been seen as something "external," "material" and opposite to man's "inner" and "spiritual" element which is designated by the concept of culture. This antithesis was pondered by Kant and Pestalozzi, and it was expressed in sharp and conflicting terms in the romantic conceptions of the German tradition in bourgeois thought.

Socialism first surmounts this one-sidedness, shaping a way of life that is based simultaneously on the steady growth of material conditions and on the constant cultivation of the individual's multifaceted capabilities. Here, the scientific and technological revolution blends with the cultural revolution, so that man's social development gradually forges ahead with respect to the development of material conditions proper. This removes the age-old contradiction between civilization and culture, between material and spiritual culture.¹⁵

Socialism develops the new civilization not "by dint of the most extravagant waste of individual development"¹⁶ but by converting the wealth accumulated and newly created by the society into "a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer."¹⁷

The elaboration of large scale and scientifically grounded projects designed to perfect the people's life in every possible way and taking into account a broad range of socio-economic and scientific and technical measures for its benefits, is an object of daily effort by the fraternal parties of the socialist-community countries. Just recently, such programs were vigorously reaffirmed at the 26th congress of the CPSU, the 16th congress of the CPCz, and the congresses of other ruling parties in these countries, showing the world once again the perspectives opened up before humanity by the civilization which is centered on man.

The tremendous social energy set in motion by the new society helps to solve the most intricate problems with which earlier civilizations could not cope. Perhaps the most visual evidence of this fact will be found in the struggle for peace: socialism now provides the most solid basis for mankind's hopes of eliminating war from the life of the society.

The entry of the peoples upon the epoch of civilization, Engels said, led to the erection of formidable walls around the new fortified towns and the formation of regular armies.¹⁸ War became an organic element of history. Socialism alone has no need of war for its development. This system organically shuns

the idea of imposing its principles and ideals by means of force or external pressure. At the same time, it resolutely resists any attempt of the outgoing society to prolong its existence at the price of big and small military disasters, at the price of posing a threat to mankind's very existence. "Socialism," Gustav Husak emphasized at the 16th congress of the CPCz, "is the crucial force in the people's struggle for peace and international security." By leading the peoples' movement against war, by marching in the vanguard of the struggle for peace, the new civilization defends the future of human history itself.

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 54.
2. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 333.
3. Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1955, p. 68.
4. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 333.
5. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 434.
6. See, H. Kahn. *World Economic Development 1979 and Beyond*, London, 1979; J. Chartenet, *L'agonie d'une civilisation*, in: *Revue des deux mondes*, Paris, May 1977; A. Toffler. *The Eco-Spasm Report*, New York, 1975; V. Ferkiss. *The Future of Technological Civilization*, New York, 1974.
7. See, M. Toda. *Civilization and Science*, in: *Conflict or Collaboration?* Amsterdam-London-New York, 1972;

A. Peccei. *The Human Quality*, Oxford, 1977; V. Ferkiss, op. cit.; M. Guernier, *The Great Imbalance*, in: *Human Futures, Needs — Societies — Technologies*, Rome, 1974; G. Higgin, *Symptoms of Tomorrow*, New York, 1978.

8. See, Karl Marx. *Theories of Surplus-Value*. Part I, pp. 284-287, Moscow 1969.

9. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1959, p. 391.

10. This ruinous tendency is visually expressed by the activity of the U.S. military-industrial complex connected with the use of latest scientific and technological achievements. In the second half of the 1970s — and mostly under pressure from this complex — 40 per cent of the outlays on science and 50 per cent of the scientific personnel throughout the world were involved in the making of mass destruction weapons (see, S. Ramphal. "Quo vadis, homo sapiens?" in: *Science and Public Policy*, No. 2. 1979).

11. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 519.

12. See, J. Monod. *Le hasard et la nécessité*, Paris, 1970, p. 185.

13. E. Laszlo, *The Systems View of the World*, New York, 1972, p. 103.

14. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 390.

15. Some bourgeois analysts of the gap between civilization and culture, notably, Charles P. Snow (the author of *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* and *The Two Cultures and a Second Look*) have not failed to notice that this gap does not exist in the socialist countries at all (see, C.P. Snow, *Public Affairs*, London, 1971, p. 35).

16. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 88.

17. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 499.

18. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. III, p. 322.

An unsinkable aircraft-carrier? No, a ship of peace

Anthony Vassallo

General Secretary, Communist Party of Malta

THE COMMUNISTS' STAND FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Two and a half years ago our people celebrated a historic event: the last British soldier left Malta on March 31, 1979. The republic's red-and-white flags were hoisted over the buildings that had been the headquarters of London's emissaries. For the first time in many centuries Maltese soil has become free of foreign occupation.

Our road to independence has been long and tortuous. But we are realists and must say that we still have a long way to go. Although Malta has achieved political and military sovereignty, it continues to be burdened by the legacy of a colonial economy and remains a target of neo-colonialist attempts to impose a one-sided

foreign policy orientation. The guidelines of the Communist Party of Malta, defined at its second congress in February 1979, call for continuing the struggle for Malta's complete liberation from dependence on foreign countries, for social and economic progress in the interests of the working people, and for the consolidation of peace and security.

Malta is frequently classed among midget states. Our young Republic is indeed small. The area of the islands comprising the Maltese archipelago is 316 square kilometers, and the population is somewhat above 300,000. But Malta has been a factor of world politics. Being situated on the routes from Europe to Africa and Asia, notably to the Middle East — to wide expanses of sea — it has been seen for centuries as the key to the Central Mediterranean. Many

in the imperialist camp are eager to gain possession of that key, and make Malta an unsinkable aircraft-carrier.

This is why, having attained political independence as early as 1964, it took Malta a long time to shake off military dependence. With the aid of the local collaborationist bourgeoisie, London forced a Governor-General on the Maltese people and, more importantly, continued to operate its military bases on Malta that could be used by NATO member-states. The NATO South Europe Naval Command had its headquarters on Malta.

Even after a Labor government came to power in 1971 on a pledge to reject the defense agreement with Britain, it took another eight years to achieve this aim.* But to this day NATO leaders are weaving their web of intrigues around the republic with support from the Nationalist Party, which is spearheading the reactionary pro-NATO forces. They are still hoping to bring Malta into the orbit of that main military bloc of the imperialists, and turn our island into a bastion of its aggressive forces.

Washington is particularly active in this direction. It has arrogantly proclaimed that the Mediterranean is a zone of its "national interests." It would like to saddle Malta in order to give the U.S. monopolies the route to Middle East oil and ensure the Pentagon with strategic positions in that region. The USA is making every effort to push the Mediterranean countries into a confrontation conflicting with their national interests and imperilling world peace.

We were reminded of the USA's insidious plans relative to Malta by the visit last April of a U.S. Congress study mission led by Clement Zablocki, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. The very fact that prior to the talks in Valletta this mission had visited some North African countries, as well as Spain, was an indication that Washington had assigned a definite role to Malta in its strategic concepts affecting the entire Mediterranean.

The Zablocki report underscores Malta's strategic location and notes that its ideal natural harbors have historically been a tempting target for powerful states. On a note of anxiety the report went on to say that since the closing of the British bases the Maltese government had reduced its ties with its West European

*As soon as it came to power the Labor government demanded a revision of relations with Britain. Its first step was to send the NATO headquarters packing, and it demanded that Britain evacuate its presence in March 1979 and until that time pay a rent for the military bases. Ultimately, with the support of progressive opinion worldwide, the Maltese patriots compelled London to accept this decision. — A.V.

neighbors, declared itself nonaligned, and sought to broaden its relationships with socialist countries and the countries of the Arab East. It made the point that in most cases the Maltese government had evaded supporting the USA's political postures. Finally, the report acknowledged that Washington was using its European allies in its attempts to sign a new "security" agreement with Malta, in other words, to compel the Maltese government to resume military links with the imperialist powers.

This diplomatic assault is proceeding against the background of a dangerous rise of imperialist activity throughout the Mediterranean. This is exemplified by the concentration of U.S. armed forces in the Persian Gulf, Washington's aborted military action against Iran, the massive supplies of U.S. armaments to Israel and Turkey, the stationing of NATO forces in Italy and on Crete, and the reinforcement of British military installations on Cyprus. And all this on the pretext of countering the notorious "Soviet threat." Our party is tireless in showing that the only purpose of "arguments" of this kind is to justify the U.S. naval presence in the Mediterranean, which with its allies Washington would like to turn into an American lake.

The NATO strategists are finding support among the local reactionaries. On Malta, reactionary elements are openly pressing the government to renounce its nonaligned posture. They are begging the West for "security guarantees" and economic aid and insisting on Malta joining the Common Market.

With memories of the cruel consequences to the Maltese people of the Mediterranean's repeated conversion into a theater of confrontation between imperialist powers, Maltese public opinion is thoroughly disquieted by the U.S. and NATO military build-up in our region. The Second World War brought our island hardship and destruction and memories of this are still fresh in the minds of the Maltese people. Our long experience of suffering is that when military conflicts break out, small countries like Malta — no matter how strongly they declare their neutrality and desire for peace — are inevitably involved in the carnage and crushed by aggressors. For that reason we feel that our only hope lies in détente, which would give all nations the opportunity to go their own ways and work for economic and social progress.

This was the angle from which the second congress considered the tasks of the Maltese communists. The unanimously passed program, whose provisions define the main orientations of our efforts, stresses that it is important

to continue the struggle for peace and détente, against the forces of imperialism and war.

The Communist Party of Malta and all other progressive forces on the island have taken a firm stand against the attempts to direct the Republic into a path of adventure that would imperil the destiny of its people. They consistently advocate good relations with all Mediterranean states and with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They see the way to countering the intrigues of the imperialists in strengthening mutual security and promoting economic cooperation. The Communist Party of Malta sees our region's conversion into a sea of peace, security and cooperation as vitally important to détente and peace in Europe. The Maltese communists have drawn up a program for improving the situation in this region, envisaging:

- the withdrawal of all nuclear-armed naval units from the Mediterranean and the dismantling of foreign military bases in the region;

- the renunciation of the plans for stationing U.S. medium-range missiles in neighboring Italy and other Western European countries, since these missiles would be a direct threat to peace in the Mediterranean;

- the signing by all the states in the region of the nuclear non-proliferation agreement and an accord on converting the Mediterranean into a nuclear-free zone;

- an all-embracing and just settlement of the Middle East problem with Israel pulling its troops out of all occupied Arab territories and recognizing the right of the people of Palestine to the formation of their own independent and sovereign state;

- the settlement of the Cyprus problem in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions and thereby enabling Cyprus to develop as a united, independent, sovereign, demilitarized, and nonaligned nation with its territorial integrity made secure.

We see a duty in resolutely countering the demagogic attempts to bracket the foreign policy actions of the Soviet Union with those of the USA. In most cases this is done to conceal a striving to help the USA and its allies to change the military balance in their favor, to the detriment of peace and international security.

From our point of view the attempts of some quarters to reduce the problem of Mediterranean security to a call for the withdrawal of U.S. and Soviet naval units must be denounced. It is foul and reprehensible to ignore the distinction between the USSR and the USA. The former is a bulwark of all anti-imperialist movements, while the latter is imperialism's strike force. In our country the progressive, democratic and

peace forces see the Soviet naval presence in the region as a major deterrent to any aggressive ambitions.

The Communist Party of Malta thinks highly of and supports the Soviet proposals for settling Mediterranean problems. It is our belief that their full implementation would lay the foundation for lasting peace and stable security in the Mediterranean and contribute to the promotion of mutually beneficial cooperation among all the nations fronting it.

With the final dismantling of the British bases on its territory, Malta is intensely interested in the full and consistent implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. That is why the Communist Party of Malta supports the government in a policy aimed at expanding dialogue and cooperation with developing countries and with socialist-community nations. The CPM backs all initiatives that facilitate an improvement of the political situation in our region. It welcomed the convocation on Malta of an international conference against imperialist bases, for security and cooperation in our part of the world, that was co-sponsored by the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization and the Malta Labor Party.

Representatives of some 50 political parties, national liberation movements, and mass organizations in 25 countries on three continents made a detailed analysis of the problems aggravating the situation in the Mediterranean area and came to the conclusion that U.S. imperialist policy was chiefly to blame for the increased tension.

In its declaration this conference recorded the deterioration of the international situation. It emphasized that this was threatening détente, endangering the national independence of countries, and imperilling the social progress of peoples. Imperialist circles are bent on subjugating newly-independent countries and controlling their resources and political and cultural structures. This conference was another step toward uniting the peace forces of various political persuasions in the effort to turn the Mediterranean into a peace zone.

In the face of imperialism's heightened aggressiveness, it is by no means easy to achieve this aim. Precisely for this reason it is vital, now more than ever before, to strengthen cooperation in the international communist movement and enhance its vanguard role in the people's struggle against the whipping up of international tension, the revival of the cold war, and the threat of war. With this as its guideline, the Communist Party attaches enormous significance to the promotion of its relations with fraternal communist parties, notably with the

parties in the countries of the Mediterranean and contiguous regions. Here paramount importance is attached to the extension and strengthening of contacts with the communist parties of socialist countries.

Our stand, as stated in the documents adopted by the second congress, is that our party is an independent contingent of the international communist movement and committed to proletarian internationalism. The struggle for social progress and socialism on Malta, the CPM program declares, is inseparable from the common anti-imperialist struggle of the socialist countries, and the international working-class and national liberation movements. Moreover, it is linked to the powerful movement for peace and world security, against war and aggression, against the imperialist positions of strength policy.

Impelled by the working people's desire to see Malta completely independent, the Labor government has in recent years taken a series of important steps to build up the economic resources for the nation's independent and progressive development. It has put into effect socio-economic reforms that, while gradually extirpating the consequences of colonial backwardness, can lay the foundations for the Republic's further democratic development.

The drydocks, the island's largest industrial enterprise, have been placed under workers' control. The banks, telephone and telegraph, the radio and television network, and the air and marine transport have been nationalized. The government has created a number of state-run manufacturing facilities. It has introduced tax reforms, with the result that part of the revenues of private companies and the church has begun to go into the national treasury. Some laws related to wages and social security have been passed. Also, it must be mentioned that some steps have been taken to improve health care and education and to promote housing construction. All this has helped to upgrade the people's working and living conditions and influenced the thinking of most of the population. Steps of this kind have had and will have the active support of our party.

However, the Labor leaders have, at the same time, opted for a mixed economy with foreign investments as its life-line. The government keeps inviting Western firms to invest capital in the Maltese economy and open subsidiaries on the island. It has even published a brochure featuring the rights and privileges enjoyed by foreign companies in Malta.

In other words, the Labor leaders have chosen a path that objectively sets the nation on a course of dependent capitalist development,

with the result that Malta has been unable to avoid the economic crisis gripping the entire capitalist world. Inflation is rampant. Prices are rising inexorably. Thousands of working people are jobless, and many are employed partially or on a short working day. Meanwhile, the foreign and local capitalists reap the fruits of neo-colonialist policies.

While supporting the government's foreign policy decisions aimed at ensuring peace in the Mediterranean and strengthening goodneighborly relations among nations, the communists keep drawing the attention of Maltese public opinion to some internal problems affecting the welfare of the working class. The government's connivance at the neocolonialist practices of the Western capitalist investors who have penetrated Malta's economy not only hits at the living standard of the working people, including small-holders, farmers and fishermen, but mortally imperils the Republic's independence and sovereignty.

Stern economic reality makes radical changes urgent. These can only be achieved by an unremitting struggle against the legacy of colonialism, against the imperialist agents still operating in the country. The Communist Party of Malta urges reforms that would ensure an equitable distribution of incomes, the effective democratization of political life, and a steady rise of the Maltese people's living standard. Moreover, it urges a reduction of foreign investments, an end to the drain of profits into the pockets of foreign monopolies, and an enlargement of the public sector in the national economy. The communists are insisting on a reform of the state apparatus. These and other steps in the same direction would make it possible, with the support of the people, to implement social and economic changes with the ultimate goal of building a just society along socialist lines.

The Communist Party of Malta feels that the most pressing tasks of the moment are to freeze prices, broaden state forms of ownership, improve social security, increase pensions, abolish age, sex, or family discrimination in job opportunities, give an incentive to raising labor productivity by increasing wages, and reform income taxes in favor of workers' families and unmarried working people.

The many serious social and economic problems confronting Malta, as many other Mediterranean countries, have their origins in centuries-old backwardness, in the legacy left by colonial oppression, and in neocolonialist policies. Moreover, new problems have arisen. These spring from the shortage of raw mate-

rials, environmental pollution, and the struggle for seabed resources.

It is the CPM's stand that these difficulties and the problems inherited from the past can be surmounted if there is peace and security, by abolishing subordination to and dependence on international monopoly capital, achieving complete economic independence, and promoting all-sided, mutually-beneficial economic, scientific and technological cooperation with all countries. A contributing factor is that with the establishment of diplomatic relations with socialist countries and some developing nations Malta has broken out of the political isolation into which the imperialists had forced it on the international scene.

The benefits of such cooperation are seen in the economic returns from, for example, the building of a number of projects jointly with socialist countries and the expansion of Malta's trade relations with them. It is also seen from

the practice of implementing the marine and bunkering agreements signed with the Soviet Union. Soviet passenger, merchant and fishing vessels can now enter Malta and use the bunkering facilities at the former NATO installation. This provides many Maltese with employment and increases the country's currency reserves.

True sons and daughters of their people, the Maltese communists are confident that all the impediments to full independence can and will be surmounted. But for this it must be constantly borne in mind that peace, freedom, and well-being are never "given from above." They are won in struggle and labor. It is to this struggle and to this labor in the name of peace, democracy and social progress that our party calls the people of Malta. It sees its priority aim in spiking the imperialist plan of turning Malta into an unsinkable aircraft-carrier. Our islands must become a ship of peace.



Freedom of opinion illusions blasted

Gerhard Deumlich

member of the Presidium and Board Secretariat,
German Communist Party

COMMUNISTS AND THE MASS MEDIA

Our country is a visual example of the vast spread of the spectrum of problems in the capitalist reality inflaming social and political conflicts. The arms race being stepped up by the United States and NATO, a real threat that the FRG will be converted into a launching-pad for the new U.S. nuclear missiles, mass unemployment, the energy problem which has been exacerbated by the monopolies to the utmost, the crisis in the education system, the job ban for progressives, the discrimination against women, the anti-social housing policy, the peasants' uncertainty in the future, the far-gone destruction of the environment — all of these are no longer merely topics for discussion, but also causes taken up by diverse and broad public movements. An in-depth analysis of these problems was given by our party's sixth congress in Hannover at the end of May.

The deep conflicts and the ultimately irreconcilable contradictions between the interests of the people and the rule of big capital

characterize, it was said at the congress, the state of present-day West German society. From this it follows that the communists must daily reckon with the new phenomena and carry into the popular movements constructive alternatives which add up to the question of the country's future.

The activity of the mass media is closely connected with the prospects of the progressive forces' struggle. In November 1979, the Presidium of the GCP Board approved a document entitled "For a Democratic Policy on the Mass Media." It emphasized that the importance of the mass media under the scientific and technological revolution has increased to such an extent that on their further democratic development depends the democratic future of our country.

Every strike, every democratic action drives home to those who are fighting for their rights the fact that bourgeois mass media in the FRG are not at all the unbiased chroniclers or objective recorders of events, but instruments of the

ruling class. Monopoly capital has long since realized that they are just as important as the classical instruments of power and suppression of the masses. In its effort to pull out of the economic crisis, the bourgeois state has been cutting back appropriations for education and culture, but it has displayed the same solicitous concern for the mass media as it has for the arms industry.

But it is not only this typical attitude to the mass media in all the imperialist countries that has brought them to the fore as a problem of internal politics in the FRG. An acute polemic is now under way in the country in view of the intention of big capital to transform the whole media system. There is, above all, the attempt to do away with the so-called public-law status of radio and television and to entitle industrial and publishing concerns to have their own radio and TV stations. This would amount to deep intervention in the republic's inner-political structure, because the public-law status of radio and television is written into the constitution and is the people's democratic gain. Being aware that it would be hard to change this clause of the constitution by means of an ordinary amendment, the CDU/CSU, the SDPG and the FDP have resorted to all kinds of tricks, seeking to confuse the public and prevent it from having a say in solving this important problem.

The absence of private radio and television stations in the FRG is an achievement of the progressive forces. Over a long period, reaction has been making attempts to take away this gain. Let us recall, for instance, the scheme of Franz Josef Strauss — frustrated by a referendum — to convert Bavarian Radio into a private estate of the CSU. Later, the CDU also tried to fold up North German Radio and to foist on radio and television in Schleswig-Holstein and Lower Saxony new organizational forms that would give that party preponderance in the local mass media and pave the way for the establishment of the monopolies' radio and TV stations. Although in the latter instance reaction did make some headway, it failed to realize its scheme in full. Let us note that the defense of North German Radio was even the factor behind the first strike planned by radio and TV employees, a strike which was prevented by a court injunction.

The struggle is now entering into a more acute stage. Monopoly capital's tactics are aimed above all to secure control of novelties like cable and satellite television and video. For this purpose, Springer and Bertelsmann, the publishing companies, and Siemens, a leading manufacturer of communications equipment,

have joined together in putting pressure on the government and the legislative bodies.

The Association of West German Newspaper Publishers has decided to take part in a Radio Luxembourg project for commercial satellite television. Why? In order to spread its own programs along the channels of our television in a flanking movement, from abroad. CDU chairman Kohl has extolled this trick as the "event of the century," while the SDPG/FDP government has confined itself to embarrassed commentaries.

Experimental cable TV stations capable of simultaneously relaying many programs are being set up in a number of large cities (Munich, Mannheim, Ludwigshafen and Dortmund). This could, in principle, provide a good opportunity for using technological progress for the working people's interests, but from the outset this new type of television is being developed along a different line: the authorities have indulged the self-seeking interests of the publishing and industrial concerns, which have the decisive say in the planning and the conducting of the research connected with this novelty, and ignore the requirements of the inhabitants of the districts concerned. They have ignored the fundamental demand made not only by the GCP but also by the trade unions that cable television should be democratic, that is, that its programs should be drawn up in accordance with its public-law status, and in the light of the interests and desires of the population and TV workers themselves. The fact is that the monopolies are taking over the new TV studios and all the technical facilities required to run them.

The CDU and the CSU have been using the full plenitude of power in the Federal Lands, where these parties head the governments, to promote the interests of private capital. What is more, they have started a fierce campaign for private radio and television across the whole country. Meanwhile, the SDPG has made substantial concessions, paving the way for realizing the schemes of the publishing and electro-technical concerns, which already control the video and TV cassette market.

Under the domination of big capital, the scientific and technological revolution poses the danger of social regress. The monopolies' media policy is fraught with the same abuses as it is in the computer field, which is being used for the almost blanket surveillance of the population. That is why efforts must be made to prevent technological achievements, which create extensive potentialities for spreading democratic and humanistic culture and improving education, from remaining a

monopoly of those who regard them as a source of profit and as an instrument of their ideological domination.

The reactionary forces' policy in the media field is part and parcel of the extensive prophylactic measures taken by big capital for the purpose of maintaining its positions. These measures spring directly from the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, affect the system of education and upbringing, and include the recently stepped up attempts to curb the right to strike and demonstrate, and to eliminate the workers' participation in the management of production, and sanction lock-outs. FRG imperialism can no longer cope with the effect of the long-term factors of the crisis and has to wrestle with the progressive instability of its political system and face "irritated discontent with the state." The reactionary forces are worried about the fact that ever more young people turn their backs on the existing system, while the intelligentsia increasingly tends to criticize the capitalist society and is no longer capable of inventing pro-capitalist ideals. In these conditions, the ruling class no longer confines itself to interference in the functioning of the mass media but seeks to establish direct control over them.

Let me add, too, that here the international factor also has an important role to play. The FRG neighbors on the world of existing socialism, and West German imperialism would like to keep the media on a short leash so as to use them more effectively for hostile propaganda campaigns against the Soviet Union, the GDR and the rest of the socialist community, against détente and for a whipping up of the arms drive. Such subversive activity is being pioneered by the Munich-based CIA stations Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to which the federal government has displayed a highly tolerant attitude in token of its alliance with the USA within the NATO framework.

As has frequently happened in the history of bourgeois democracy, its own institutions — in this case the public-law status of the electronic mass media — tend to become obstacles or risk factors for the ruling class. Defense of this status, says the above mentioned GCP document on the media, "is a central task in the struggle for the maintenance and extension of democratic rights and freedoms." The communists' political conception of the mass media goes beyond the mere maintenance of the status quo: we have put forward the demand for democratic transformations in this sphere to counter the expansive claims of big capital. But while advocating the maintenance of the public-law status of radio and television, the GCP is

simultaneously aware that underneath its integument, big capital has long since established its preponderance. This will be seen both from the content of the programs, which meets the interests of the monopolies, and the disproportionately small representation of the trade unions and other democratic bodies on the supervisory boards, and also the removal of thousands of employees, editors and authors from effective participation in the management of radio and television.¹

The defense of the public-law status of the electronic mass media entails above all resistance to any attempts to privatize them. But we also believe it necessary to work for the definitive influence of organizations of the working class and other strata of the working people on the nature of the programs and personnel policy, for parity participation by station employees in the activity of administrative councils, and greater efforts to democratize the organizational forms of radio and television. This is bound to affect the interests of those who believe that the democratic influence there, is much too great as it is. Potentialities for exerting such an influence do exist, there are progressive-minded men and women among the editors and authors, and critical programs and films are broadcast on the air and played on small and big screens. Reaction has been making loud noises about the "infiltration" of radio and television by the "left," and wants the removal of many editors and authors and the elimination of a whole range of broadcasts: in other words, it has shown very well that in this area there is no room for any illusions about "pluralism."

The drive by the right-wing forces is the result of the accelerated concentration of private-enterprise in printing and publishing and the emergence of giant monopolies. The Springer newspaper concern has already secured a preponderant influence throughout the country and in many big cities and whole regions its rule is undivided.

Bertelsmann, which closely collaborates with the Second German TV Company, carries on its business operation on an even larger scale. It issues books, newspapers, records and films, owns printing shops, distribution agencies and shares of publishing houses throughout Western Europe and the United States. The growth of its annual sale, totalling 5 billion marks, is now second only to those of the oil transnationals. In the mass media of the capitalist world, Bertelsmann ranks second to CBS of the United States.

It is precisely such octopus monopolies, deceptively flaunting the slogans of "free enter-

prise," "greater diversity of programs," or "broader satisfaction of human preferences" that seek to do away with the now burdensome façade of radio and television and to introduce the same private-enterprise arrangements as there are in the newspaper and publishing business. This threatens to convert the constitutional freedom of the press and opinion into a farce. Since only a handful of multimillionaires are able to finance mass media under the scientific and technological revolution — something that gives them an undemocratic monopoly in shaping public opinion, says the GCP in this context, it is high time to convert newspaper and publishing concerns and companies making and distributing films to public ownership under democratic control. Quite understandably, this demand also includes the removal from FRG territory of the subversive CIA stations: Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Such is our alternative. The communists realize that this cannot be achieved in the immediate future, considering the present internal political balance of forces. But the struggle is already under way within the framework of action for the solution of many urgent everyday tasks, among them provision of jobs for media workers, introduction of standard labor contracts for staff and non-staff employees, improvement of their professional training, and guaranteed security in old age. To this should be added more effective defense of elected persons and representatives of young people from dismissal, solidarity of trade unions and the public in the struggle against censorship and the efforts to fire politically active editors, producers and authors. There is also, of course, a need for vigilance in face of the attempts to manipulate public opinion by efforts to discredit the working class movement and action by various democratic forces.

The conditions for a dynamic advance of this struggle have become more favorable. The Association of German Trade Unions and sectoral industrial trade unions have written into their programs and special resolutions the demand for greater influence by the working class on the media. The opposition by the Radio and Television Workers Union against the winding up of the North German Radio, and preparations for the planned first strike by workers in the electronic media met with support and expressions of solidarity from a sizable section of the other trade unions in the country. The logic of events dictates the conclusion that there is a need to set up one trade union for all workers in the mass media: radio, television, the press and publishing, as a concrete form of close cooperation between the working class and the intel-

ligentsia. This idea is winning ever greater support, and has already brought about some initial organizational steps. In a number of big cities, broad civic initiative movements are vigorously acting for democratic radio and television.

The Communist Party seeks to explain its media policy to the public, arranging discussions with those who work in this field, and putting out special topical issues of its production papers. The communists are, of course, always in the front ranks of the trade-union and public struggle for a democratic and progressive press, radio and television.

The first prerequisite of success in all these actions is consolidation of the mass media owned by the working class. We believe this to be the most important step in creating a powerful force opposed to the ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie. This potential is not so small. It includes the GCP's daily *Unsere Zeit*, production, local, district and higher-school papers of the party, journals issued by progressive young people and students, anti-fascist and democratic periodical publications, progressive book publishers, firms turning out records, film studios and the trade-union press. Altogether, a force of the democratic and working-class movement to be reckoned with.

Our party's sixth congress adopted a special decision which not only confirms the earlier formulated basic principles of GCP policy on the media but also sets forth concrete measures. The GCP Board was authorized to prepare for publication circumstantial and well-argued material to facilitate the primary organizations' explanatory work among the population and the convocation of a working meeting on the mass media problem with representatives of regional, district and primary organizations on whose territory technical experiments are being staged to introduce cable and other types of television.

The congress decision emphasizes that the "GCP reaffirms its readiness to cooperate with everyone, regardless of their views, in the struggle for the democratic development of the mass media."²

Marx said that the democratic press "is, and should be, nothing but the public, admittedly often passionate . . . expression of the daily thoughts and feelings of a people. . . . It sympathizes with all the latter's hopes and fears, love and hatred, joys and sorrows."³ Today it is a matter of urgency for our country to make the mass media truly serve the people. The communists are resolved to develop among the working class an understanding of the fact that this is not a matter of some narrow, specific

requirements in a single sphere, but one of the key political issues. It is an issue on which largely depends success in the struggle to ensure peace in Europe and throughout the world, the struggle to turn our country toward democratic and social progress.

1. This is being done on the basis of the law on the Statute of Radio and Television. It contains clauses on the

so-called protection of the non-commercial character of the enterprise. In the FRG, enterprises turning out magazines, books, films, records, etc., are regarded as "non-commercial" in virtue of their ideological character, and are painstakingly safeguarded from participation by those who work in the management of their affairs. Here you have a fine self-exposure of bourgeois freedoms!

2. *Unsere Zeit*, June 4, 1981.

3. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 311-312.

Fighting in the forefront against the nuclear threat

With the aggressive imperialist forces openly rejecting détente, eroding its norms of peaceful coexistence and cooperation of nations, and stepping up the arms race, the communists believe that their most important and most pressing task is to unite and mobilize broad social forces and search for new forms and methods of struggle against the nuclear threat, for more durable peace and security, and the internationalization of activities for peace. The following reports on initiatives and actions of the communists and other peace forces are based on contributions from *WMR* representatives of fraternal parties and party press reports.

Discussions before demonstration

The Flemish Committee Against Atomic Weapons and the National Action Committee for Peace and Development are mobilizing public opinion to oppose the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons and to demand the resumption of talks on medium-range missiles. Belgium's communists widely support the activity of these committees, which are made up of organizations and people of diverse political convictions. The Communist Party of Belgium (CPB) is taking an active part in preparations for a nationwide demonstration to be held in October 1981. Public discussions and numerous demonstrations against the nuclear threat are being held in many cities. The CPB believes that by linking up with the anti-war action that is to take place in London, Paris and Bonn in the same period, the October demonstration will acquire international significance. The communists publicize the idea of creating a security zone in Europe that would involve 30 states without nuclear arms of their own. This plan has been put forward by public figures and MPs in Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland and Belgium, including representatives of the CPB.

Parliament picketed

The decision of Britain's Tory government to allow the deployment of U.S. missiles in Britain and modernize the country's nuclear arsenal has given rise to a powerful protest movement in which the communists play a prominent role. Peace supporters are carrying on their campaign in diverse forms. They daily picket the Houses of Parliament with slogans like "No to Cruise Missiles" and "No to Tridents." This action will continue until the UN holds its special session on disarmament, due in 1982. By then, it is planned to collect seven million signatures to a petition against nuclear arms and to hold numerous demonstrations, marches and rallies.

Defeat dangerous plans

Demonstrators in Tilburg, Northern Brabant, Netherlands, have protested against the build-up of nuclear potentials, the imposition of new U.S. missiles on Western Europe, including the Netherlands, and NATO's militarist preparations. In the course of rallies and discussions on the university campus, speaker after speaker insisted on removing U.S. bombs, shells and missiles with nuclear warheads from Dutch territory. Among the more active participants in the nationwide movement of peace supporters are numerous members of the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN). It was resolute action by the communists against the new and dangerous plans of the United States and NATO that helped the party make gains in the recent general election. Over 178,000 votes were cast for the communists, with the result that three CPN candidates won election to Parliament.

For the peace forces' unity

A meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Spain (CPS) has reaffirmed the communists' negative attitude to NATO. Membership in

NATO, the CPS points out, would mean deployment of nuclear weapons on Spanish soil, curtailment of national sovereignty and subordination of the country's armed forces to the interests of the Pentagon. The communists regard as a growing threat to peace the U.S. imperialists' current policy of aggression designed to step up the arms race, undermine détente and increase international tension. The communists believe that this situation calls for joint resistance by all the forces acting for peace.

Cross-continental march

An Action Week Against Nuclear Weapons has been held in Norway. The participants demanded that the government should bar nuclear arms from Norwegian soil. Within the framework of the Action Week, a rally was staged by Scandinavian peace supporters who had organized a march from Copenhagen to Paris. A national relay for peace started at North Cape, the northern tip of the country, and finished in Oslo. Norway's communists regard these actions and their own part in them as important steps toward the accomplishment of the tasks set by the recent meeting of the National Board of the CPN, which called on the communists to fight for détente, disarmament and peace and for the creation of a Nordic nuclear-free zone.

Resisting U.S. pressure

The communists play a notable role in the No-to-Nuclear-Arms Movement in Portugal, which involves numerous political leaders, trade unionists, youth and student organizations, intellectuals, members of local government bodies, workers, peasants and clergymen. Tens of thousands of Portuguese have signed an appeal directed against the introduction of U.S. nuclear arms into Portugal. The success of the campaign was made possible, among other things, by a PCP CC document showing in detail the dangers stemming from the deployment of new U.S. bases and nuclear missiles on Portuguese territory.

Appeal finds response

"Let us form a popular peace movement in every country to safeguard our cultural, historical and material values from destruction in the flames of a new war." This joint appeal by the communists of Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden has met with growing support. The latest congress of the Communist Youth League

of Sweden (Stockholm) adopted a declaration entitled "Campaign for a Non-Nuclear North" which emphasizes the significance of the peace forces' struggle against the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, for disarmament and military détente. Demonstrations and marches bring together not only communists but representatives of numerous political trends, the trade-union movement and Christian organizations.

Congress ideas in action

The sixth congress of the German Communist Party (GCP) declared that the communists are determined to make every effort for disarmament, to prevent the deployment of new nuclear missiles in the Federal Republic, bring about understanding among nations and safeguard peace. Action against the threat of nuclear destruction is gathering strength and scope. Evidence of this is seen in the Peace Weeks held in many cities. GCP members cooperate with members of other political parties, anti-war organizations, trade unions, youth, women's and ecological movements and religious groups in holding discussions and rallies within the framework of Peace Weeks and in sponsoring film shows, concerts and other events. Each Peace Week closes with a mass demonstration. For example, 20,000 peace fighters took to the streets in Monchengladbach.

Three basic principles

The Standing Bureau of the CC Presidium, Communist Party of Japan (CPJ), has called on the people to resist the introduction of U.S. nuclear weapons into Japan and to fight for the abrogation of the Japanese-U.S. "security" treaty and the enactment of a law laying down three non-nuclear principles: no manufacture, introduction or storage of nuclear weapons on Japanese territory. These demands enjoy widespread public support. The National Council for Peace, Democracy and the Unity of Progressive Forces has held its constituent assembly in Tokyo. The delegates represented all prefectures and nearly 1,000 democratic and mass organizations with nearly 3,900,000 members. A powerful protest demonstration against the deployment of nuclear arms in Japan took place in the capital on the initiative of the CPJ. A rally held in one of Tokyo's largest parks drew nearly 100,000 workers, employees and members of youth and women's movements.



The international and the national in the working-class movement

International Scientific Theoretical Conference

An international scientific theoretical conference, "The Dialectics of the National and the International in the Working Class Movement; the Formation of Internationalist and National Consciousness and the Behavior of the Working Class in Contemporary Conditions; Ways and Experience of the Communists' Struggle" was held at Balatonföldvár in Hungary from May 5 to 7, 1981. It was sponsored by the HSWP CC together with WMR.

It was attended by the representatives of communist and revolutionary-democratic parties and Marxist scientists from 47 countries of the world, including Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, FRG, Finland, France, GDR, Great Britain, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, USSR, USA, Venezuela, Vietnam, and People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. The conference was also attended by members of the WMR Editorial Board.

The opening speech at the plenary sitting was delivered by M. Ovari, HSWP CC Political Bureau member and CC secretary. The conference then resolved into two sections. The participants in the conference prepared written statements circulated in advance to the other participants. The discussion was carried on in the light of the ideas set forth in these statements, by way of comradely discussion and open comparison of standpoints. The concluding plenary sitting heard reports on the work of the sections by their chairmen: Janos Berecz, HSWP CC member and head of the CC International Department, and James West, CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA, WMR Editorial Board member. The conference was closed by CPSU CC alternate member, WMR Editor-in-Chief Konstantin Zarodov.

A. Gyenes, Secretary of the HSWP CC, who took part in the work of the conference, conveyed on behalf of Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the HSWP CC, wishes of further successes in

the work of the Editorial Board and Editorial Council of the Journal.

The papers presented by the conferees and the verbatim report of the speeches, rejoinders and remarks, run to over 2,000 typewritten pages. It is, consequently, quite impossible to present an exhaustive report of the content in the limited space available to a journal and to show the course of the discussion in each of the two sections of the conference. Besides, some points were duplicated. That is why in this review, the assessments, views and judgments of the conferees are grouped by topics so as to make them available to the reader even if in concise form. Coverage of the conference will continue in future issues.

UNITY OF TWO TENDENCIES

Opening Speech by Miklos Ovari
CC Political Bureau member and CC Secretary,
Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

We note with a sense of satisfaction that this is the third time that we join *World Marxist Review* in holding an international theoretical conference here on the shores of Lake Balaton on the current questions of the communist movement. In 1976, we gathered to discuss the cooperation of the three main revolutionary forces of our day in the struggle for international détente. In 1979, we met again to consider the complex problem of the interaction between revolution and democracy. For our party, these meetings were useful and helped to acquaint it with interesting experience and new approaches to the problems under discussion.

In the present-day struggle against imperialism, as in the struggle for world peace, special importance is attached to the unity and cohesion of the communist and workers' parties. At the same time, it is the strengthening of the communist and working-class movement that creates the conditions enabling the parties independently to determine their own strategy, tactics and policies, to choose their own way to

socialism or the concrete mode of its construction. This enhances each fraternal party's responsibility and, accordingly, increase the need for an exchange of experience in an open, comradely and creative atmosphere.

Consultations between our parties and informal international theoretical conferences are an indispensable means for finding the right answers to the new problems raised by life and in the development of our theoretical work and practical activity. That is why the HSWP willingly takes part in such meetings, and why it was happy to act as host. Mutual respect on the part of the participants has run right through the work of our earlier conferences. Complete equality is the general principle in relations between our parties, and it will, of course, be observed in the theoretical discussion which is about to begin.

On the agenda is a topic which also bears on the main issues dealt with at earlier meetings. Its discussion will help to cover a wider range of problems, and here we shall be able to rely on the conclusions — useful conclusions, we believe — drawn in the course of comradely discussions at earlier conferences and borne out by experience.

We believe that today's topic is especially meaningful and important. Our common experience proves that the correct establishment of the dialectical interconnection of the national and the international and the practical activity carried on in the light of this dialectics have a decisive influence on success in the struggle of the individual parties, on strengthening the cohesion between them, and on successfully advancing the world revolutionary process.

The fraternal parties within the international communist movement are carrying on their struggle for common goals within the national framework. The conditions of their activity and their potentialities are different. In some instances, these differences are substantial. Accordingly, their immediate tasks are different as well. This objective reality exerts an influence on the shaping of our ties and the development of our cooperation. The result is an enrichment of the revolutionary movement.

However, the difference in the conditions of activity and immediate tasks before the parties cannot divide us in any way. We are linked by our scientific world view, the basic interests of the working class, which are objectively identical, despite national boundaries, and on that basis, by the common goals of international solidarity in the fight against internationally organized capital, against imperialism.

On the basis of all this, it is not only possible

but necessary to work constantly to coordinate national and international factors which determine the development of our cooperation and, naturally, the strengthening of our unity. In the light of the fundamental community of interests of the international working class, the HSWP attaches exceptional importance to cooperation between the communist and workers' parties in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The idea of internationalism in the history of the working-class movement has been constantly enriched. Its influence increased, and as a consequence of this, the international communist movement has become the mightiest political movement of our epoch. Addressing the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties in 1976, comrade Janos Kadar emphasized the following: "In our opinion, the idea of proletarian internationalism harmoniously combines national and international interests, because the achievements of the individual parties strengthen our movement, and the strengthening of the international communist movement assists the individual parties.

"Proletarian internationalism is mutual solidarity and assistance, comradely cooperation which presumes the independence and equality of the individual parties and non-interference in each other's internal affairs."

From our standpoint, proletarian internationalism presumes the urge for unity, regular exchanges of opinion, joint standpoints and united actions by the independent and sovereign communist and workers' parties on the most fundamental issues, studies of the common experience of the movements, its consideration and enrichment on the basis of one's own experience, and consistent struggle against anti-Marxist views. In this spirit, the HSWP strengthens its relations with the fraternal parties and seeks to contribute to the accomplishment of the aims of our common struggle for peace and social progress.

It is an objective uniformity of social development that national development and internationalization run in close interconnection with each other, and it is a specific feature of our epoch that the national character of development in the individual countries and the process of internationalization tend to gain in strength simultaneously. Without an understanding of the dialectics of the national and the international, without its conscious translation into life it is impossible to tackle national tasks successfully or to attain common goals. Any concept that reckons only with national development, ignoring the international, is

bound to lead to national seclusion and isolation. Any abstract concept that gives absolute validity to the objective tendency of internationalization and disregards national development is likewise bound to remain ineffective, because it is out of touch with the concrete social realities in the life of nations.

National and international interests are determined by objective circumstances, with the connection between them constantly developing and changing. Its correct understanding, and ability to apply this understanding in practice are crucially determined by the party's theoretical activity. When considering the inter-relation of international and national interests and objectives, one must recall that the history of our party was not devoid of subjectivist mistakes in this sphere. In the initial phase of socialist construction, in the period of the personality cult, many aspects of the national were regarded as impediments retarding our development. We also gave absolute value to the common, the international, and in making use of international experience often disregarded our own conditions, our national specifics. In the period preceding the counter-revolution of 1956, however, attempts were made to give absolute prevalence to the individual, national features in contrast to the common, general and international aspects.

Misunderstanding and practical negation of the dialectical relations between the national and the international aspects formed a common element of and gave identical substance to these two — nominally antithetical — concepts. The tragic events taught us that only a consistent struggle on two fronts, against both distorting views, can enable us to choose the right path and to ensure stable development of our socialist society.

A thorough analysis of our historical experience following the counter-revolution of 1956 produced the conclusion — and this has been our party's invariable stand for almost a quarter-century now — that no one can be a true internationalist unless he takes account of national peculiarities, just as no one can be a true patriot unless he is also an internationalist.

Under socialism, national and international interests, internationalism and socialist patriotism mutually presuppose each other, proceed from one another, are based on each other and mutually complement each other. The national and the international are a dialectical unity. Like every unity, this, too, carries within itself its own contradiction. This unity is not shaped automatically, either in consciousness or in practical activity. The attainment of this unity requires of all the parties a concrete

analysis of the concrete situation and the constantly renewed harmony of national and international interests.

Even if through a complex process of transmission, it is essentially the objective class interests that are reflected and the fundamentally opposing positions of the bourgeoisie and the working class that are expressed in the concrete interpretation of the relationship between the national and the international aspects. The position of the bourgeoisie on the question of patriotism, the nationalism and cosmopolitanism which it feeds, are a reflection of the class interests of capital. Socialist patriotism and the idea of proletarian internationalism express the interests of the working class. With the victory of the socialist revolution, the working class roots out nationalism in society. Nationalism is deprived of its objective basis. But our earlier assumptions that in the course of socialist construction we would manage to solve the problem of nationalism relatively rapidly and consummately proved to be an illusion. Our experience says that the potentialities for expressions of nationalism also remain in the socialist countries, because it is not easy to overcome the ideological legacy of the overthrown social system. The preservation of nationalism is promoted by imperialist propaganda; in some instances, the mistakes we made in the course of socialist construction or the weakness of our ideological work have also had a role to play.

This phenomenon is a real theoretical and practical problem which makes it necessary for us to study it more fundamentally. In Central and Eastern Europe, the range of problems arising in this connection tends to be enlarged because of the existence of national minorities. Our party is sure that the existence of socialist relations creates the basic objective conditions for the complete elimination of nationalism and for a just and lasting settlement of national minority issues through the consistent implementation of Leninist principles.

But even under socialism this does not happen automatically. A very great deal depends on the subjective factors, and theoretical and practical activity of the communist and workers' parties acquires an exceptionally responsible role.

The fact that the national minorities living in our countries are objectively able to act as the connecting link between us follows from our social system, from the community of our basic interests and goals. And it is in the interest not only of each individual country, but also in the common international interests that that should be so.

The question of tying in general uniformities and national peculiarities is, we believe, an especially important one in the dialectical interconnection of the national and the international.

In the socialist countries, too, there is a simultaneous realization of the two tendencies in social development: national progress and internationalization. The experience of Hungary's three decades of socialist development shows that the elimination of exploitation created the possibilities for our country's genuine national progress.

For a long time, bourgeois propaganda tried to scare our people by claiming that socialism tends to blur the national features and to destroy the national identity. Practice has convincingly proved that socialism paves the way not only for social but also for national advance. The application of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and of the general uniformities in keeping with concrete conditions and national specifics has been an indispensable source of our successful creative endeavor. The drawing of the socialist countries closer to each other, as Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th congress of the CPSU, is continuing. The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee pointed out that this does not eliminate the national and historical peculiarities of the socialist countries. In their social life and the diversity of the forms of economic organization we must see that which exists in reality: the wealth of ways and means of developing the socialist way of life.

The HSWP's programmatic stand is that the construction of a developed socialist society requires the work and activity of people whose love for their socialist homeland is inseparable from internationalism. The simultaneous development of the one and the other — that is the important task in shaping the socialist consciousness. The importance of this was specifically indicated by the October 1976 plenary meeting of the HSWP CC, which considered party propaganda. It emphasized, in particular, the following: our party's propaganda work has the same basis as the whole of its policy and practical activity, namely, the developing theory of Marxism-Leninism and the rich experience of the Hungarian and the international working-class movement. In order to further strengthen the unity of theory and practice, there is a need to concentrate attention on the multifaceted elaboration of theoretical problems, especially those connected with the building of a developed socialist society, the nature of power and socialist democracy, pro-

letarian internationalism and socialist patriotism.

Our party and our working class are the heirs and continuators of all the progressive historical traditions and the keepers of all the true values of our national past. Our working class and its revolutionary party, the leading force of the society, express the national interests and bear the responsibility for the future of the nation. It is our conviction that socialism embodies the true interests of our nation today, and will continue to do so in the future. That is why our people regard the program for building a developed socialist society as their own national program. An important source of the effectiveness of our creative endeavor is active socialist patriotism, which means social activity, work and a constant readiness to serve the country.

Addressing a ceremonial meeting of the Central Committee to mark the 60th anniversary of our party's foundation, Janos Kadar said: "Assessing the experiences of our historical path, we are entitled to say with a clear conscience that our party has been a patriotic internationalist party from the very first moment of its foundation until now, and will remain so in the future too. Our party, a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary vanguard of the working class has always proclaimed the principle of proletarian internationalism and has proved its loyalty to it by its deeds. Our party expresses solidarity with the communist and workers' parties of the world, with the Soviet Union and the member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty, with all the peoples building socialism, with the peoples fighting for their liberty and with the progressive forces of the world. Those of our comrades who fought arms in hand for the victory of the revolution in Russia in the years of the civil war, those who fought in the international brigades for the Spanish Republic and who, in every European country, joined the units of the armed anti-fascist resistance — although being far from their homeland — fought for their own country, for our people, for the freedom of the people."*

The HSWP continues resolutely to reject both bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism. We educate our people and youth in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, principles which are indissolubly connected with each other. We are true to our people's red-white-green flag, and to the red banner of the international working-class movement. In accordance with our people's chief national interests, we safe-

*Nepszabadsag, November 21, 1978.

guard and constantly strengthen our friendship and solidarity with the Soviet Union, with the forces of socialism and progress, and with the communist and workers' parties of the whole world.

Elemental force and the role of education

Which are the factors, on a world scale and in the conditions of individual countries, that now influence the shaping of the national and the internationalist consciousness of the working class, of masses of people? What are the problems and tasks this poses before the communist parties and the revolutionary liberation movements? These questions were dealt with over a large part of the discussion.

Dr. Johannes Henrich von Heiseler of the Institute of Marxist Studies in Frankfurt-on-Main (German CP) proposed that a distinction should be drawn between two processes which interweave with each other in life and which have an influence on national and internationalist consciousness. One of these is the development of the spontaneously shaping general features of thinking, emotions, urges and views of the working class. The other is the spread of theoretically formalized systems of views representing the interests of the chief classes locked in struggle; in other words, the struggle of ideologies.

The condition of the wage worker ultimately impels him to seek to eliminate the relations oppressing him. Such is the spontaneous basis of anti-capitalist positions and attitudes. But, on the other hand, reality again and again forces the wage worker to give attention to the objectively existing competition between him, as the individual seller of labor-power, and other wage workers. The urge for unity in the presence of competition with others of one's kind is ideologically expressed not only in spontaneous criticism of this state, but also in the illusory notion of a social partnership between wage-labor and capital.

Consequently, on the level of spontaneous shaping of the working-class consciousness, we find two opposite tendencies: one toward the development of a true class consciousness, and the other, toward the production and reproduction of forms of false consciousness corresponding to capitalism. But these tendencies do not unfold of themselves. Here, the organized forces of the ruling class go into action in an effort to twist the consciousness of the proletariat, to fragment it and to make it unfit for collective practice. Here there must also be set in motion the organized forces of the working class, above all the Marxist working-class parties, on which primarily depends the

development of the political class consciousness of the working people.

On them depends whether masses of workers come to realize the structural relations constituting the foundation of the capitalist society. This understanding does not spring from a comprehension of the antithetical interests of labor and capital within the framework of the given enterprise. Of course, personal experience is a good basis for carrying this understanding from the level of the workplace and the enterprise to the level of the firm and the concern. But even for this, immediate experience alone is inadequate. When it comes to getting the workers to comprehend their class interests on the national, let alone international scale, the communist party, its ideological and educational work are indispensable.

The growth of the productive forces and their internationalization accelerated by the scientific and technological revolution; the growing interdependence of countries in that which pertains to energy, raw-material and food-supply problems, protection of the environment, problems of the World Ocean, etc.; and, first and foremost, the development of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons systems which could put an end to life on the globe—all of this, in the opinion of James West, CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA, has created new conditions objectively exerting an influence on the shaping of social consciousness.

For communists in the United States, the internationalist outlook, and I stress the word outlook, has always been essential for a number of special reasons. Among them is the historical and present-day position of U.S. imperialism in the world, the role of the U.S. transnationals, the mixed national and racial composition of our population, including the working class. The Communist Party has perseveringly waged a struggle for asserting the ideas of internationalism among the masses of working people. Here, considerable success has been achieved. We cannot as yet say that the working class of the United States is overwhelmingly anti-capitalist, but in its midst are already highly developed anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist, that is, internationalist, feelings of solidarity with the peoples fighting against oppression and exploitation. And that is an important step in the shaping of the class consciousness proper.

Valdez Vivo, member of the CP Cuba Central Committee, said that patriotic and internationalist feelings, like the corresponding consciousness, tended to emerge on a different soil. Revolutionaries awaken in themselves and in the whole people feelings of patriotism for

the purposes of liberation. It is impossible to deny that these feelings become the chief motive for the people's national action. However, internationalism has a different, class basis.

To substantiate this standpoint, Vivo analyzed the experience of revolutionary struggle and defense of socialist gains in Cuba. He showed, in particular, how the content of the famous slogan "Patria o muerte," how the very notion of "country" had changed in the consciousness of the masses: today it is no longer a matter of loyalty to one's homeland, as in the past, but also of loyalty to socialism.

The advance from the national consciousness to the international is just as important as the understanding of the reciprocal connection between them. Cuba has succeeded in remaining an independent sovereign state owing to the international solidarity of other countries, of other nations. That is why millions of Cubans now accept Fidel Castro's idea that "we would be the most ungrateful people and the victims of the most terrible form of human self-complacency and foul and despicable chauvinism, which we resolutely condemn, if we believed that we are capable of performing our revolutionary feat exclusively with our own forces, and forgot how much we owe to international solidarity."* Cuba's example shows, Vivo stressed, that there is a growth of the masses' patriotism with the growth of the internationalist consciousness.

Our common goal, that is, socialism, the building of a communist society, is essentially an international one, said Academician A.M. Rumyantsev (USSR). But socialism does not arise spontaneously. And people are not born either as fighters for socialism or as internationalists, but become such. They adopt this ideological and political stand. They are educated by participation in the revolutionary struggle, and in socialist and communist construction, in our country this is done under the CPSU's leadership. Of course, these processes go forward on the national soil. But this applies, one could say, to the ways and means of the struggle for the new social system and its development. Here there are always many specific national elements, whether in terms of concrete achievements or difficulties. But if the main, the ultimate goal is not lost sight of — and, I repeat, in content, in nature it is international — the consciousness of revolutionaries, of the builders of socialism is also shaped as internationalist.

*"Discurso pronunciado por el Comandante en Jefe Fidel Castro Ruz en la Sesión Solemne de la Asamblea Nacional del Poder Popular por el XX Aniversario de la Victoria de la Revolución." Havana, 1979, p. 26.

Jeronimo Carrera, member of the CP Venezuela CC, brought out five basic factors which, in his opinion, determine the historical context in which the problem on the conference agenda needs to be considered. First, the growing role of the international working class as a whole; the growing influence of the socialist community of states; the impossibility of solving on the national level, some acute economic problems; the development of the means of communication and exchange on the basis of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution; the almost complete collapse of the colonial system as a result of the international solidarity of the peoples. Taken together, all of this signifies the start of the decline of nationalist ideology. By contrast, internationalism is becoming an ever mightier ideological weapon. In one way or another it penetrates the consciousness of masses of people throughout the world.

Marx and Engels believed that proletarian internationalism is a force capable of changing the world. Their forecast has been justified. And that does not at all contradict the fact that the national self-consciousness of the peoples has also markedly grown.

It would be unscientific and even fatal for the international working-class movement to fail to notice a great many negative phenomena which arise from the fact that the expression and realization of national aspirations and rights are being more or less limited. That is why Marxism-Leninism attaches much importance to the nationality question and the study of relevant problems. On their solution in the internal plane largely depends the success of socialism, and in the international plane, the creation of a climate of lasting peace and development of cooperation among states.

Internationalism can be harmonized with national interests, and the communists should work to this end, declared Sarada Mitra, member of the National Council of the CP India. But what are national interests? In 1942, a trend took shape in India expressing the national aspirations of the people in such a way that it had the intention of staging an uprising against British rule and expected to rely on assistance from the Japanese army which was approaching the country's borders. Our party was forced to start a struggle against such ideas and plans. This cost us some loss of our political influence. But ultimately, our orientation toward genuine, basic and long-term national interests, an orientation resting on an analysis of international realities yielded fruit. The importance of the rout of fascist Germany and Japanese militarism as a necessary prerequisite for the

successful development of the liberation struggle in India was widely realized, and the stand earlier taken by our party appeared to Indian patriots in a new light. The prestige of the communists rose once again.

In the course of the discussion, many participants found it necessary to emphasize the importance of some general theoretical and methodological principles in analyzing the dialectics of the national and the international. Attention was drawn to the fact that while being of independent scientific value, such studies should also help to make the parties' educational work in the masses more effective. Questions connected with the demarcation and ordering of the relevant concepts and terms were also raised.

Girgin Girginov, member of the Bulgarian CP CC, dealt mainly with the importance of the strictly scientific approach to the problems under discussion. He emphasized, in particular, that science, which is international as such, does not at all make meaningless the summing-up and comprehension of nationally limited experience. However, national or regional practice can become a basis for genuine scientific conclusions only when its analysis is based on general theory and methodology.

The coherent theoretical system of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, would lose its value if it was unsuitable for analyzing national phenomena and could not be used in national social practice. But from this it does not at all follow that, being applied to specific local conditions, theory which is essentially international becomes a national one. Attempts to create regional versions of Marxism, to "sinicize" or "africanize" it are just as absurd as an attempt to create national physics or regional mathematics.

Many preconceptions, distorted notions about reality and confusion of concepts tend to arise on the level on which the everyday consciousness is shaped. The level of scientific theory, which is designed to give an adequate reflection of the objective realities of the world, is another matter. This problem cannot be solved otherwise than through tireless theoretical work by the Marxist-Leninist party and its educational and propaganda activity aimed to develop the patriotic and internationalist elements of consciousness which are introduced into it as scientific generalizations.

Iosif Boda, scientific secretary of the Romanian Institute of Political Sciences and the Study of National Problems, said that in clarifying the substance of the problems connected with the national and the international, to say nothing of presenting our conclusions to the

masses, we must take care about our formulations and definitions. Words must always be used with circumspection. That is why, he said, a specification of the concepts of "international," "internationalist," "national," "nationalistic," "nationalism," "patriotism," etc., could become an important subject of a special study. In practice, all these categories to some extent intersect with each other. But now that, as other speakers have said here, the problems we are considering have acquired exceptional significance, it is especially important to avoid unnecessary confusion, whether in terminology or, accordingly, in arguments of substance.

I think that it is important to draw a clearcut line between the national proper and the patriotic consciousness, between the negative and the positive in national traditions and their present-day perception, said Leonardo Paso, CC alternate member, CP Argentina. I think that national feelings and even, one might say, patriotism, are in certain conditions a possible channel through which the bourgeois ideology infiltrates the mass consciousness. Consider Peronism in our country. Ideologically, it is a bourgeois nationalistic expression of the bourgeoisie's pseudo-patriotism. Since 1946, we have been working for unity with the Peronist masses, and we are always faced with the question of what attitude to take to the values of the national consciousness adopted by the members of that trend. In this case, we take a negative attitude to the Peronist view of the historical past, the role of the working class today, the periodization of historical epochs, etc.

Here, I think, the epoch to which the various elements of national culture apply is a question of tremendous importance. Today, nationalistic circles in our society uphold traditions cherished by the Argentinians, elements of popular creativity which emerged in the period when the bourgeoisie was a rising class and fought for national independence. These are used to preach social harmony, of which there is now not the slightest sign in the country. Where then is the boundary line beyond which patriotism turns into its antithesis, into the defense of the interests of the ruling class?

Paso also said that when considering the problems on the agenda, notably, the present state of the nationality question, full account should be taken of the distinctions in their nature and expressions in the socio-economic conditions of developed capitalism, the developing countries and socialism.

This review considers the proceedings of the conference from this angle and on the follow-

ing pages presents some of these problems grouped in accordance with comrade Paso's proposal.

In the developed capitalist countries, speakers said, the growth of national consciousness has become one of the distinctive features of our day, and it is all the more important to clarify the reasons for this, because it has emerged despite the sharply intensified tendencies toward the internationalization of social life.

Daniel Debatisse, a staff member of the Foreign Policy Department of the French CP Central Committee and a member of the board of the Institute of Marxist Studies, said that in the present conditions national independence is a most acute question for France and its people. This is usually considered only in political, military or diplomatic terms. We believe that of crucial importance today are its social and economic aspects.

The authorities, the Socialist Party keep talking about the crisis. But they distort its nature and present it mainly as a crisis that is global and external with respect to France. There are, of course, international features to the crisis, which influence national development, but they do not, we believe, give ground for referring the sources of the crisis situation to phenomena of a world order, and what is most important, to make the struggle of the working people in each country dependent on the maturing of a militant consciousness in the whole of the society or on proposed solutions of problems on the European, Atlantic or super-national levels. Our approach is that the crisis and the ways of dissolving it are above all of a national character.

Here we find that the on-going crisis is a crisis of the imperialist system of exploitation and domination. It is expressed in a deepening of the contradictions between the growing forces of progress and the capitalist structures which stubbornly prevent their advance.

Armando Lopez Salinas, a member of the Executive Committee of the CP Spain CC, spoke of the crisis as a most important factor in sharpening the problems arising from the national and the international. In his view, the present situation shows that the postwar model of capitalist accumulation has been fully worked out. Capitalism tries to start a new process of accumulation which intensifies socio-political authoritarianism on the national and international scale.

We connect our way to socialism in Spain with the solution of the nationalities question, which will be finally found only under a socialist system. But now we already advocate

autonomy status for the historically rooted national-territorial formations, and the establishment of regional governments and parliaments in these, as already instituted in Galicia and Catalonia.

In the conditions of the crisis, disputes arise between the various contingents of the proletariat and even within the party over the state of the nationalities question in Spain, over the possibilities of solving it and using concrete historical experience in consolidating international solidarity within the framework of the whole working class of the country and within the ranks of its organized vanguard.

"The British Crisis" was the title of a paper presented at the conference by John Kay, Secretary of the Scottish Committee of the CP Great Britain. He said that the economic disorder in the country went hand in hand with a crisis of political institutions and the system of democratic rights. This applies especially to Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and this makes the nationalities question increasingly acute.

Neglect of the national is not a communist tradition. It is rather an approach which originated with Kautsky, who connected socialism with the conversion of mankind into a single nation. When these ideas were accepted by Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin subjected her to sharp criticism. This was recalled by Pierre Joye, member of the CC of the CP Belgium. As for the enlivening of the national feelings of the peoples inhabiting Belgium, in his view, it cannot be explained by any attempts to suppress them. There was simply an awareness by the Flemings, Walloons and Brusselites of the fact that each of these national communities has some specific problems and interests. In these conditions, the Communist Party advocated a federal structure for the country, which is fully in accord with the socialist perspective, as it does not in any event imply a nullification of national distinctions.

From the experience of their own countries, the representatives of the Communist Parties of Austria, Great Britain, Greece, Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway and France showed that capitalist integration was one factor behind the activation of the national consciousness of the peoples and the working class. The struggle against subordination of national interests to monopoly capital internationally united in the European Economic Community has become an essential element of the spiritual and political life of Western Europe.

Bert Ramelson, a member of the WMR Editorial Board from the CP Great Britain, expressed the view that current developments have made

the content of these problems markedly complex and introduced many new elements into them, which our theory has yet to consider adequately.

Among other things, he referred to the role of the transnational corporations in the life of present-day capitalism. At one time we Marxists imagined that the concentration and centralization of capital would objectively erode the national boundaries and produce ever larger state associations, for instance, in the form of federations and confederations. Some still refer to the Common Market, presenting it as the prototype of the future, as that to which Marx's law of capitalist concentration and centralization allegedly leads. But, as usual, life turns out to be richer than any flight of fancy. Marx's law does operate. But how? In the formation of the transnationals and the development of their activity. They operate over and above state borders. They ignore national interests and, one could say, distort whole countries. They manipulate the working class setting some of its national contingents against others. That is a new situation, and if it is to be duly assessed, there is a need for a flexible application of Marxist analysis.

Ingemar Andersson, member of the Board Executive Committee of the Left Party — Communists of Sweden and Editor-in-Chief of the newspaper, *Arbetartidningen-Ny Dag* said that concerning his own country, one's attention is drawn to at least two points which reveal new aspects in the consideration of the nationalities question and induce efforts to raise the level of the internationalist consciousness of the working class. The first is the exceptionally rapid internationalization of Swedish capital and the conversion of big firms in Sweden into transnational corporations. In the international class struggle, the transnationals apparently outstripped the trade-union movement. Indeed, the national organizations of industrialists have also coordinated their policies to such a point that their positions turn out to be stronger than those of the trade unions. At the same time, there is evidence of a growing interest in the Swedish working class to internationalist acts. It is involved in the movement of solidarity with the fighters for national liberty, notably, in Central America and South Africa. Our party actively promotes the development of this positive tendency.

The second point is the influx of immigrant workers into the country. We believe that the problems arising in this connection should be tackled through the complete integration of foreign workers into the country's socio-political life, with respect for their right to

maintain their national, cultural and linguistic features. This is a complicated problem and, we believe, it deserves further joint discussion by the communist parties which have to face it.

Hans J. Kleven, Deputy Chairman of the CP Norway, said that the nationalities question, which has played a considerable role in his country's history, has acquired a content in the postwar period which is mainly determined by the struggle against submission to imperialism in the form of NATO and also to the EEC. Within the framework of this struggle, which involves broad strata of the society, there is evidence both of genuine patriotism combined with internationalist views, and of narrowly nationalistic trends.

He said that there were also a number of other factors conducive to the rise of national self-awareness in the developed capitalist countries. Among them, for instance, could be included the realization of the threat impending over the national culture from the flood of U.S. films and publications, which are followed by the spread of mores, vocabulary, etc., cutting across local traditions. In Norwegian conditions, a specific element is connected with the extraction of oil in the North Sea. The problem here is to put the exploitation of this key resource at the service of Norway's interests and not of those of foreign companies.

Franz Parteder, member of the CC of CP Austria, said that in his country a number of specific and contradictory factors had an effect on the development of the working people's national and international consciousness. The high level of capitalist nationalization, the ramified system of state regulation of the economy, a strong agriculture, strong positions of social democracy with its ideology and practice of "social partnership" — those are the features of the reality which, against the background of the general crisis of capitalism, produce the psychological effect that the population of Austria, including the working class, tends to develop a sense of national superiority. The Socialist Party has also speculated on this fact, as will be seen from its standard electoral slogan: "Home is best, vote for the SPA." In such an atmosphere, the struggle to develop the internationalist proletarian consciousness in the working class naturally merges with the struggle against the ideology of social reformism.

At the same time, the Austrians' patriotism is a basis for the advance of political movements which meet the genuine interests of the people. For instance, our party, together with other democratic forces, is now carrying on a struggle against neofascism, which has reared its head. The peculiarity of the situation in our

country is such that fascism and neofascism here are not an expression of local but of foreign, that is, German non-Austrian chauvinism. Substantial importance is also attached to the struggle for the observance of the articles of the State Treaty which guarantee full rights to the national minorities: the Slovenes, the Croats and the Hungarians. Consequently, while taking a consistent stand for democracy and socialism, we take into account the essential importance of the factors on the way to these goals which are connected with the national, patriotic consciousness, and with interethnic relations.

The national-liberation struggle has naturally been the chief factor which has influenced the development of the mass, social consciousness in the countries that have to fight for political sovereignty and independence, and to stand up for these in intense and protracted battles against imperialism. This was repeatedly noted in the course of the conference. At the same time, many speakers drew attention to the fact that since the disintegration of the colonial system and as a result of the filling of the national-liberation processes with social content, many new problems requiring a theoretical analysis have arisen.

The need was pointed out, in particular, to specify the very concept of "nation" in the light of the actual discrepancy between the boundaries of many young states and ethnic and linguistic boundaries.

Sarada Mitra brought out another relevant problem arising, he said, from the ever less justified view of the state as a nation-state. Indeed, he said, many modern states are multinational and include not just one, but several and frequently large numbers of peoples.

India's experience also makes one ponder some of the fundamental questions connected with the various stages of ethnic development: the development of tribes into nationalities, nationalities into nations, and finally, the inner consolidation of established nations. In the struggle for political independence, we have seen the cohesion of ethnic groups. With the switch of the center of gravity in the liberation movement into the economic sphere, there was an increase in the number of conflicts which, as a rule, reflected the dissension between bourgeois and other elite groups claiming to express the corresponding special ethnic interests. It is typical for the weaker side in such conflicts to put forward separatist slogans, which are immediately supported by the imperialists, and also in Peking.

We oppose separatist trends, while demanding of the government autonomy for the tribes

and urgent measures for the economic development of the areas in which they live. But we understand that this is a good approach for mounting political campaigns, but it is hardly adequate for an exhaustive solution of the problem in substance. How must it be solved? That is the question for which we are seeking an answer and which, in our view, could become the subject of a collective theoretical discussion.

One of the most important problems now being raised by the development of the national-liberation struggle was connected by speakers with the need to work to help the patriotic movements overcome their frequent national limitations in their ideological and political stand. Naim Ashhab, member of Political Bureau of the Jordanian CP Central Committee, said that in the mass patriotic consciousness there may not be any sympathies for socialism accepted in advance as a basis for the working out of internationalist views. What are then the factors on which the development of these views depends? Let me point to two of these. The first is the support given by the Soviet Union and the community of the socialist states to the peoples' anti-imperialist struggle. In the Arab world, it played a tremendous role in the past and continues to play such a role today, helping to spread among ever broader masses of people correct notions about who is their true friend and necessary ally in the struggle against U.S. imperialism and the Israeli expansionists.

But it is in this context that I should like to emphasize the importance of the other factor. The point is that it would be wrong to assume that the complicated, contradictory and ever changing international situation is shaped only out of the acts of solidarity by the socialist states with the liberation movements, acts which are obvious to the masses. If we rely only on people representing different strata of the population themselves being able duly to appreciate the course of world political life and to draw the right conclusions, we shall never obtain a stable internationalist consciousness. Here is yet another key to success: persevering explanatory work by the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Experience shows how necessary the formation of a working-class party is for the development of the national-democratic revolution and the advance to building socialism, said Farook Ali Ahmed, head of the Propaganda and Agitation Sector of the Ideological Department of the CC Secretariat of the Yemeni Socialist Party. We fully reckon with the fact that in our country, where the socio-economic system of the society has a transitional charac-

ter, the working people's consciousness is still very heavily influenced by the ideological, psychological and behavioral rules connected with their former social condition. The prevailing perception of development in the country and the world is patriotic and not internationalist. Patriotism is intensified as the working people, the workers are ever more directly involved in the administration of social affairs and have a clearer sense of personal involvement. We seek to develop and deepen notions and feelings which should become the basis for molding the internationalist consciousness as well. There are already signs, for instance, of a patriotic sense of pride which springs from an understanding of the role and responsibility falling to Democratic Yemen in international affairs. Of course, our party carries on extensive explanatory work, trying to develop within the working class and the other working people a conviction of the need for sound international solidarity of all the progressive, anti-imperialist, revolutionary forces.

To take a principled internationalist stand, let alone to come out in defense of this stand before the masses can be a very difficult exercise, especially in a developing country like ours, where the numerical strength of the working class is relatively small and its party under constant attack from the ruling circles, said *Clement Rohee*, member of the Central Executive Committee of the People's Progressive Party of Guyana. Under such conditions, he went on, there are two alternatives: either to succumb to pressure from the bourgeoisie, from the ruling circles, or, despite everything, continue to take a firm internationalist stand. It is clear which alternative the communists should choose. But one can proclaim one's loyalty to proletarian internationalism very loudly and yet no one will understand or support you unless the party carries out extensive political and ideological work, especially among the workers. This line of party activity should be of a vigorous and offensive character. It is useless to take a defensive stand and merely to argue that the charges of anti-patriotism hurled by the bourgeoisie at the communists are untenable or false. Indeed, it is necessary to actively expose bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

The results of such work cannot be expected within a week or a month. Now and again it appears that the party's word meets with no response at all. Some are even prepared to give up. But as our experience shows, perseverance justifies itself. When in 1969 our party sent a delegation to Moscow to attend the International Meeting of Communist and Workers'

Parties, in Guyana we were called renegades and traitors. But our actions and policy statements have always proven that we are patriots in the true sense of the word. The reality today is such that our simultaneously expressed internationalist and patriotic stand has won us respect in Guyana and in the Caribbean region generally, but particularly in the English-speaking countries, where a number of Marxist groups and other progressive organizations have emerged over the past few years, not without our party's influence.

Amha Dagneu, Editor-in-Chief of the theoretical journal *Meskerem*, organ of the CC of the Commission for Organizing the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE), replied to a question about the level and specifics of the development of the mass internationalist consciousness in his country. He pointed to the extreme backwardness of the pre-revolutionary Ethiopian economy and its predominantly feudal character. The embryonic nature of the capitalist relations, the small size of the working class and its organizational weakness did not bring about even an embryonic formation of internationalist consciousness. Besides, the feudal-bourgeois regime constantly conducted a policy of fanning national strife among the country's peoples. However, the 1974 revolution, the support it received from the socialist states and other international progressive forces, together with the active aid which imperialism gave to local reaction — all of this helped the working people of Ethiopia rapidly to adopt some of the basic internationalist views. The foreign policy of the country's revolutionary government has had and continues to play a great positive role in this respect.

But however valuable these lessons are which the working people learn from life, they are inadequate. We realize that internationalism cannot be solidly established in the consciousness of the masses without special efforts on the part of the Marxist-Leninist party. We are now working to create such a party, and it is safe to say that with its formation internationalist ideas will be assimilated by our working people better and more fundamentally.

Socialism ensures and stimulates a rise of national culture, a general flourishing of the nation and, accordingly, the spread of patriotic feelings, said *Sandor Lakos*, member of the HSWP CC, and director of the Institute of Social Sciences under the party's CC. One should also bear in mind that historically, socialism was in most cases victorious in countries with a middle or low level of economic development. In

such conditions, the formation of a national, patriotic consciousness could not develop otherwise than as simultaneously and in direct connection with progress in other spheres of social life. Accordingly, patriotism itself as it gathered strength, had to be filled with a definite concrete content reflecting the specifics of the formation of the socialist society.

Both these factors should undoubtedly be assessed as positive. But it would be wrong to assume that their positive significance is somehow absolutely guaranteed. On the contrary, unless due attention is given to the internationalist education of the masses, the patriotism which springs even from the socialist soil could reveal a tendency to self-expression in negative, nationalistic forms.

There was a lively exchange of opinion on the problem of the influence exerted by socialist transformations on the overall state of the nationalities question, on the development of the national consciousness.

Addressing J. Carrera, A.M. Romyantsev said: I have some doubts about one thing you said in your speech. Was I right in understanding that, in your opinion, the building of socialism depends on the solution of the nationalities question? I should like to hear your explicit view of the role which the nationalities question has to play in the process of socialist transformations. How is it connected with them?

A question on an allied topic was asked of A.M. Romyantsev by Mitra: What you said left me with the impression that you regard the solution of the nationalities question under socialism as virtually an automatic process. How, in that case, do you explain the nationalistic attitudes and tendencies which now and again arise even under the socialist system?

Bert Ramelson asked M. Ovari to clarify what he said in his opening statement, namely, that "with the victory of the socialist revolution the working class roots out nationalism in the society. Nationalism is deprived of its objective basis." Does that imply that socialism generally eliminates the ground for national specifics? Could the Hungarian comrades clarify what this means?

The following answers were given.

J. Carrera: I believed it to be necessary to emphasize that the full and irrevocable success of socialism in any country also depends on the solution of the nationalities question. I insist, too, that this is a difficult and complex question. It has historical roots and it can be solved also in the course of a protracted historical period.

A.M. Romyantsev: Of course, I can speak only of the Soviet Union. Considering the pres-

ent situation I should like to emphasize that we now have a new historical entity — the Soviet people. Of course, historically matters were quite different. At the early stages in the existence of the Soviet state there were dangerous nationalistic tendencies. With the construction of socialism, nationalism was deprived of its social roots. But none of that occurred of itself. That is the result of long and intense effort, of our party's education activity.

Janos Berecz, member of the HSWP CC, head of the CC International Department: The simplest answer to comrade Ramelson's question would be a reference to the specifics of language. The word "nationalism" seems to have different shades of meaning in Hungarian and English. In our language "nationalism" means precisely "bourgeois nationalism." But I should also like to explain something in substance, because the question bears on an important topic.

Let us consider these two facts. First: before the First World War, one-half of Hungary's population was of non-Hungarian origin. Second: two-thirds of the Hungarians live in Hungary as it took shape after the war as an independent state, while one-third remained outside its borders. The bourgeoisie, and the feudal forces before it, stirred up interethnic conflicts and used these for their interests, set groups of working people against each other, spread chauvinistic attitudes and fanned territorial disputes. In 1848-1849, the ruling circles managed to direct the forces of other nationalities against the Hungarian bourgeois revolution. In 1919, the same nationalistic instruments were set in motion by the counter-revolution in its fight against the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Furthermore, the ideology of nationalism and chauvinistic hatred in our country was the mainstay of the fascist regime.

The phrase in comrade Ovari's speech to which you drew attention reflects the fact which is now incontestable in the light of our more than 30-years' experience, that socialism has put an end to the objective basis for such reactionary phenomena. We assert that here, in the socialist part of Europe, territorial problems have been settled for good. The working people of all the socialist countries, whatever their nationality, work for the benefit of their homeland as its full-fledged citizens. The cohesion between our countries and peoples and their cooperation with each other is a key factor both of their national and of their common, that is, international progress.

At the same time, we see, of course, that the formation of consciousness is a slow process. The survivals of the past have not fully disap-

peared. That is why we regard the struggle against nationalism or, to be more precise, against bourgeois nationalism, our constant task. Such survivals of a consciousness that is alien to socialism do not disappear spontaneously, of themselves.

K. Lipkovics, member of the WMR Editorial Board from the HSWP, expressed the view that spontaneous development continues to be a factor in the formation of social consciousness which has to be reckoned with even under socialism. The importance of this factor, he said, should decline and does decline with the development of the socialist society. But for various reasons it has an effect at various stages of development. That is because, for instance, there continues to exist small-scale production, which has a considerable positive role to play, but which nevertheless remains a nutrient medium for views and attitudes which tend to introduce their specific aspects into social consciousness. Or because there exist spheres of social life, like culture and creative art, in which one frequently has to deal with the element of individuality. Spontaneous elements with which the socialist countries have to reckon in their political and ideological work will be found in demographic and migration processes.

Chuong Hong, deputy editor-in-chief of the journal *Cong San*, organ of the Central Committee of the CP Vietnam, spoke of the need for the working class party to carry on persevering work in filling the national, patriotic consciousness with a socialist content. He noted that his party represents a conjunction of Marxism-Leninism not only with the working-class, but with the national-liberation movement. Relying on this historical basis and on its unflagging ideological-education work in the masses, the party has become the recognized leading force not only in the industrial areas with a large concentration of the working class, but also in all the strata of the population throughout the country.

The experience which we have gained testifies that any break of ties between the universal principles of socialist construction and national specifics, the tendency to regard this or that factor as absolute always poses a threat to the very substance of socialism, said Janusz Kolczynski, deputy department head, PUWP Central Committee. This experience also carries the lesson that underestimation of the universal principles which stem from the uniformities of the world revolutionary process, and which have been tested by international experience, results in a distortion of socialist development and eventually in a weakening of

the party's ties with the working class, so producing a crisis on that basis.

The underestimation of the role and importance of the universal principles and uniformities of socialist construction directly explains the interpretation which the party leadership put on the concept of "unity of the people" in the 1970s. It failed to reckon either with the contradictions actually existing in the process of our socialist development or the attendant social conflicts. The "moral and political unity of the people" was regarded not only as a state that had been attained — something that was in itself, a distortion of the social reality — but also as allegedly the main feature of the socialist system in Poland.

This non-class and non-historical approach largely sprang from an overestimation of national specifics. And this had a negative effect on the political and the ideological activity of the party and directly resulted in a dulling of class consciousness. The propaganda practice which sprang from the "unity of the people" thesis promoted the emergence of illusory notions about reality, instead of giving a class assessment of social phenomena, and led to deep distortions of social consciousness. Ignoring the complex dialectics of the formation of the socialist nation, our propaganda, in effect, obscured the contradictions and differences of interest existing within society. The party's ideological front and its theoretical basis — the Marxist-Leninist social sciences — were inadequately oriented toward an analysis of the sources of the contradictions which remained or emerged, and toward ways of overcoming these. This also explained the inadequate preparation of mechanisms for determining and the procedures for coordinating diverse standpoints, aspirations and propositions; mechanisms, whose necessity has been revealed by the latest crisis.

A substantial and grave mistake which sprang from the incorrect interpretation of the "unity of the people" problem and the consequent "propaganda of success" was also the nationalistic-rooted manifestations of national megalomania, which incidentally went hand in hand with toadying to the West. This entailed consequences like distortion of the class socialist consciousness, emasculation of many of its concepts and values, and watering down of the principles of proletarian internationalism, which our party had sought to implant in the consciousness of the masses for decades.

Finally, the erroneous interpretation of the "unity of the people" led to a slackening of vigilance with respect to the adversaries of socialism in Poland and even to some extent to

an end of struggle against them. The existence and activity of adversaries of socialism did not accord with the "unity of the people" thesis. That is why they were ignored, together with the facts and actual problems of the class struggle, to suit the adopted false conception.

The neglect of work in this sector of political and ideological struggle favored the accumulation of forces by the anti-socialist centers, and on the other hand, the national-unitary phraseology of our propaganda created favorable conditions in which these centers could speculate on nationalism. In our country, these centers, regardless of the distinctions between them, have some common program planks. One could say that they have a common urge to shake the leading role of the party and Poland's membership in the socialist community, notably, its alliance with the USSR. This is also a stake on so-called creeping counter-revolution, that is, a gradual dismantling of the socialist system. Here, an important element in realizing these propositions is nationalism, which is solidly allied with anti-Sovietism.

This also determines the lines of our action in the struggle against the anti-socialist forces. The main content of this action is an urge to deepen in the social consciousness the understanding of the connection between internationalism and patriotism. This is now the key problem in the ideological struggle.

The relatively small anti-socialist groups in Poland have a broad field of action, enjoying the support of a ramified propaganda machine which international anti-communism in practice puts at their disposal. In this situation, the fight against the adversaries of socialism at home must be organically connected with the exposure of the overall goals of anti-communism and the mechanisms by means of which its ideological subversions are effected.

The adversaries of socialism in our country seek to rely on the mood of discontent which still exists among the working people. That is why we concentrate our efforts on isolating the anti-socialist groups from the working masses. An extremely important aspect of this problem is that these groups seek to establish ties with the adventurist trend within the Solidarity trade-union movement and to invest it with a patently anti-communist tenor. We actively resist these attempts to manipulate Solidarity and seek to show how much harm this inflicts on it, on the interests of workers and on the country as a whole.

It is the duty of our party not only with respect to the Polish working class and people, to carry our country out of the state of crisis in the shortest possible period, Kolczynski con-

tinued. It is well known that the events in Poland have been widely echoed throughout the world. The enemies of socialism have used them in their efforts to discredit our social system and the Marxist-Leninist theory, and to attack existing socialism and the community of socialist countries. That is why this is also our international duty to eliminate all the mistakes and distortions and to get Poland to further develop along the socialist road.

In this context, much importance is attached to our responsibility to strengthening the socialist community and the positions of existing socialism on a world scale. Our mistakes and the protracted process in overcoming the crisis are naturally a source of anxiety in the ranks of the fraternal parties, the socialist countries, and the whole international communist movement. It is quite clear that the situation in Poland has a substantial influence on the balance of class forces in the world.

Jaroslav Kase, Editor-in-Chief of *Nova Mysl*, theoretical journal of the CP Czechoslovakia CC, referred to his country's experience as bearing out the importance of the nationalities question in socialist construction. This experience shows that socialism alone is capable of ensuring the national prosperity of the peoples, of bringing them closer together and enabling them to cooperate with each other. At the same time, the solution of problems arising from interethnic relations can be no more than a protracted process even under socialism. Some negative features inherited from the bourgeois past remain in the mass consciousness. It is understandable, therefore, that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has attached much importance to the nationalities question and to the internationalist education of the masses, especially since the crisis year of 1968. Great successes now being noted in this field are among the historic achievements of our revolutionary working-class movement, of our party.

The idea that the concrete historical approach and a clear-cut definition of the meaning of the national and international do not allow of any abstract, hard-and-fast formulas for the solution either of the nationalities question proper, or of the problems which spring from its connection with international phenomena and processes, was stressed by Roland Bauer, member of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. He backed up his view with a detailed analysis of some of the aspects of the problems arising from the class struggle in Germany and the formation of a socialist nation in the GDR.

We have had to deal, he said, with changing

conditions of the class struggle between capitalism and socialism. Accordingly, there was a change also in our approach to the so-called German question. From 1945 to 1949, the communists and other progressive forces carried on a struggle for a united democratic, anti-fascist Germany. Then, there arose two German states, and we set the goal of reuniting them. By the mid-1950s, the problem of peace became the very core of the German issue. We clarified this for ourselves and had to work to get the people broadly to understand the truth that the problem of German unity receded to the background as compared with the task of maintaining and strengthening peace.

In the process, the substance of the class struggle remained unchanged. We fought for a socialist Germany, and the bourgeoisie — for a capitalist Germany. And in the 1950s and 1960s, both sides, in effect, relied on national slogans for their opposite purposes. What did we manage to achieve? It was that — most importantly — the bourgeoisie failed to eliminate our socialist state. Socialism has been firmly established in the GDR. At the same time, life showed the illusory nature of the expectations of the FRG's socio-political system undergoing some change in the near future. That is why the problem of German unity disappeared from the agenda.

In the GDR, socialism has transformed every aspect of social life which is of crucial importance for the formation of the nation. A new national self-consciousness also arose on that basis. In accordance with this objective situation, a socialist German nation is emerging in the GDR from a part of the old integral capitalist nation, while the old capitalist nation continues to exist in the FRG.

On the strength of this conclusion, drawn on the basis of a creative application of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the specific conditions of social development in the GDR, in the period between the eighth and ninth congresses a number of further problems in the development of a socialist nation in the GDR were elaborated and summed up in a comprehensive, theoretically and historically grounded conception of the essential marks and perspectives of development of a socialist German nation, and this was reflected in a special section of the party program adopted by the ninth congress of the SUPG.

Konstantin Zarodov, WMR Editor-in-Chief, and alternate member of the CPSU CC, said that the discussion in effect dealt with the Marxist-Leninist view of the dialectics of the national and the international, or — in more concrete terms — with the work and experience of the

parties in the internationalist and patriotic education of the masses. The problems being tackled within the framework of this work are not simple in any sense. They are not made more simple by the fact that social life is being increasingly internationalized. Under capitalism, their scale and acerbity even tend to increase in view of the fairly strong bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalistic tendencies. There, this even leads to the most acute conflicts, including interethnic rivalry within the ranks of the working class. National or racial strife even leads to sanguinary clashes. Interethnic frictions frequently lead to wars among developing countries, especially as a result of imperialist intervention.

Even after the victory of socialism in a country, the assertion of internationalist ideas in the minds of the masses does not proceed of itself. We have repeatedly witnessed how armed, "peaceful" and "creeping counter-revolution" have operated in the socialist countries under the flag of nationalism. At this conference we have also learned additionally and in greater detail about some relevant facts. I have in mind the paper presented by comrade Kolczynski of Poland.

Consequently, I can support Academician Rumyantsev, when he says that the communists and workers' parties standing at the helm of state power have to carry on long and intense educational work in order to root out nationalistic trends in the consciousness of the masses.

In general, life fully bears out Lenin's idea that it is not easy to put an end to all kinds of nationalistic limitations in the mass consciousness; in one way or another, this problem has to be dealt with at every stage in the advance toward communism.

That is why it is highly important for the communists to make a scientifically precise choice of positions in their ideological and propaganda work addressed to the masses. This is all the more necessary because the mass consciousness is more inclined to comprehend the outward, visible aspect of phenomena rather than going below the surface to their substance. In this context, I should like to support the comrades who spoke about the importance of drawing the attention of the communists' theoretical thinking to the in-depth, creative analysis of new phenomena and processes which in the present-day conditions exert an influence on the national and international aspects of the revolutionary struggle. And equally those who supported the need to seek ways and means for more effectively carrying our conclusions to the consciousness of

broad masses of working people. In this connection one should, apparently, also recall this other well-known truth: the scientific precision of our theoretical studies and the effectiveness of our educational work can be ensured only if our class vision is always well focused. Out-of-focus vision is a dangerous disease for the revolutionary practitioner, for the theoretical scientist and for the propagandist educator.

Inexorable logic of class relations

An important topic in the discussion was the question of ideological "autonomy" of internationalist and especially national forms of consciousness, of their place within the system of existing social ties and contradictions, and of their relation to the other motive forces of socio-political development, of the revolutionary process.

National self-consciousness is a powerful ideological force. The communist movement has long emphasized this. It has put forward and elaborated this idea both in theory and in practice, said Ib Norlund, member of the CC Political Bureau and Secretariat, CP Denmark. But we are not alone in understanding this. This is also understood by the bourgeoisie. It has learned and knows how to use national feelings and notions for its own interests and for its terrible purposes, including wars. The people of my generation remember, for instance, the episode with the plebiscite in the Saar region, which German imperialism managed to annex to the Hitlerite state in 1935 precisely by playing up national feelings. But one does not have to go back into history, one could turn to the present day to discover the same urge on the part of the bourgeoisie to convert national habits and prejudices into its weapon and to use it above all against the unity of the international working class.

But the time when the bourgeoisie had, one could say, a monopoly on the use of national forms of consciousness is gone for good. The working-class movement has gained in strength and experience which enable it both to understand the interests of the nation and to undertake the responsibility for them.

Can we always use the word "internationalism" with the plus sign? asked Professor G. Diligensky, department head at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences. I could refer to the paper presented by comrade Heiseler and emphasize in the light of his interesting considerations that, in contrast to nationalism, the development of internationalism, of the internationalist consciousness is not a process that could be called spon-

taneous. And our class adversaries are very well aware of this. That is why, apart from the fact that the bourgeoisie contrasts its nationalism to the internationalism of the working class, it also makes extensive use of the tactic of "stolen" slogans in an effort to produce its own version of internationalism. At times this assumes a blatantly reactionary-anti-communist form and appears, for instance, as a conception of the unity of the Western world confronted by an alleged communist threat. In other cases, it appeals to "globalism," suggesting that nowadays all world problems are interconnected. The formulas of "Europeanism" are another version. In this context, it is also worthwhile to consider the present-day social-reformist versions of internationalism, because social democracy makes very active use of the internationalist traditions of the working class for its own purposes.

Consequently, when it comes to the formation of the patriotic and internationalist consciousness, the work of ideological education in the masses cannot be reduced to attacking nationalism and standing up for internationalism. It should, rather, be a consistent struggle against bourgeois nationalism, but in defense of national-patriotic feelings, attitudes and positions. At the same time, it should be a struggle for internationalism, but for an internationalism that is proletarian, one that is resolutely opposed to the pseudo-internationalist schemes and calls of the bourgeoisie and the reformists.

Many conferees presented concrete facts reflecting the historical and contemporary experience of their countries and peoples to show that the national consciousness, including patriotic consciousness, and internationalist calls and formulas may indeed acquire a different class content and serve different class interests.

Mario Vella, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Malta, described, for instance, the national movements in his country's past and present history, emphasizing that it is impossible to understand their true social substance — which is the main thing — if one's attention is rivetted only to their outward, purely nationalistic or patriotic aspect.

In the inter-war period, the Nationalist Party led a movement in Malta which was traditionally known as "national." Its slogans were directed against British colonial rule and so had a liberatory and patriotic ring. Besides, it also had its own "internationalism": intimate ties with Italian fascism. Those were the conditions in which our workers, concentrated mainly in the port areas and engaged in servicing British

warships, had to work out their own view of Malta's national interests. It was very hard for them to take a correct anti-imperialist stand if only because everything that was "anti-British" was immediately associated in their minds with "pro-Italian," with fascism.

Today, the Nationalist Party has proclaimed itself to be the champion of the "Euro-national legacy." What does that mean? This means a re-establishment of ties with NATO, Malta's entry into the EEC, to ward off a "threat" allegedly coming from the country's participation in the nonaligned movement and its cooperation with socialist and progressive states. There is apparently no need for a commentary to bring out the class substance of such "nationalism."

The purely national or even nationalist movement, which has no overt or direct ties with some class interests could, however, have a progressive, democratic potential, which needs to be noticed and made use of in due time. This was suggested by some speakers, including *Jean Steiger*, CC member, Swiss Party of Labor. He gave the example of a movement which developed some time ago in his country for the formation of the Jura Canton, that is, the separation of French-speaking areas from the Berne Canton (where German is mainly spoken), which is traditionally the bulwark of reaction. The Party of Labor supported the movement from the outset, and has now become a substantial political force in Jura, the new canton.

The Front for the Liberation of Mozambique, founded on June 25, 1962, set itself a primary task of actively educating national and patriotic self-consciousness in every strata of the people, said *Gideon Ndobe*, FRELIMO CC department head.

In that period, many patriots still held narrow tribal and feudal views. For them, the need for unity meant no more than a tactical alliance: they believed that the Mozambique society freed from colonialists had to be transformed on feudal and tribal lines, so as to make them masters of it. As a result, a class struggle developed within the framework of the liberation movement, a clash between two antagonistic views: one, reflecting the aspirations of the people and the other, regarding the national struggle as a way for acquiring the traditional feudal privileges of those earlier enjoyed by the colonialists.

This led to a situation in which some regard the exploitive colonialist system as the Mozambique people's chief enemy, while others see every white man, every foreigner as the adversary. The former want an end to

every system of exploitation, and the latter are prepared to maintain the exploitive system so long as it has a suitable racial color.

The advanced revolutionary contingent within FRELIMO has raised the national banner. The national consciousness is being strengthened and deepened in military, political, ideological and cultural confrontation with the enemy. The exacerbation of class contradictions and the correct conclusions drawn from these transform the national-liberation struggle into a revolution against every form of exploitation.

Ibrahim Malik, CC member, CP Israel, gave a detailed analysis of the class substance of Zionism. Replying to a question, he additionally shed light on the reactionary role of Zionism in the international arena and its complicity in the acts of imperialism.

Addressing Malik, *K. Lipkovics* said: I find your analysis interesting, meaningful and correct. Still, I should like to ask whether you see any possibility of cooperating with some political forces represented in Zionist-minded groups. Say, on the questions of war and peace, in the fight against the monopolies? Do you draw a distinction between Zionist ideology and political practice?

I. Malik: The latest congresses of the Communist Party of Israel stressed the strategic goal of our struggle which consists in a just settlement of the Middle East conflict, the establishment of lasting peace in the region, and the solution of the Palestine problem. Analyzing the situation in the country, we have reached the conclusion that the interests of the working people, including those who consider themselves to be Zionists are actually at odds with Zionism. The Communist Party has exposed Zionism as the ideology of the big Jewish bourgeoisie, which does not in any way express the interests of the working people, although a majority of them now support Zionist organizations. At the 18th congress, we proposed the establishment in Israel of a united front of struggle for democracy and peace. Considering the prospects for its formation, we believe that there should be no division of the groupings existing in the country depending on whether they rank themselves as Zionists or not. The main thing is their stand on peace in the Middle East, on the Palestine issue. That is why our party has also invited for cooperation the Zionist organizations prepared to recognize the Palestinians' rights, to work for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands, and to carry on a struggle against the fascist threat within the country.

Here, we have been faced with grave difficul-

ties arising through no fault of ours. Some Zionist organizations, for instance, while agreeing to engage in political cooperation with us on the questions of peace, an end to the occupation, etc., have put forward the condition that we should recognize the existence of progressive, democratic elements in the Zionist ideology. But for us that is a matter of principle. Here no concessions are conceivable. Zionism is an ideology of reactionary nationalism that in itself has no progressive potential on which one could rely and which could be used.

L. Paso said that the Communist Party of Argentina has had to deal with calls for a dissolution of the communist movement in the country and its subordination to nationalistic trends. Those who took such an approach insisted that the national-patriotic ideology of Peronism had greater prospects in the country than the communists' emphatic class movement. On the eve of 1973, having in mind the first period of his government (1946-1955), General Peron himself said that in Latin America he could become "the first Fidel Castro."

Why did he not become one? Why did Peronism generally fail to display the capabilities for the progressive transformation of the society which were ascribed to him? Paso gave a detailed analysis of the ideology and political positions of Peronism in their historical development, and drew the following conclusion: the narrow nationalist approach, the consequent urge to swing like a pendulum between the two extremes in the international arena and to seek a class reconciliation at home, naturally led the Peronists to abandon the structural renewal of the society. In practice, Peronism ran into a contradiction not only with the working people's class interests, but also with the country's national interests. This turned out to be so obvious that toward the end of his life Peron was himself forced to revise some of this views.

Without a class understanding of the nationalities question, Paso went on, without a consideration of the concrete historical substance of each stage in the development of the society, it is impossible to show the real interrelation of the people's national interests and the international solidarity of the working class. Outside the context of such an analysis, they appear to be at odds with each other. But that is an imaginary contradiction. We shall discover the interrelation if we adopt the class view.

Some speakers drew attention to the problems which faced the revolutionary movement in the struggle to realize the peoples' right to national self-determination, a right which the

communists consider to be incontestable.

Alvaro Ribeiro Mateus, a staff member of the Central Committee of the Portuguese CP, recalled that in pre-revolutionary Portugal the communists were persecuted for displaying solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau. When we spoke of these peoples' right to national self-determination, we were accused of betraying the country and wishing to dismember the Portuguese state. But now imperialist intrigues are being woven for granting the "status of independence" to the Azores, while some reactionaries, until recently opposing the idea of liberation for the African colonies, now turn out to be prepared to break up the territory of Portugal itself for the principle of "national self-determination." The Portuguese Communist Party naturally carries on a resolute struggle against such distorted views and reactionary uses of the right of the peoples to self-determination.

The common struggle for mutually concerted goals with full respect for the principle of independent struggle in each individual country, that is, the correct interrelation between the resolute defense of the right of nations to self-determination and genuine international solidarity between the national movements, such is the important task of our time, declared Huroyuki Okamoto, member of the Standing Bureau of the CC Presidium, CP Japan.

Marx and Engels, he went on, regarded the defense of the right of nations to self-determination, guarantee of national independence, independent status of the people in their country and the establishment of democratic relations of equality with the other peoples as the most important basis of international cooperation among the proletariat in the different countries. In a letter to Jon Nadejde of January 4, 1888, Engels wrote: "Without the free development of all nations and each respective nation it would be impossible to think of a social revolution taking place in the respective country, nor could it be achieved by mutual assistance."

It is instructive for us today that Engels launched a strong warning against a possible intervention in other nations under the name of socialism in a letter as follows: "... the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing."*

In his work "Socialism and War," Lenin em-

*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 481.

phasized that "it is therefore impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognized" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 317). Lenin thus fought national oppression in all its forms and regarded the defense of national self-determination of peoples as an important component of the tasks of the working class.

This attitude of the founders of scientific socialism on national self-determination is not based upon the tactical considerations of anti-imperialist struggle alone. It demonstrates that the socialist revolution and socialist construction in each respective country is an undertaking of the working class and the working people of that country for themselves, passing through diversified ways according to concrete historical conditions of social contradictions and class struggle in the respective countries and arriving at a socialist society.

Real internationalism first of all is for the working class in each respective country to strive for a victory of the revolution in their own country and to mutually support each other's struggle.

In his work "Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution," Lenin said: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is — working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) *this struggle*, this, and *only this*, line, in every country without exception" (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75).

The founders of scientific socialism defended the principle of national self-determination in opposing imperialist aggression and national oppression. We want to emphasize the importance of carrying through this principle most thoroughly and most consistently even for victorious socialism.

Referring to a number of statements by Engels and Lenin, the representative of the CP Japan emphasized that, in his view, it is extremely important today to be most attentive to what the founders of scientific socialism said about the relationship between internationalism and the right of nations to self-determination.

Barbu Zaharescu, member of the Central Auditing Commission of the Romanian CP, said that perhaps Okamoto had given a one-sided interpretation to his quotation from Engels' letter addressed to the Romanian Socialist Nadejde. In it, Engels speaks of the free development of each people as a necessary condition for the success of the revolutionary move-

ment. But there is there yet another idea, namely, that the socialist revolution in the various countries needs to be started, and indeed completed, on the basis of international cooperation. I think that in the light of its full content, Engels' idea is truly very meaningful.

I should like to propose to all the comrades, Bert Ramelson said, to agree on the following. If in discussing the present situation we seek to understand it in Marxist terms, if, as I believe, we rely in our discussion on a Marxist basis, it is not necessary to defend one's arguments by means of quotation-mongering. I think that it would be better to analyze the actual situation and to try to establish that which in it does or does not meet the interests of the international working class and how.

As for the right of nations to self-determination, here again I should not like to rely on quotations. But it is fundamentally important, I think, that each Marxist accepts this as the right of each people to determine its own future. Of course, we retain the right to advise this people how it can best realize the principle of national self-determination. Let's take our party. We believe that it would be in the interests of the Scottish people and of the Welsh people if we created a democratic federation of equal states — the English, the Scottish and the Welsh, with not only their own parliaments but also other important rights. However, they should nevertheless be a part of a single federal state, and here we do not refuse to stress the right of the Scottish and Welsh people to self-determination, including the right to secede from Great Britain.

The right of nations to self-determination should not be set up as some absolute, said Eddie Glackin, member of the National Executive Committee of the CP Ireland. Can one regard this right, which we recognize, as being superior to the other and truly absolute principle of the communist movement, that is, its principle of struggle for the power of the working class, against imperialism and capitalism, and for building a socialist society? The nationalities question is a question of general democratic struggle, that is, a component part of the struggle for socialism. Consequently, whatever its solution it cannot be contrasted to the tasks of the struggle for socialism, let alone being set up over and above them.

I note that comrade Ramelson insists in strong terms on the principle of national self-determination. He does not allow of any reservations. Good. But then, neither in his own paper, nor in the paper presented by comrade Kay, also of the CP Great Britain, is there any reference to the right of the Irish people to

self-determination. Comrade Ramelson was asked about his stand on this point, and he said that his party supports the policy and stand of the Communist Party of Ireland. I will not deny that that is so. But the papers and speeches of the British comrades at this conference show that they are inclined to regard the Irish problem on a par with the problems of Scotland and Wales. I think that this is altogether wrong. This would be similar to the Communist Party in Belgium, say, equating, at one time, the problem of liberating the Congo with the internal national question in Belgium between the Flemings and the Walloons.

Furthermore, I find an inner contradiction in comrade Ramelson's reasoning. He says that the peoples have the right to national self-determination, including secession, while the communists have the right to advise on the choice of forms in which this right is exercised. I agree. But what does advising mean? It is to carry on propaganda and mount political campaigns in favor of a definite choice, is it not? But where then is the unconditional priority of the principle of national self-determination? One has apparently to recognize, after all, that even with the utmost respect for national rights, the rights and interests of the working class should not be forgotten.

Ahmed Azad, a representative of the South African Communist Party, said that in his view the right of nations to self-determination does not allow of any over-simplified approaches. We cannot confine ourselves to proclaiming the abstract principle according to which nothing more than the following is asserted: if you want to secede — secede, and that is the end of the matter. I think that we must take a deeper view of things and in every case clarify the class nature of the national demands being put forward, be it demands for secession or any other.

Take Africa as an example. There is virtually not a single state there which has sprung from a purely local economic and political soil. Each has a history behind it, in which colonialism had a tremendous role to play. State borders were laid down and imposed by the colonialists. That is the reality, and it is within the framework of this reality that the African revolutionary forces now have to work.

Furthermore, in Africa — in contrast to, say, Europe — the formation of national states proceeded in a struggle against colonialism. The nation-states emerged in anti-colonial struggle. And it is in this struggle that the peoples' national consciousness, and national face were shaped.

The experience of the African states, expressing the political and ideological interests of

their peoples, shows that the concept of national, political, anti-imperialist unity turns out to be much more meaningful than the concept of independence in terms of depth, scope and potential.

And if we take all this into account, if we consider that in many cases the consolidation of the nation-state remains low, how then are we to regard the demands of individual ethnic groups or nationalities which subjectively claim to be nations and insist on the right of territorial secession? I think that it would be totally wrong to give automatic support to these demands only because we accept the general principle of national self-determination. Do these demands meet the interests of all the revolutionary forces of the given country? Do they correspond to the interests of the revolutionary development of the whole continent? Of the whole world revolutionary process? And what are in this context the expectations and hopes of imperialism? What is the attitude to these demands on the part of local reaction? I think that only by answering these and all similar questions can we work out a correct attitude to each concrete situation arising from interethnic conflicts.

It would be totally absurd, of course, for anyone to draw the conclusion on the basis of our discussion that some of us display greater, and others lesser concern for the right of nations to self-determination. Nothing of the sort. All the communists have been and will be champions of this national right of the peoples. But we are communists, which is why we must not forget about the class aspect of the matter whatever the circumstances.

Pavel Auersperg, WMR Executive Secretary and CC member, CP Czechoslovakia said that, in his view, the nationalities question generally and the right to self-determination in particular cannot be discussed outside the context of class relations. And any discussion on this subject cannot, of course, boil down to an exchange of quotations and the construction of abstract schemes. I would prefer to discuss it on the strength of concrete historical experience.

My country has such experience. When did the question of the self-determination of nations of the former Hapsburg empire become a practical issue? In January 1918, in connection with the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations. The victory of the Great October Revolution, the general strike in Vienna, which met with wide response in the Czech lands as well — those are the events which were behind the demands for Czechoslovakia's national independence. But the working class, as Klement Gottwald sub-

sequently said, acted only under the red banner, whereas it should have simultaneously also raised the Czechoslovak tricolor. Incidentally, opening our discussion, comrade Ovari also spoke about two banners. So, you see, this is not only a Hungarian formula. It could apparently be regarded as an international asset of the communists.

At any rate, we have successfully followed it on our way to the victory of the socialist revolution. This was also reflected in the relevant terminology. We interpreted the liberation from German imperialism as a national-democratic revolution. National committees, the national front and national enterprises provided the mainstay for our socialist revolution.

All these institutions of our national self-determination naturally had a revolutionary class content. In other words, the working class of Czechoslovakia was able in practice to blend the interests of the nation with its own class interests, with the perspective of socialism.

My main point, Pavel Auersperg emphasized, is that in Marxist-Leninist terms, the national does not exist outside the class context, and that is what life itself drives home to us. For that reason it is very strange to find attempts to seek in our theory ideas and propositions in support of the view that the right of nations to self-determination is some kind of superior rule which supersedes the inexorable logic of class relations.

USA: who benefits by "re-industrialization"?

Seamus Shaw

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF CAPITALIST RATIONALIZATION

WMR has published a series of articles discussing the impact of capitalist rationalization on the social and economic condition of the working people.* The following is a response to this discussion.

At the beginning of this year it was apparent that the economic crisis, which had hit the USA at the end of 1979 and grown more acute in 1980, had become protracted. The worst affected are the steel, auto, durable consumer goods, and housing construction industries. The nation's balance of payments is causing anxiety: last year it ran up a deficit of \$25.2 billion. President Ronald Reagan has conceded that the USA has not been in a worse economic situation since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

The difficulties encountered by the course toward "re-industrialization," the term used in the USA for the program of the monopolies to update industry by adding to the burden already bearing down on the working people, are a hallmark of this situation. These difficulties have brought some basic industries to the brink

of disaster. The epidemic of plant closures and shutdowns has spread to almost all sectors of the economy.

This situation has triggered "re-industrialization debates" over the ways and means of rationalizing or to use the official White House jargon, revitalizing the economy to enable the U.S. monopolies to regain world markets lost to more efficient competitors overseas. The biggest corporations have embarked on a vigorous campaign to secure drastic tax breaks and a relaxation of pollution and safety standards. Corporations in trouble are increasingly demanding federal subsidies on the plea of avoiding bankruptcy. The industry barons have been joined in their appeals by the proponents of class collaboration in the AFL-CIO and some other trade unions, who are going along with wage freezes.

The indications are that Washington will respond to the voice of the monopolies. The new administration's economic strategy is, more than any other, directed toward extending unlimited aid to capital within the framework of the notorious free enterprise system.

That some basic industries had to be modernized was seen some years ago. The question was how industry was to be modernized and what should be the end aims of this rationalization? As might have been expected, the capitalist corporations are not bothered by the social consequences of the problem when they plan to restructure their plants. Their sole in-

Seamus Shaw is the assumed name of a leading U.S. trade unionist, who because of the political situation in the USA cannot sign his article in WMR with his real name — Ed.

*WMR, January, March, June 1980, February 1981.

terest is, as it always has been, to milk profits. This is why decisions to replace outmoded production facilities often include a decision to relocate these facilities to areas of the country where unions are weak or non-existent and where local tax policies are especially favorable.

For the corporations this is rational because it reduces outlays on production. However, this sort of rationalization may be extremely costly in the social context. The relocation of production facilities requires extra provisions, usually at public expense, for new roads and new energy inputs. The cost of training workers is also borne at public expense.

An operation of this kind brings little benefit to the economy of the new area. Relocated facilities usually have fewer jobs and pay lower wages than in the original site. Moreover, enormous costs are incurred by the community from which the corporation has fled: a reduction of tax revenues and of workers' pay results in the plummeting of effective demand. There is a growth of outlays on unemployment allowances and social security benefits, and the denial of job opportunity not only to the workers formerly employed there, but also to young people who had hoped one day to work there. In addition, it has disastrous consequences on shopkeepers, services, and doctors, whose income depends on workers. From a social perspective, this cost of plant removal far outweighs any possible benefits of rationalization.

Last year big business launched a major ideological offensive to create the political climate for retooling on its own terms. The journal *Business Week* carried an article headed "The Reindustrialization of America," spelling out the measures which this mouthpiece of business circles expected the government to take to achieve the goals of monopoly capital. Above all, it called for reduced government spending, naturally in social sectors, not the military. It called for a foreign trade policy allowing U.S. corporations to invest overseas and restricting imports from competitor nations.

Private corporations are out to plunder natural resources now in public hands. They want the abrogation of anti-trust laws, the virtual elimination of taxes on business, and a strict limitation on the rights of trade unions. Lastly, to provide the huge funds for re-industrialization at public expense, the captains of the capitalist economy have projected a ten-year program of "belt tightening."¹

The "re-industrialization debates" now focus on the situation in the U.S. steel industry. Once the most powerful in the world, it now occupies third place behind the Soviet Union and

Japan. In 1947 the USA produced 60 per cent of the world's steel, but some three decades later its share fell to 16 per cent. Furthermore, about 20 per cent of the steel used in the USA is now imported.

Steel is one of the most highly monopolized industries, with eight firms accounting for 95 per cent of the nation's output, of which nearly 40 per cent is controlled by two of these, U.S. Steel and Bethlehem Steel. This structure allowed U.S. steel bosses to lay down their terms in the market, caring little for competition. As a result, the steel industry was slow to adopt new technologies and began to lag behind overseas producers in terms of productivity. For example, Japan produces almost 80 per cent of its steel in modern oxygen blast furnaces: in the USA these account for only 60 per cent of the steel output. At the close of the 1970s continuous casters yielded 35 per cent of the output in Japan, and 10.5 per cent in the USA.

New investment is also lagging. All the indications are that the bosses of this industry have chosen to withhold investments. But they do not forget the stockholders, maintaining the latter's returns at levels unjustified by profit rates.² In this connection *Business Week* noted that "in the last five years dividend payouts have averaged 72 per cent of the U.S. Steel's earnings, and 83 per cent of Bethlehem's. That leaves little for modernization."³

Steel corporations are seeking to invest heavily in other, more profitable industries, such as petrochemicals. For instance, U.S. Steel owns or leases properties containing 3.4 billion tons of coal, 3.3 billion tons of limestone ore, 4.2 billion tons of iron ore, and a uranium mine. U.S. Steel's foreign holdings are also extensive with nickel mines in Indonesia, copper, zinc, manganese, iron ore, and ferromanganese in South Africa, manganese in Gabon, iron ore in Canada, ferromanganese in France. It also controls coke plants in the FRG.

As more steel is imported, the USA is shifting away from steel production, and the U.S. banks are increasing their loans to Japanese steel-makers and to steel firms in developing countries. In 1977 the six largest Japanese steel firms received loans totalling \$1.03 billion from a group of U.S. banks, including Morgan Guaranty Trust, founder of U.S. Steel. U.S. banks also have loans out to steel firms in Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Malaysia, Mexico, South Korea and Taiwan.

As monopoly capital sees it, the quickest way to achieve rationalization and save lagging profits is simply to lop off facilities with declining profits. This is precisely what big steel firms have been doing. In late 1979, for example, U.S.

Steel shut down 16 facilities at a cost of 13,000 jobs. This massive job-cutting had its most severe impact in Youngstown, Ohio, where mills were closed by Jones and Laughlin Steel, Campbell Works and Briar Hill Works. This was followed by the closures at U.S. Steel's McDonald and Ohio works. As a result, in the Youngstown area the steel industry now employs only 10,000 workers, which is 15,000 fewer than 10 years ago.

The social costs of these closures are illustrated by the fate of the Wisconsin Steel Works plant in Chicago. The shutting down of this facility in March 1980, left 3,500 workers unemployed and deprived of their last two weeks' pay. More, they were deprived of medical insurance, entitled vacation pay, severance pay, and supplementary unemployment pay.

Analogous developments were to be observed all across the USA. As *Business Week* put it: "The unpleasant truth is that American steelmakers have been unable or unwilling to invest in new equipment and more efficient processes. They have let producers in other countries pioneer and exploit advanced technologies while they plug along with the old mills. Instead of upgrading aging facilities and keeping them up to date, the industry has preferred to run them to the point of obsolescence and then close them."⁴

Hundreds of thousands of steelworkers have lost their jobs in the last decade as a result of the steel barons' job-slashing and speed-up tactics. In 1978, when the steel industry produced 137 million tons of raw steel, and shipped 100 million tons and imported 21 million tons of rolled steel, it employed nearly 600,000 people (449,000 in steel production). By August 1980 employment in the steel industry had fallen to 276,000 workers — the lowest level of employment since the crisis year of 1933.

A salient feature of the situation is that these plant closures are encouraged by government tax policies and lavishly subsidized by the government. U.S. Steel President David Roderick confided to stockholders that "to shut down facilities involved minimal cash outlay . . . in fact, cash flow from discontinued operations over the next six years (the tax write-off — S.S.) would improve profitability."⁵

Without the tax incentives, these businesses would have been sold rather than abandoned. A convincing example of how these incentives benefit the monopolies is given by Harry Brill, a professor at the University of Massachusetts. "Bethlehem," he writes, "received a tax refund of \$134 million by carrying back its losses to 1974, a year in which its profits and therefore its tax bill were substantial." These federal tax

policies represent a "bonanza" to the corporations and "harsh injustice to the worker," Brill concludes.⁶

The situation in the steel industry is only one example of what re-industrialization is costing the working people. An analogous picture is to be observed in, for instance, the auto industry. In the USA fewer cars were produced in 1980 than in the crisis year of 1975. Compared with 1979, their output has dropped by 22-25 per cent, while sales have fallen by 16 per cent. In nine months last year the output of three of the largest corporations (General Motors, Chrysler and Ford) declined by 24, 40, and 46 per cent respectively, while the sales of these giants, which account for 95 per cent of the industry's output, shrank by almost 20 per cent.

The year 1980 saw something unprecedented in the history of U.S. monopoly capital. Losses amounting to \$2 billion in the period from the beginning of 1979 to mid-1980 brought Chrysler to the verge of bankruptcy. From April to June 1980 General Motors' books showed a loss of \$412 million.

As in steel, production facilities were closed and more workers were discharged. The auto barons are resorting to rationalization, to the replacement of manual labor by automated technology as one of the levers in their bid to become more competitive. This is further deepening the crisis and making additional hundreds of thousands of people jobless. By the close of last year 325,000 auto workers, or 32 per cent of the auto industry's workforce, were looking for jobs.

The significance of these facts will be seen most clearly if one bears in mind that in the USA the auto industry creates nearly 20 per cent of the GNP, that this industry consumes 60 per cent of the nation's synthetic rubber, 50 per cent of its malleable cast iron, 33 per cent of its zinc, 25 per cent of its steel, and 17 per cent of its aluminium. A decline in the auto industry is a formidable threat to the entire economy of the USA. (The reduction of the output of cars has already cost 650,000 jobs in intermediate industries.) It is the view of some bourgeois analysts and business leaders that the entire industrial potential of the USA is threatened.

What we now see in the steel and auto industries is linked directly to the fundamental vices of re-industrialization. The U.S. monopolies hope that intensified exploitation of the working people will bring them the \$126 billion needed for technologically retooling outmoded facilities and thereby enable them to start a new round of the battle for the world's markets.

The adverse impact of this policy is further heightened by the fact that the working people

have not yet recovered from the crisis of 1974-1975. The steady upward trend in unemployment figures in the 1970s indicates that each crisis leaves an ever larger number of permanently unemployed in its wake. This is particularly true in the case of Afro-Americans and other oppressed minorities, among whom unemployment percentages run at a much higher rate than among white workers. One of the reasons for this is that new jobs, where they are being created, are not located in the big cities where minority populations are largest. Rather, they are located in white suburban areas, where Blacks cannot afford to live and which inadequate public transit facilities make difficult to reach. Chicago, for instance, still feels the effects of the fact that in the 1960s, a total of 229,000 jobs were closed in the city itself and 500,000 were gained by its white suburbs.

In this article I have considered only some social aspects of capitalist rationalization in the United States. While the steel and auto industries⁷ are the primary concern at the moment, other industries such as machine tools are also in crisis. The emphasis being placed on the development of "high-tech" and high profit industries such as computers, chemicals, etc., cannot ease the situation. They may restore the profits of certain capitalists, but they will not restore the health of the capitalist economy of the USA, which bourgeois economist John

Kenneth Galbraith once described as private wealth in the midst of public squalor.

Monopoly rationalization of industry, Gus Hall told a recent meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USA, was coming into conflict with the basic interests of the masses. "The epidemic of plant closings," he said, "strips naked the capitalist system and exposes its anti-human nature."⁸

The self-seeking policy pursued by big business spells out further hardships for the nation's working people. A determined fightback is urged by the communists, progressive trade unionists, and many democratic organizations. The anti-monopoly movement in the USA is growing in breadth and strength. One of its fundamental aims is to make scientific and technological progress serve the working people.

1. *Business Week*, June 30, 1980.
2. Since the end of World War II the profit rate in the U.S. steel industry has demonstrated a marked tendency to decline, and by the 1970s the steel companies ranked only 41st in terms of profits. — Ed.
3. *Business Week*, June 30, 1980.
4. *Business Week*, April 7, 1980.
5. *Six Myths in Steel*, Leaflet by Local 65, USWA.
6. "It Pays to Go Out of Business," *The Progressive*, August 1980.
7. In mid-1980 the output in steel, compared with the pre-crisis maximum, was 50.3 per cent, and in the auto industry it was 43 per cent.
8. *Daily World*, June 12, 1980.



The constitution of a victorious people

Truong Chinh
CPV CC Political Bureau member;
Chairman, SRV State Council

This year is a special one in the life of Vietnam. The country entered it with a new constitution, which consolidated the working people's socio-political gains in the building of socialism. Under the new fundamental law, elections have been held to the National Assembly of the Republic, which is to adopt legislative acts to set forth the constitutional provisions in concrete terms and ensure their fullest implementation in practice. The new constitution is in operation. It has become an indisputable fact of Vietnamese society's life and a powerful stimulus in its further development along the socialist road.

The constitution of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was unanimously adopted by its National Assembly on December 18, 1980. Elaborating on the ideas and principles written into the DRV constitutions of 1946 and 1959, the new fundamental law reflects the specific features of the period of transition to socialism on the scale of the whole country. It sums up and legislatively consolidates the results of the Vietnamese people's revolutionary struggle over the past half-century, expresses its will and aspirations and ensures the society's successful development at the new stage. The constitution determines the socio-political system

and the cultural development of our socialist Republic, and also the main rights and duties of Vietnamese citizens, and the organizational structure and the principles underlying the activity of state organs.

Let us consider some of the basic features of the new fundamental law.

The revolutionary goal of the working class is to put an end to man's exploitation by man, together with all the forms of class and national oppression, and to build a just, free and happy communist society. The founders of Marxism-Leninism emphasized that this road was in no sense a well-paved highway. It is possible radically to transform the economy, to build socialism and to advance to communism only if the working class is in power, controls the instruments of state administration, and stands at the head of the society.

This condition is met by our political reality: "the Socialist Republic of Vietnam shall be a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Article 2, SRV Constitution).

Through its victory in the revolutionary struggle, the working class has liberated the working people of Vietnam from every form of oppression and exploitation. That is why the proletarian dictatorship expresses the main long-term interests not only of the workers, but of all the other working people as well. It is an embodiment of the power of the people, exercised by the people and for the people. Our power is based on an alliance of the working class and the peasantry, with the former maintaining the leading role. The workers, cooperative and individual peasants, the socialist intelligentsia and other strata of the working people have the right to elect their representatives to all the organs of state power, from the highest to the lowest.

"In the Socialist Republic of Vietnam all power shall belong to the people.

"The people shall exercise state power through a national assembly and people's councils of every level elected by the people and responsible to it" (Article 6).

We believe that there is no contradiction between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the right of the whole working people to be the country's collective master. Indeed, the more fully this right is realized, the more solid the dictatorship of the proletariat. And the greater its potentialities both for timely and resolute suppression of the anti-socialist forces, and for the development of socialist democracy, and prevention of bureaucratic or authoritarian practices.

The relations between the party, the people and the state is a question that was considered

by the fourth congress of the CP Vietnam in 1976. The substance of these relations is now recorded in the new constitution. Its Article 4 says: "The Communist Party of Vietnam, the vanguard and combat headquarters of the Vietnamese working class, armed with the Marxist-Leninist theory, shall be the sole leading state and social force, and the basic and decisive factor in all the victories of the Vietnamese revolution."

Concerning the role of the working people in the country's political life, the constitution declares: "In the Socialist Republic of Vietnam the working people, including the working class, the cooperative peasantry, the socialist intelligentsia and other working people shall be the collective master ..." (Article 3). The working people exercises its right to be such a collective, socialist master of the country through the National Assembly as the supreme organ of state power and the people's councils at every level representing the state power in the localities. It also exercises this right through the trade unions, the youth league, the women's federation, and other social organizations within the Vietnam Patriotic Front. Participation by the masses in the management of state and social affairs is also ensured directly in the localities — at the enterprises, in the cooperatives, in the administrative organs, in the units and subunits of the people's armed forces — and in the working people's residential areas.

The constitution reflects the tremendous responsibility which the state has to the people or the policy it pursues, for the organization of economic planning, for the concrete direction of the economy, for cultural construction, for strengthening the country's defense capability, for the maintenance of social security and public law and order, and for ensuring the basic rights and duties of citizens.

The three above-mentioned questions — the party and its leading role, the people and its right to be the country's collective master, and the state and its place in the administration of the society — are closely interrelated. Indeed, we believe that the fundamental basis of socialist democracy in Vietnam at the present stage is the definition of this interrelation in the fundamental law.

A short review of our history will help to gain a better understanding of the conditions in which the new Vietnamese constitution has been adopted and which it is designed to meet.

During the French colonial rule, the country was divided into three parts: Tonkin, Annam, and Cochinchina, which together with Laos and Cambodia made up "French Indochina."

Vietnam's very name was wiped off the map of the world. Vietnam regained its territorial integrity after the August 1945 Revolution. But the French colonialists returned to reconquer the country. As a result, it was divided into two zones: one occupied by the French troops, and the other free.

Following the glorious victory at Dien Bien Phu in 1954, Vietnam still remained truncated into parts with different political systems: the DRV, a people's democracy, lay in the North, while the neocolonialist regime of the U.S. imperialists and the local puppet administration ruled in the South.

In these conditions, the Vietnamese people, led by the Communist Party, advanced along the road of the socialist revolution in the North, while continuing the people's democratic national revolution in the South, striving to liberate that part of the country from the U.S. imperialists and their satraps.

With the liberation of Saigon in 1975, the people's revolutionary power was established throughout the territory of the South. The Vietnamese state was fully and genuinely reunited, something that was made possible only on the basis of national independence and socialism. The CPV faced the task of consolidating this reunification in every sphere: political, economic, administrative, social and cultural. For this purpose, on the one hand there was a need resolutely to abolish the puppet administration and its army, to eliminate the neocolonial economy in all its forms and the survivals of neocolonialism in the sphere of culture in the South; and on the other, rapidly to carry the South in the wake of the North along the new road by building up the material and technical basis of socialism in the area.

At the time, the economic situation in Vietnam was a peculiar one. In the North, the new system had already scored some decisive successes: the socialist sector of the economy (state and cooperative) accounted for 88.4 per cent of the social product, and for 84.1 per cent of the national income, the rest coming from small individual peasants. The private capitalist sector had been completely transformed. Meanwhile, the South was just taking its first steps along the road to socialism.

The task of the Vietnamese revolution was, therefore, to continue building the new society in the North, while carrying out a socialist revolution in the South. And while both parts of the country stood at different levels of development, they were, in effect, at the stage of transition to socialism.

The constitution of the SRV became a mighty instrument of the Vietnamese people in the

struggle for the ultimate triumph of socialism throughout the country. In order to score a full victory, the Vietnamese people are engaged in simultaneously carrying on three revolutions: in the sphere of relations of production, scientific and technological progress, and ideology and culture. We regard this as the main content of the socialist revolution in present-day Vietnam, where the new mode of production is being spread across the whole country, where the new consciousness and ideology are winning the minds of more and more men and women, and rising to the dominant position in the society's spiritual life.

The Vietnamese people's experience over thousands of years shows that creative activity and defense of the homeland are indivisible.

Since its emergence, our republic — first democratic and then socialist — has been forced to carry on a life-and-death struggle against imperialism. The Vietnamese people had to stand their ground in four successive wars: two national-liberation wars — first against the French and then against the U.S. colonialists, and two in defense of their homeland: one against the clique of the Peking puppets Pol Pot and Ieng Sary, and the other directly against the Peking expansionists and hegemonists.

In the present conditions, defense of the homeland for our people is defense of a mighty outpost of socialism in the Southeast of the Asian continent against bellicose imperialism led by the United States, and against the Chinese great-power expansionists, who have not abandoned their attempts to start aggression against Vietnam and to turn it into a springboard for the annexation of the whole of Southeast Asia. By defending its own vital national interests, the Vietnamese people is simultaneously doing its internationalist duty to the international forces of peace and revolutionary renewal. It not only defends its own country's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, but also makes a contribution to the development and strengthening of the world socialist system, so helping to bring about the fiasco of the colonial urges of imperialism.

The building of a new society in Vietnam together with defense of the homeland is completely in accord with the existing politico-historical reality. This is clearly expressed in the constitution of the SRV: "The Socialist Republic of Vietnam shall build a modern national defense by the efforts of the whole people, in every sphere, conjoining creative endeavor with defense of the homeland, combining the might of the people's armed forces

with the strength of the whole people, the power of the traditions of national unity in the struggle against foreign aggression with the power of the socialist system" (Article 50).

In other words, while being concerned constantly to develop the economy and raise the people's material and cultural standards, the state has continued to strengthen the country's defense capability on the basis of a development of the three types of popular armed forces: the regular army, regional forces and people's militia. These forces have the task of withstanding external aggression, and maintaining security and law and order in the country.

According to the new constitution, SRV citizens enjoy broad rights in the political, economic, cultural and social spheres, and in public and personal life. Workers by hand and by brain, men and women, old people, youth and children, citizens wounded in the fighting, the families of those who gave their lives for the homeland, individual citizens and families with services to the revolution, disabled, members of families where no one is able to work, and orphans — all of them are given special attention in the constitution. It also defines their basic rights and the privileges held out to them by the state and the society.

Together with the rights of citizens, the constitution proclaims their most important duties. Among these are the duty of each to work, to observe the constitution, the laws and rules of social life, and to respect and protect socialist property.

The provisions on the basic rights and duties of citizens express our urge to settle the question of relations between the society and the individual on the basis of the following principle: "The vital requirements of the society shall be harmoniously combined with the genuine freedom of the individual, and the mutual interests of the state, the collective and the individual shall be guaranteed in accordance with the principle 'one for all, all for one'" (Article 54). The main idea here is the following: rights and duties of citizens are indivisible; fulfillment of duties helps to enjoy the rights guaranteed by the state.

In the period of transition to socialism, the class struggle, the struggle between the advanced and the backward continues to be intense and complicated. This means that in these conditions it is especially important to prevent any abuse of civil rights on the part of the individuals. This point is made in the fundamental law: "No one shall have the right to use democratic freedoms to the detriment of the interests of the state and the people" (Article 67).

The constitution guarantees to citizens a growth of their material and cultural standards. But our goals in this sphere have nothing in common with the approach of the notorious "consumer society," which is so assiduously advertised by bourgeois propagandists. We regard the raising of living standards as a condition for the shaping of the new man, of the harmonious and all-round development of the individual.

Our constitution is written in the spirit of ardent patriotism and unity in the struggle against foreign aggression, the unity the Vietnamese people have displayed at various periods of their history. The constitution emphasizes: "The state shall develop the people's patriotism and revolutionary heroism . . ." (Article 52). It is the sacred duty of every citizen of the SRV to be loyal to his homeland and to defend it. "Treason to the homeland is the most grievous crime against the people" (Article 76).

But the new constitution is also permeated by a spirit of proletarian internationalism. It asserts the Vietnamese people's constructive foreign policy and high international commitments: "The Socialist Republic of Vietnam shall strengthen its fraternal friendship, combat solidarity and relations of all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union, Laos, Kampuchea and other socialist countries on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism; defend and develop its relations of friendship with neighboring countries; display solidarity with the peoples of all countries fighting for national independence and social progress; conduct a policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-political systems on the basis of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage; actively support and make a contribution to the struggle of the peoples of the whole world against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, hegemonism, racial discrimination, and for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism" (Article 14).

All these clear-cut and unambiguous provisions explode the slanderous assertions by the Chinese leaders' reactionary clique that Vietnam allegedly seeks to practice some "small-scale hegemonism," that it seeks to set up an "Indochinese federation" with itself in the commanding role.

If the new fundamental law is to be fully translated into the country's social life, a great deal still has to be done, including the enactment of a number of statutes which follow from the constitution and specify it. It is equally

important to have the workers of the party and state apparatus and of social organizations, and the whole population to gain a good comprehension of the fundamental law and to work perseveringly and vigorously to implement it. The struggle to implement the new constitution will be much more difficult than its drafting. But because it is in line with the laws of our society's development and the

people's interests and cherished aspirations, we are firmly convinced that this difficult and complex task will be successfully fulfilled. The practical application of the new constitution and the full use of the rights it holds out assure our people of even broader freedoms, opening up before it new horizons and helping to complete successfully the construction of a peaceful, independent and united socialist Vietnam.

Why has the situation in Central America sharpened?

COMRADES-IN-ARMS REPORT

A *WMR* staff member met with Manuel Mora Valverde, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica; Rigoberto Padilla Rush, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Honduras; and Ruben Dario Souza, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Party of Panama, and asked them several questions. The following is a transcript of their talk.

Q. The situation in Central America is causing grave anxiety among progressive opinion everywhere. What, in your view has aggravated the situation in this region?

Mora. I think that there is a deep-seated social and economic crisis that has developed into a political crisis, to a larger extent in some states and to a lesser extent in others. Its roots will be found above all in the protracted rule of the oligarchies, and in the bankruptcy of the development model imposed on our countries by imperialism decades ago. The substance of this model is to build up industries which go to benefit only the U.S. monopolies, and to preserve the archaic forms of land tenure, which ensure fabulous profits for a handful of local and foreign latifundists. In short, it is a crisis of the system of domination, which dooms our peoples to poverty and despair.

The imperialists have repeatedly declared their intention to maintain control over Central America, which they proclaimed to be "a zone vital for the security of the USA." One could pinpoint two main reasons for which they display a heightened interest in the Central American countries and meddle in their internal affairs. First, there is the urge in some cases to retain, and in others, to get hold of the vast riches of the isthmus. The imperialists have always regarded many of our natural resources,

primarily minerals, as a reserve — they did not work these themselves and did not allow us to do so either. But manpower, our indigent peoples, are the most valuable and most ruthlessly exploited wealth. Second, there is Central America's key military-strategic location, the fact that it is a part of the Caribbean. In 1914 U.S. President Woodrow Wilson said that the Caribbean should be made an "inland lake" of the USA. Later high-ranking Pentagon officials maintained that the Caribbean was the key to the two oceans forming the USA's natural marine frontier. To gain possession of this key the USA had to make itself secure on two opposite shores: the Antilles and Central America. However, the Antilles nations, who have added vivid pages to the history of the liberation movement proved, especially after the victory of the socialist revolution in Cuba, inaccessible to total imperialist control. Imperialism's positions were shaken also in Central America. The victory of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua changed the alignment of forces in our region and reinforced the determination of its peoples to achieve liberation. After Nicaragua, the revolutionary flame flared up in El Salvador, and the left forces in Guatemala and Honduras became more active.

With Reagan's inauguration, a louder burst has come from the chorus of those who assert that the weakening of the positions of U.S. imperialism in other parts of the world tends to convert Latin America into the most important objective of its influence, with the Caribbean and Central America assigned a special place. The latter is regarded as a kind of bridge linking the two extremities of the continent, with the empire on one side, and the Latin American peoples waging a courageous struggle against it, on the other. Large U.S. military installations have been built in many of our countries. For instance, the U.S. Southern Command has its

headquarters in Panama, the former canal zone. Moreover, it is the location of bases for nuclear-armed missile-carrying submarines and centers maintaining communication with spy satellites. The purpose of all these installations is to ensure the rapid deployment of armed forces in the event imperialist interests are threatened anywhere in Latin America.

Padilla. I subscribe to comrade Mora's view of what generated this serious structural crisis in the Central American states. In Honduras, the crisis has reached a point at which an acute conflict has become inevitable: it may be expected to break out at any time in the immediate future. The model of "exporter of farm products" imposed on Honduras has not stood the test of time, shattering the political system. The most stable element today is political instability. The ruling classes have proposed and tried various means to end the crisis, including reformism. But none of them provided for the people's participation or took their interests into account. The threat of a coup loomed when bourgeois democracy exhausted its potentialities and the political model ceased to function. This has been the pattern of developments in Honduras since 1963.

The masses have found that peaceful means cannot bring justice and are taking up arms. What occurred in Nicaragua is now happening in El Salvador and other Central American nations.

The U.S. imperialists are going to all ends to protect their usurped "right" to military and political supremacy on the continent. Under President Theodore Roosevelt at the turn of the century, the U.S. Congress passed the notorious Platt Amendment that reduced Cuba to a U.S. semi-colony. Presidents Hoover and Coolidge were not satisfied with Cuba and the Caribbean. They toyed with the idea of controlling the whole of Latin America and seeing the Stars and Stripes flying everywhere — from the Colorado River to Patagonia. Today President Reagan is trying to resurrect the Monroe Doctrine, which embodies the colonialist policies of the past. "America for the Americans," the imperialists proclaim, by "Americans" meaning U.S. citizens. As it loses some of its positions in Western Europe and realizes that it can no longer interfere in the internal affairs of African and Asian nations with impunity, Washington regards the American continent as its last major "security zone." Moreover, it has proclaimed that Central America and the Caribbean are a region "vital to U.S. interests." This policy stems from a totally mistaken perception of realities, from incomprehension of the fact that the world has changed, that our

peoples no longer intend to tolerate national oppression and social injustice.

Souza. Although, by and large, I share the views stated here, it seems to me that we should accentuate two aspects of the structural crisis: the internal (national) and the external (international). To be more exact, we should draw attention to the growing disintegration of the system imposed on the Central American nations by imperialism. Needless to say, in each of these countries the crisis has its own features depending on the actual situation. Nonetheless, they have a common feature — to use Lenin's definition, the upper classes cannot rule in the old way, and the lower classes no longer wish to live in the old way (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 213). When one understands this one will have a clearer picture of the revolutionary struggle in which our peoples are employing various forms and methods.

A basic reason for the growth of the liberation movement is the rise of the political consciousness of the masses, who are inspired by the achievements of world socialism, of the Soviet Union and Cuba in the first place, and by the victories won recently in the national-liberation and democratic struggles. This is alarming the class adversary. Hence the "burgeoning" of the reactionary geopolitical doctrines mentioned here. The imperialists arrogantly claim a "right" to Central America and plunge into gambles that do not exclude intervention in the affairs of the countries of that region including direct armed intervention. Of course, it was not accidental that Carter, when he was president, arbitrarily "included" the Panama Canal in the "USA's continental waters."

Q. Bourgeois propaganda alleges that the developments in El Salvador are orchestrated from outside. Would you comment?

Mora. This is a manifest absurdity which does not require much effort to topple. Take Cuba and Nicaragua. Why did the peoples of these countries rise? Where did they get their courage from and why were they able to win? Would anybody believe that this was due to preaching from outside? Or was it that they were compelled to rise to struggle by the dictatorial regimes relying on U.S. support? If there are external reasons for the revolution in Latin America, they must be sought in the imperialist policy of plundering and subjugating its peoples.

Let us take a look at what is happening in El Salvador. Why have its people risen in arms? Why are they making such sacrifices? Can one, even if he has the most superficial knowledge of realities, believe that thousands of people

will risk their lives and tranquility in response to calls from outside? No, the people of El Salvador are fighting because they can no longer endure brutal exploitation and abject poverty. The nation is in fact divided up among 14 of the wealthiest of families. The peasant is compelled to labor in the sweat of his brow for a handful of rice. Like a slave he can be bought or sold together with the patch of land cultivated by him. The fascist-minded dictatorship and the terrorism with which it responds to any sign of protest are what made the people rise in struggle.

Padilla. I should like to add a few words about imperialism's propaganda myth that the USSR and Cuba are interfering in the affairs of Central American countries. In this connection it is important to keep in mind the growing impact worldwide of Marxism-Leninism and of the example of socialist states. Back in 1932, Manuel Calix Herrera, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Honduras and a staunch revolutionary, who was imprisoned by the authorities, wrote that the Soviet Union was not exercising pressure or interfering in our affairs. On the contrary, the peoples of Central America, inspired by the example of the USSR, were turning their eyes to it. These words are true to this day. More, they are acquiring a new dimension. The achievements of the socialist community in any area whatsoever are of greater significance to us today than ever before. While the Cuban revolution dispelled the myth of "geographical fatalism" and demonstrated that it was possible to build a new society in the Western Hemisphere, 20 years later the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua reaffirmed this possibility. It demonstrated that the chain of imperialist domination can be broken in Central America as well, provided, of course, the appropriate conditions appear, the conditions mentioned by comrade Souza; in other words, provided a revolutionary situation matures. Here we have noted that, while the revolutionary process manifests itself differently in each of our countries, it has on the whole reached a high level of development.

Souza. Washington's propaganda campaign is designed to blunt solidarity with the patriots of El Salvador. The purpose of its slogans and propaganda clichés is to make us fight windmills. From history we know that peoples always drew upon the revolutionary experience of other countries. The imperialists are well aware of this. Hence their aim to split and destroy the movement for international solidarity, which has become a major factor of political life in Latin America. Thanks to this movement it has been possible to save many lives, to secure

the release of many political prisoners, even to neutralize the enemies of the Nicaraguan revolution and to prevent them from using their strength to support Somoza. Today imperialism is having recourse to blackmail and pressure against all who justifiably support the democrats of El Salvador. For our part, we have no intention of concealing the fact that we are doing all we can to expedite their victory.

Q. What prospects do you see for the struggle of the peoples of Central America?

Padilla. For us communists they are quite obvious. In alliance with foreign imperialist circles, Central American reaction is seeking to intimidate our peoples with the bogey of a communist threat. Nevertheless, as we have already noted, a national-liberation process is gathering momentum in our countries; it can be neither slowed down nor, much less, halted. Imperialism's strategists have repeatedly admitted that it would be foolish to deny the inevitability of changes in Central America. That explains why they are trying to prevent changes from being accomplished under the leadership or with the participation of the communists. In this context, there is justification for speaking of the probability of a direct U.S. armed invasion of El Salvador and Nicaragua. We should not ignore this danger. Precisely because of this the forces of democracy and liberation not only in Central America but also throughout the world are mobilizing to expose the plans of reaction. More than ever before it is vital to strengthen the movement against this probability of intervention. This movement showed its strength as early as the 1920s, in the lifetime of Sandino, a great Nicaraguan patriot, who headed the armed uprising of the people against the U.S. invaders. Its significance has now grown immensely.

Souza. I think that we should underscore two principal factors influencing the revolutionary process in our region. The first is the systematic restriction of the peoples' democratic rights, and the second is the intensifying oppression and ruthless exploitation by U.S. imperialism and the local oligarchy. This brings the problems of democracy and national liberation into prominence. More than ever before, the settlement of these problems depends on the people. While flaunting nationalist banners, the bourgeoisie is pursuing a treacherous policy, allowing the U.S. monopolies to do what they want in our countries. I believe that today there are good prospects for the democratic and national liberation struggle. The left forces have the ability to give it a character that will expe-

dite a movement for socialism.

Mora. The USA has never concealed its determination to invade Central America if it feels that the working masses are taking the destiny of their countries into their own hands. In the present tense international situation the possibility of such an invasion is very great. Nonetheless, the peoples will break the chain of im-

perialist rule and move on to the building of new society.

We should bear in mind that as socialism wins the battle against imperialism and weakens it, the small nations have greater possibilities for winning liberation. The struggle will be hard and probably long, but time is working for us.

Defending the revolution

Alexander Sukhostat
WMR Staff Member

A POLITICAL REPORT

Only recently an epitome of arbitrary rule and rabid reaction, Nicaragua is today a source of pride for progressive people throughout Latin America. The revolution in that country has fortified the determination of the continent's freedom fighters. It showed that in the present international situation the "heavens can be stormed" also in Central America, long regarded by the U.S. imperialists as their unchallenged domain and immediate strategic rear.

By reaffirming many universal laws of the liberation process the Sandinista revolution was a further reminder that new paths of deliverance from imperialist and oligarchic oppression must be sought (and found). It is now confronted with many questions for whose answer there must be flexibility and prescience. Let us recall Lenin's words that "no revolution is worth anything unless it can defend itself" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 124). In the case of Nicaragua this means: first, to defend the revolution economically, in other words, to rehabilitate the devastated economy, to draw into its restoration the forces (including the patriotic bourgeoisie) that had taken part in overthrowing the Somoza dictatorship; second, to defend the revolution politically, i.e., to create the political guarantees for social changes, for consolidating the new power, and form the vanguard of the working people; third, to defend the revolution militarily, i.e., safeguard it against the armed provocations of internal and external reaction.

History had set many peoples analogous tasks. That these tasks are urgent in Nicaragua is noted by the keen observer even from a great distance. But direct contact with reality allows seeing common features in what is specific to each nation and how these tasks are being tack-

led under the concrete conditions of a given country.

The economic front

Opposite Government House in the center of Managua building workers were arguing angrily. I asked what it was all about. The answers came thick and fast: wages were meager, many workmates had been discharged, and housing was not even promised.

Everywhere there were the cosmetically touched up traces of the 1972 earthquake that took a toll of 10,000 lives and destroyed a large part of the city. The gaping windows of a semi-demolished cathedral were covered with a huge portrait of Augusto Cesar Sandino, the national hero who led the people's rising against U.S. interventionists and their local flunkies at the close of the 1920s. It was his slogan "Freedom or Death!" and black-and-red banner that were adopted by the Sandinista National Liberation Front, under whose leadership victory was won two years ago.

That evening a Sandinista I had been introduced to commented on the street incident:

"The grievances of these workers are justified. But what is one to do? The government does not have the means to satisfy all grievances at once. Some people do not appreciate this. They feel that since there has been a revolution there must be prosperity. All of us hope that that will come to pass. The building near which the workers had their meeting can be quickly restored from the battering it got from an elemental calamity. But it is quite a different matter to restore the economy of a country that Somoza had pillaged and tyrannized for almost half a century with the blessing of the U.S. imperialists."

A bitter legacy was left to the revolutionary power from the former regime. This concerns

not only the economy in the literal sense of the word. In only its last year of rule the Somoza dictatorship killed 50,000 people, crippled 160,000, and orphaned 40,000 children. For a population of two millions this was a ghastly price. In the economy the losses were enormous. Hundreds of production facilities, communications, and neighborhoods in many towns were levelled to the ground. One-third of the plantations growing basic agricultural crops were destroyed. The army of unemployed grew steeply and the food problem was aggravated to an incredible extent. Judging from some key indices, at the time the revolution triumphed the nation had been thrown back to the 1962 level.

In order to defend the revolution economically the main thing the Sandinista National Liberation Front has to do is to provide jobs, food and housing. The first tangible results are to be seen today. Most of the factories and plantations have been restored. Agricultural cooperatives uniting small and medium producers have been set up. More than 110,000 jobs have been created within a little over a year and this has halved unemployment. The inflation rate has dropped by more than 75 per cent.

The Sandinistas define the basic task today as "production and defense." A digression has to be made to give a clearer idea of this dual definition.

The Nicaraguan revolutionaries are seeking to develop a social structure that would satisfy the broadest sections of the population — where possible, all who had fought the Somoza tyranny. This is no easy task in view of the heterogeneity of class and political forces that has now grown more marked.

This brings to mind words spoken by Georgi Dimitrov. In analyzing the civil war in Spain he said that a new power could be born in its crucible. Its aim would be not "to end private ownership once and for all," but it would nevertheless enforce sweeping reforms that would lead to the "organization of production with the participation and under the control of the working class and its allies." This type of power was regarded by Dimitrov as a phenomenon of the period of transition, as an advance toward the socialist stage of the revolution.

Something of the sort is to be observed in Nicaragua. The question of immediately expropriating and socializing capitalist property is not being raised. The state is still not strong enough economically to ensure the normal functioning of production. In the obtaining situation the enlistment of the local

bourgeoisie, of the positive economic initiative of those of its groups that have no links to imperialist monopolies, is helping to promote the economy and improve the material condition of the masses. This is what is inducing the government to make the fullest use of the means and expertise of local entrepreneurs to develop the productive forces and, as far as possible, limit capital's exploitative tendencies and protect and extend the rights of the workers.

There are many small and middle entrepreneurs. The government encourages their activity and hopes that the useful functions of small-scale industry will be maintained for a long time to come. Efficiently operating small facilities make it possible to compensate for the difficulties of starting capital-intensive industries and ensure the output of basic commodities. And the most important thing is that they substantially increase employment.

The Sandinistas are inclined to let foreign capital into the country on the condition that its activity does not prejudice the nation's sovereignty and independent economic development. They are introducing rules for regulating foreign investments that allow receiving a profit and provide commercial incentives.

However, the revolutionary forces can establish their "rules of the game" and guarantee the observance of these rules only if they hold the command positions in the economy, i.e., possess real economic strength. The foundation for this exists in Nicaragua.

A large public sector accounting for nearly 40 per cent of the nation's gross product has been formed on the basis of property expropriated from Somoza and his henchmen. Foreign trade, banking, insurance and natural resources are controlled by the government. Prior to visiting Nicaragua I met with Tomas Borge Martinez, the only surviving¹ founder of the Sandinista National Liberation Front and now the nation's Minister of Internal Affairs. In reply to my question about the possibilities for economic coexistence with the bourgeoisie, he said: "It is not so much a question of political coexistence as of an economy combining private, mixed and public property. With the consolidation of the revolution and the growth of the people's consciousness we shall extend public property without, however, aggravating relations with that section of the bourgeoisie that accepts revolutionary changes."

The idea of a tri-sector economy is appreciated by the small and medium entrepreneurs and is, on the whole, acceptable to the bourgeoisie. This is the foundation for social

relations in Nicaragua and for organizing economic life. On the basis of these three forms of property the state participates in international economic relations.

Obviously, the defense of the revolution on this front is not limited to property relations. It is vital to give the working people managerial expertise, to train managers and other economic executives. This is understood not only by the nation's leadership.

"You want to know what the workers think?" asked Alberto Alvarez and Rafael Santana, who head the Ronaldo Altamirano trade union at the San Antonio private sugar refinery, the largest in Central America. "Let's go and talk to them."

Our jeep jolted over the endless ruts along a wall consisting of two-meter-tall sugar-cane. This was a typical plantation and is called Adela Nueva. We braked at tiny huts made of old boards and palm leaves. Each houses from 8 to 10 persons. There is neither electricity nor running water. Clothes are laundered at the refinery's drains.

I spoke to many of the workers and their collective reply may be summed up as follows: use should be made of all the potentialities of cooperation with the bourgeoisie, experience must be gained of managing the production facility, and those workers still siding with the owners should be weaned away from them.

This is not easy to do. Relatively recently the owners of the San Antonio facilities induced nearly 500 people to resign from the trade union by all sorts of promises and threats. They are opposed to extending workers' rights or allowing them to participate in decision-making concerning production. But pressure from below is getting them accustomed to the new developments. The first results are on hand — a more equitable collective bargaining agreement has been signed.

Cane-cutter Nicolas Umana put it in a nutshell:

"You've seen the conditions under which we live here. But we know that things cannot be changed overnight. We are patient. But if the owners do not learn to respect the revolution and do not change their attitude to us, we'll say: Enough! And we'll have total workers' control. They tell us we don't have the expertise. But we say that we'll learn — faster than some people think."

These are the sentiments of the revolutionary masses. Of course, while the SNLF takes all this into account it is guided not by emotions but by sober political calculation. Its leaders are conscious opponents of forestalling the revolutionary process.

The Sandinista slogans call for promoting

production in order to defend the revolution and, at the same time, for understanding the difficulties and restricting the demands (they do not engage, however, in hypocritical tub-thumping that recommends that only workers should tighten their belts). Nobody promises paradise tomorrow. The revolution does not need rosy illusions. It has already given the people what is most crucial, namely, a sense of dignity. This is a factor of great mobilizing power.

Lenin had warned time and again that in the economy it is dangerous to hack and hew, that it needs stable conscious headway in production. In this sense cooperation with the bourgeoisie may prove to be constructive, although it not only does not reject but compounds the class struggle, spreading it to the economy field. When Lenin called upon the working people of Russia to compete with the bourgeoisie, he said: "The test is a crucial one . . . Either we pass this test in competition with private capital, or we fail completely" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 277).

In Nicaragua the private sector is itself interested in economic progress. There is practically no segment of society that has not been hit by the destructive effects of the civil war and by the impoverishment to which society had been brought by the greed of the Somoza clan, by its barbarous treatment of the nation's economy. The bourgeoisie remaining in the country sees that the only way to improve its own economic condition is actively to join in economic life. This is reinforced by the fact that it is becoming convinced that it is the considered policy of the people's government to cooperate with small and medium entrepreneurs on the basis of a long-term program.

Of course, the term and forms of this cooperation are a concrete question. What is seen as the ultimate prospect? For the Nicaraguan revolutionaries the ideal is not confrontation with private enterprise but its integration in the public system of economy. This drawing together and fusion can be achieved by constantly strengthening the public sector, improving the state's economic activity, and controlling the operation of private capital. These are key conditions for defending the revolution on the economic front.

Time is needed, of course, to adjust the relations between the forces taking part in the solution of this problem. Much depends on how the relations of the SNLF shape out with other political groups and on whether the Sandinistas will be able to master the process discussed below.

Political consolidation of the revolution

In Managua and other towns there are eye-catching placards everywhere. A Sandinista placard reads: "Sandino yesterday, Sandino today, Sandino always!" In opposition to it there is a placard of the Social-Christian Party, declaring: "Christ yesterday, Christ today, Christ always!" "The Conservative Democratic Party is Nicaragua's only hope!" states yet another placard. Near it a voice insinuates: "Nicaragua needs God, order, and justice." There are many placards with appeals from the Nicaraguan Democratic Movement, which is the most militant political organization of the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie.

This placard polemic is striking evidence of the pluralism that the SNLF guarantees in politics. Only the Somoza supporters are denied free expression of views. The new power seeks to keep all public activity within the framework of the law and achieve political stability, without which there can be no radical changes. To defend the revolution politically means to cut short the activities of the counter-revolutionaries, neutralize the right-wing bourgeois parties, win the healthy forces, unite the left-wing groups and, above all, set up a close-knit political vanguard of the people on the basis of the SNLF. The complexity of consolidating the revolution on this front lies in the extremely wide spectrum of forces that had helped to depose Somoza — from bourgeois conservatives to left-wing movements.

The right-wing parties have taken the new realities into account. After a short period of confusion caused by a climax they had not anticipated² — the Sandinista victory — they steered a course toward splitting the popular movement and spreading anti-government feeling in the country. The revolution's adversaries are misrepresenting the government's decisions and trying to sabotage their fulfillment. They have brought reaction's tested weapon into the battle — social demagoguery, which still finds a response among politically unconscious sections of the population.

Using the experience of the Chilean putschists, the Nicaraguan reactionaries are hypocritically posing as champions of small and medium entrepreneurs and — under that cover — are seeking to keep the foundations of exploitation intact, asserting that private property is the basis of democracy. They intimidate the bourgeoisie by saying that there is a threat of "economic totalitarianism" and the establishment of a "communist regime." This tactic has all the earmarks of an attempt to take revenge and, if that fails, to steer the process

now under way into the channel of bourgeois reformism.

They do not stop at provocations and sabotage. To illustrate. I heard many complaints against officials of some ministries (lack of attention while concerning themselves with extraneous matters) and against doctors (who would write prescriptions for unavailable medicines and when the patient returned they would say that this was not the case before).

Moises Hassan, Coordinator of the State Council, spoke of this in a television program entitled "Facing the People":

"The revolution has been magnanimous to many Somoza people and irresponsible and corrupt elements. It has given them the chance to earn a pardon by honest work. But some of them evidently see our generosity as weakness and try to use it for counter-revolutionary purposes. They calculate that a person offended by something, for example, mistreatment by a specialist, will think that this is what the revolution is all about."

Reactionary bourgeois groupings, notably the Nicaraguan Democratic Movement, the Conservative Democratic Party, and the Social-Christian Party, have lately begun to coordinate their activities on a growing scale. Evidence of this are their joint statements on the nation's basic problems and their boycott of the State Council, the nation's highest organ of power. Backed up by large financial resources, relying on foreign assistance, and utilizing the mass media, they are telling the people that the nation is on the brink of catastrophe and are trying to sow distrust for the SNLF and discredit its policy of national unity.

The Sandinista policy toward the bourgeois parties is clear-cut: on the one hand, it gives no quarter to conspirators in their ranks and, on the other, it keeps the activities of these parties within the framework of the law and seeks a dialogue with sober-minded personalities. This policy is yielding results. Last April, pressured by public opinion, the right-wing forces had to agree to negotiations with the SNLF and concede that today it was vital to prevent foreign armed intervention. Time will show whether this is just another ploy.

One of these personalities, member of the Executive Committee of the Conservative Democratic Party R. Cordoba Rivas, who is a member of the Government Leadership Council, stated the motivations behind his stand, saying: "If we are to be a tangible political force we cannot close our eyes to the changes taking place in the nation and in Central America as a whole. We cannot box ourselves up in

disagreement with the SNLF. We must strengthen national unity."

This view is shared by others. In Nicaragua there are bourgeois political groups that understand and accept the fact that the revolutionary process is irreversible. These include the Independent Liberal Party and the People's Social-Christian Party. They were among the first to join the Patriotic Front of the Revolution set up a year ago under the leadership of the SNLF. These are not the only parties that speak of the need for radical changes in the country. Their posture is most eloquent evidence of the profound ideological change that has taken place among the petty bourgeoisie. This gives a further stimulus to the political defense of the revolution.

The Patriotic Front has been joined also by some left-wing organizations. Its constituent manifesto proclaims the defense, consolidation and development of the revolution as the principal task. All the parties that signed this document recognize the vanguard role of the SNLF in the revolutionary process.

The Sandinistas themselves realize that the earlier they turn their military-political movement into a party, the sooner will the revolution be consolidated politically. As yet the SNLF lacks a precise structure and a smooth interaction between its various links. Integration,³ however, is possible only for those who ideologically see themselves as a close-knit body and soberly assess the prospects for and aims of the struggle. A lucid political and ideological program is of great importance in this process. These problems have long had the attention of the most politically conscious members and leadership of the SNLF.

"During the war against the tyranny," said Tomas Borge Martinez, "our Front acquired considerable experience of guerrilla and insurgent warfare. After victory we have been engaged mainly in state construction. Today, however, we are faced with the acute problem of laying the foundations of a working people's political organization that would have a scientific foundation, understand its leading role in society, and have a high morale and a clear political strategy. The main thing is to build the party solidly. Of course, this is not easy because all of us lack political training and experience of organization."

Commandante Marxos Somarriba, one of the SNLF leaders, spoke of how these plans are being put into effect.

"The first steps toward turning the SNLF into a party have already been taken," he said. "The Sandinista Assembly, a democratic consultative body consisting of 67 Front leaders and

militants, was formed a year ago. This Assembly has been charged with drawing up the future party's program and rules. At its sessions it considers key issues of foreign policy, the economy, the defense of the revolution, organizational work among the people, and the education and training of cadre. Moreover, the SNLF National Leadership now has a Political Commission. The formation of a party structure has commenced. Leading committees of the Front are functioning in all of the nation's 16 departments.

To a larger or lesser degree the representatives of left-wing parties whom I met in Managua realize that there must be close organizational cohesion among all the revolutionary forces. But in some cases the impediment is personal ambition or an "underestimation of the Sandinistas' ideological and political capabilities," to quote Alvaro Ramirez, former leader of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party (at the close of last year it merged with the SNLF). Disagreements among left-wingers, who had been members of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party or its youth branch, compound the burden of the past. Those who at the time had adhered to different orientations do not find it easy to be above "own momentary truth" and look somewhat farther ahead. But life, chiefly the stepped-up activity of internal and external reaction, insistently demands the formation of a united vanguard of the revolution.

The Sandinistas do not regard other left-wing forces as chance fellow-travellers. Developments and the need for defending the revolution politically constantly pose revolutionaries with new tasks that inevitably stem from any, even a short, advance. Practice itself introduces corrections into political programs. Upon joining in the process of social changes, people and organizations abide by its objective laws. Parties and groups and also those of their members and leaders who try to go against the logic of history, lag behind or are swept away in the course of the revolution. The Sandinistas do not consider that truth belongs to them from the first step to the last. They are prepared to understand the exigencies of each moment, and are conscious of the fact that the revolution will teach them. Their allies in the struggle will learn together with them, while the sincere striving for truth will lead not to division but to greater unity.

Under conditions of political pluralism it is, of course, inconceivable to form a vanguard party without a struggle for the masses, without enlarging the social base of the revolution. And here there has been progress. In Managua, where it is sometimes hard to find one office or

another, anybody will tell you the address of the National Leadership of the Sandinista Defense Committees (SDC). The doors of its headquarters in a one-storey building are hardly ever closed. People go there with questions, offers of assistance and suggestions. Among these, very many are young people. Patricia Roco, the SDC General Secretary, is also young.

"Our organization," she said, "was formed a year before the revolution on the initiative of the SNLF and the parties that joined in the struggle against the tyranny. At the time it was called the Civil Defense Committees and its job was to mobilize the people against the dictatorship. Committees were set up where the revolutionary struggle was most acute. These provided the guerrillas with people possessing essential professions such as gunsmiths, paramedics and cooks, and taught the population how to protect itself from bombing and shelling. Many of our comrades took a direct part in the fighting. Of course, after the victory there was a change in the functions of the committees. They now have nearly half a million members and more than 15,000 locals. These explain the aims of the revolution and tasks of the economy to the people and make sure that the decrees of the government and the resolutions of the Sandinista Front are carried out. Our chief task is to defend the revolution and for this we are prepared to give our lives."

"These committees," added Veronica Roliga, the SDC Secretary for International Relations, "have become a bulwark of the forces laying the groundwork for the formation of a vanguard party of the revolution. For enemies they are a sore in the eye. There have been cases of our activists being assassinated.⁴ But it's not so easy to frighten us. If you want to meet our people I would suggest you go to the assembly of the local committees of the central district of Managua."

Some 30 persons gathered in an airy one-story school building. These were coordinators of local organizations. The sitting began with the singing of the national and the Sandinista anthems. Then they got down to the agenda, discussing the question of adjusting the committees to the new situation. It was important to explain to people the SNLF policy toward the bourgeoisie, what was causing shortcomings in the work of some state agencies, and why there had to be a united vanguard force of the revolution. In short, this was a businesslike and frank discussion permeated with a sense of responsibility for the nation's future.

The Sandinistas foster a spirit of unity and cohesion also in other mass organizations, the trade unions in the first place. There is now a

Sandinista Trade Union representing more than 220,000 people; moreover there is a Trade Union Coordinating Committee with nine large trade unions affiliated to it. In this way the mass base of the revolution's political defense is being enlarged.

The efforts of the Sandinistas in the economic and political fields are creating the foundation for the successful fulfillment of the third task, namely, the organization of armed resistance to reaction. The tragic experience of Chile has reaffirmed the Marxist-Leninist proposition that this is one of the key conditions for the revolution's progress and the fulfillment of its creative plans. In the struggle for its assertion, the new system relies on:

The strength of the armed people

In the course of the long guerrilla war the SNLF had set up a small but effective military apparatus. This allowed forming a new type of army quickly.

"You should have seen our troops during the initial days after the revolution," said a Sandinista officer. "It would be hard to recognize our present-day soldiers in the variously dressed, unshaved, and long-haired guerrillas. Today the vast majority are soldiers in the true sense of the word — smart and disciplined."

The constant danger of attack from without made it imperative to accomplish within months what usually takes years. The people's army is steadily growing stronger in continuous training and in almost daily clashes with Somoza terrorists infiltrating from neighboring Honduras. But is it strong enough to repulse aggression?

"Singlehanded, the army cannot ensure the country's defense," said commandante Dora Maria Tellez. "It is not our intention to have the largest armed forces in Central America. We can make our country secure against an external threat in another way, by calling upon the entire people to rise in its defense."

Lst February it was decided to form a mass home guard, the Sandinista People's Militia. The most popular catch-phrase today is: "Every conscious Nicaraguan is a member of the SPM." Age is no obstacle. In one of the battalions I was introduced to 70-year-old Julian Canales (he had been with Sandino in the 1930s) and his 13-year-old son Marcos. Both are quite skilled in the use of weapons. I asked them what made them join the militia. The former replied that he had no intention of dropping behind his 25 children, all of whom are dedicated Sandinistas, and that the soldiers of the revolution had to be aided; the latter declared that he wanted to help the revolution.

In itself, this is an outstanding fact — a large family had become soldiers. But this unity of generations is characteristic of the spirit of the revolutionary fighters — working people of all ages are ready to defend the revolution against its enemies.

"In Nicaragua today," said Humberto Ortega Saavedra, member of the SNLF National Leadership and Minister of Defense, "there is an integral organization that embraces the army, the people's militia, the security forces, and the police. Within the space of a little over a year they have, by common effort, uncovered and liquidated more than 30 gangs of counter-revolutionaries and criminals, and brought to light several conspiracies. Many faithful fighters died in the discharge of their duty."

Ortega did not accidentally name the security forces after the army and the people's militia. They play an extraordinarily large role in a situation marked by constant enemy provocations. These forces are headed by commandante Serna. His first name is Lenin.

"My father," he said, "was a Salvadoran worker who settled in Nicaragua. In my family we revered Lenin and knew the history of the October Revolution. As a matter of fact, my brother is called Krupskaya. My underground name was Felix. That," he added with a smile, "was probably why I was appointed to this job."

"In our work we depend entirely upon assistance from the people. Our hands are clean and, where possible, we give our work publicity. The Sandinistas hold open trials, the most important of which are broadcast live on radio and television. The accused are told that their sentence depends not only on the gravity of the crime they have committed but also on whether they are still hostile to the revolution or are sincerely repentant. Members of the press, the judiciary, and the public can interview prisoners on the fourth or fifth day after they are arrested and see for themselves that no physical violence has been used against them. The principal aim of this complex work is to reshape the people's attitude to the security forces. Let decent people respect, not fear us. Let the enemy, the enemy alone, be afraid of us.

"The revolution's magnanimity," Serna notes, "is a very sensitive weapon. There are cases when we do not agree to the release of one criminal or another, but we never forget that the security forces are no more than a political instrument of the revolution's leadership. More than 500 former Somoza guardsmen were amnestied recently. Some for reasons of health, others on account of their advanced age, and still others for various valid reasons. Of course,

most of the released are not particularly dangerous. Nonetheless, some may be drawn into conspiracies. But we take the risk deliberately, for by sacrificing operational interests we benefit politically."

The revolution makes it clear that it does not seek to wreak vengeance, that it is guided by lofty humanism. It extends its hands to those who have stumbled and even committed a crime, for it believes in people.

The Sandinista police operate in close cooperation with the security forces. Its chief, Rene Vivas Ludo,⁵ spoke of the problems that had to be tackled after the victory over the Somoza regime.

"Apart from organizing the service itself, it proved to be a very intricate matter to delineate the functions of the security forces and the police. It is sometimes hard to distinguish criminals from counter-revolutionaries. All are killers and brigands. On the other hand, there was our lack of experience, because recruits for the police were former guerrillas and underground workers. Mistakes in the initial period were therefore natural and easily explained. But we have learned and rapidly restructured our work. The Sandinista police is now fighting crime, particularly 'new' crime, much more effectively."

Seeing that the word "new" had puzzled us, Vivas explained:

"Take the situation that obtained under Somoza. The law was flouted in everything, beginning with traffic rules and ending with vendetta killing. Corruption and blackmail were rife. Innocent people were taken into custody on any pretext and held for ransom. But criminals were set free — it was enough to give a bribe to a police officer, a prison warder, or a judge. Some vices of the past are so deep-rooted that they are not condemned morally. For instance, contraband was always regarded as harmless. When we began fighting it, we had to deal not only with hardened criminals but also with ordinary citizens, who simply could not understand why people were punished for 'trivial' offenses. I believe that the main damage done by the dictatorship to the people was the moral corruption of part of the nation. The consequences of this corruption are now called the 'new' criminality. We regard the struggle against it a matter for the whole nation."

For the political and economic predominance of U.S. imperialism in Latin America, the revolution in Nicaragua was the most staggering blow since the victory of the Cuban people. The Nicaraguan people want nothing so much as peace and normal relations with all countries, including the USA. Even a single visit to

Nicaragua will quickly make it obvious that Washington's charges against the SNLF are both false and irresponsible. "They do not surprise anybody," said J. Alanisa, the Nicaraguan representative on the UN Human Rights Commission. "As soon as an oppressed people rises anywhere in the world, the USA raises a hue and cry about foreign interference, international terrorism, and other sins."

On the pretext of preventing the spread of the communist epidemic in the region, the USA is speeding its preparations to destroy the Sandinista revolution. Armed units are being trained in the mountainous areas of Honduras for an invasion of Nicaragua. These are being reinforced with mercenaries from Miami and Guatemala. The counter-revolutionary gangs consist of thousands of thugs and these are only waiting for Washington to give them the green light.

Honduras newspapers carried a paid report to the effect that a certain J. Carlos, calling himself the commander of the "liberation army of Nicaragua," had pledged to overthrow the Sandinistas and establish a "democratic, republican system." This "army" acts in close cooperation with another organization calling itself the Nicaraguan Democratic Union. It is headed by J. Cardenal, who until recently had represented the private sector in the State Council of Nicaragua. He speaks openly of his sympathies for the Somoza supporters and of his readiness to help anybody starting a rising in the country. Reaction is seeking to rally its forces. JRN, the Honduran radio station, goes so far as to call for a united front against the "Sandinista plague."

The Nicaraguan people reply to these threats by closing ranks, heightening vigilance, and joining the people's militia en masse. They have the support of all the forces of progress and peace. Reaction will not catch the revolution napping. Despite difficulties it is strengthening its ranks and has learned and is prepared to defend itself militarily as well.

There are many problems in Nicaragua. Its achievements are unquestionable and the difficulties are obvious. When one acquaints himself with the country one clearly sees what is paramount.

The revolution will be able to defend itself economically only by broadening the foundations of the new power, deepening democracy, extending the people's participation in the management of public affairs, and utilizing the positive activities of all the patriotic forces.

The revolution will be able to defend itself politically only by forming a close-knit van-

guard and rallying around it all the supporters of social changes.

The revolution will erect an armed barrier to reaction and imperialist aggressors only by strengthening the army and the people's militia and relying on international solidarity.

This will make Nicaragua's revolutionary development irreversible.

Managua — Prague

1. The others lost their lives. They include Carlos Fonseca Amador, who was the acknowledged leader of the SNLF (new Nicaragua's only order bears his name).

2. Until very recently they hoped to preserve the existing system without, of course, Somoza and his clan, that had in many cases, kept an iron grip on the bourgeoisie itself.

3. This is precisely how the question is formulated by the SNLF.

4. The reactionary media are constantly attacking the SDC. In some cases these are nothing less than provocations. For instance, on December 21, 1980 the newspaper *La Prensa* wrote that a census questionnaire was being circulated in one of the capital's districts and alleged that "filling it is tantamount to joining the SDC and pledging political support for the Sandinistas." This transparent lie only raises a smile. But there are people who hope that slander "will take root" and injure the revolution.

5. He is now Deputy Minister of the Interior.

The Agony of a Dictatorship: Nicaraguan Chronicle

**O. Ignatiev,
G. Borovik**

A panoramic picture of events culminating in the downfall of the Somoza dictatorship. A gripping and moving account by two writers who visited Central America in the months prior to the Sandinista victory.

paper 159 pages \$2.50



Freedom for the people of South Africa

ANNALS OF THE STRUGGLE

On July 30, 1981, the South African Communist Party (SACP), the oldest on the continent, celebrated its 60th anniversary. It was formed when, in 1921, a number of Marxist organizations created a single party and called it the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA).

Certain erroneous conceptions guided the work of the CPSA leadership at the early stage, such as defending primarily the interests of the white working class and underestimating the role of the Black working class and the significance of the struggle for national liberation. However, these errors can never detract from the fact that the party was founded. The founders included outstanding veteran communists, in particular D. Ivon Jones, a great international communist figure.

The South African communists' devoted effort in an atmosphere of unceasing persecution helped raise the prestige of the CPSA. The second half of the 20s saw a rapid increase in the party's numerical strength. Whereas in 1927 the membership of the CPSA was 200, by 1928 it had risen to 1,700, out of whom 1,600 were Africans. This was the first generation of African communists.

An exceptionally complex and at times contradictory problem facing the Communist Party from its inception was how to resolve the national and class questions in a viciously racist society. This problem became even more acute when South Africa reached the stage of monopoly capitalism. In the 1929-1934 period, the CPSA was nearly destroyed by the activities of ultra-left sectarians. The problems that arose were a result of the party leadership's wrong approach to the "Black Republic" resolution of the Comintern, which correctly emphasized the role of the Africans as the most oppressed section of South African society and described the national liberation struggle as a stage leading to socialism.

It should be stressed, however, that even in that difficult period the communists were always in the forefront of the struggle for the cause of the working class. They organized trade unions, mobilized the working class and

defended it from the attacks of the ruling capitalist class, championed the people's interests and fought against racism, poverty, national and class oppression. Changes within the party leadership and assimilation of the theoretical and practical conclusions drawn by Dimitrov in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Comintern enabled the CPSA to overcome the destructive effects of ultra-left sectarianism.

While it is true that in the first 30 years of its existence the Communist Party was considered legal, this "legality" was illusory. The party, its members and supporters were subjected to brutal police persecution and repression. In 1950, the racist authorities banned the CPSA and declared the propagation of communist ideas to be contrary to law. Even liberal bourgeois elements were harassed for "serving the communist cause."

In this situation the CPSA was dissolved. But shortly afterward most of its leaders began, under Moses Kotane's guidance, to prepare in conditions of clandestinity for the restoration of the party. In 1953, an illegal conference of communists elected a Central Committee and decided to rename the party the South African Communist Party. In this way the SACP succeeded the CPSA.

In 1961, the revolutionary movements resolved to engage in an armed struggle against the racist regime.

In 1962, under conditions of fierce repression, the SACP adopted its program "The Road to South African Freedom." The program described South African colonialism as a "colonialism of a special type" under which the colonial oppressor and the colonized oppressed live side by side, within one geographical entity. It also emphasized that the national liberation of the African people is the party's main task, and also the pre-condition for the transition to socialism. The invaluable role of the African National Congress (ANC) as the leading political organization in the national liberation alliance was fully recognized.

The party, which is working illegally, has an active apparatus and fully participates in Um-

khonto we Sizwe (Spear of the Nation), a military wing of the African National Congress. It brings out numerous publications, including an illegal edition of the quarterly *African Communist*. The party sees its chief task in strengthening the national liberation movement, spreading the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and bringing the masses into the struggle for the socialist future. In the six decades of struggle, the party has produced from its ranks many outstanding revolutionaries committed to the working people's interests, such as Albert Nzula, Johannes Nkosi, Moses Kotane, J. Marks, Bram Fischer, Yusuf Dadoo and Moses Mabhida.

The communists of South Africa have always been staunch upholders of the principles of proletarian internationalism. The Communist Party has invariably helped foster the consciousness of the masses, their internationalist thinking and their solidarity with the working people of the socialist countries as well as with the people of other countries fighting against colonialism and imperialism. The SACP is guided by the fact that proletarian international solidarity is a two-way process. It receives disinterested all-round assistance from the socialist community. An important criterion of proletarian internationalism for us

South African communists, is our attitude to the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. The SACP stands for the cohesiveness and unity of the world communist movement and fully supports every endeavor to promote it.

The SACP has a proud record of 60 years of struggle for national and social liberation, a struggle that is becoming ever more difficult and taxing. Forged and steeled in the heat of class battles, the party proves worthy of its name. "The SACP," says one of the latest statements of its Central Committee, "is a vital component of the revolutionary alliance for national liberation headed by the ANC. As such it has no interests separate from any contingent of that alliance which we have always worked to strengthen. Both as a party and as a part of the alliance of revolutionary forces, we enter the new decade with a keen awareness of the heavy responsibilities ahead, with absolute confidence in the justness of our cause and with the certainty that our people will destroy the racist tyranny, win People's Power and move on to build a socialist South Africa."*

Essop Pahad
South African journalist

*The African Communist, No. 80, 1980, pp. 37-38.

Terrorism elevated to official policy

HISTORY OF THE ISRAEL RULERS: A HISTORY OF AGGRESSION AND CRIME

The long list of crimes committed by Israel's militarists now includes the piratical air raid on the Iraqi nuclear research center near Baghdad. The raid left charred corpses and ruins in its wake. With the exception of fanatics blinded by anti-Arab chauvinism, no one in the world takes seriously Tel Aviv's assertion that the raid was a "defensive measure" aimed at heading off the "nuclear threat posed" by Iraq. A signatory to the Treaty on Nuclear Non-proliferation, Baghdad has scrupulously respected its provisions, a fact authoritatively confirmed by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Iraqi nuclear research program pursues solely peaceful aims.

As for Israel, it has not signed the Treaty on Nuclear Non-proliferation, nor is this accidental. Its leaders do not merely covet nuclear

arms, admitting this only in the narrow circle of trusted people. Indeed, preparations for the manufacture of nuclear weapons have long been a reality of Israeli policy. "The fundamental alternative to forming a large army is armaments differing from conventional ones," Professor E. Saadan, a high-ranking Israeli government official, has said in public, speaking of the possibility of cutting the country's enormous military expenditures. This kind of euphemism is hard to misinterpret. Experts believe that late in September 1979, Israel and South Africa carried out joint nuclear tests in the Atlantic. That Tel Aviv has an atomic potential is no longer called into question.

This infernal torch which could set fire to the planet is now in the hands of irresponsible men who have repeatedly shown cynical scorn for universal moral principles. The very motto which guided the Zionists in setting out to

colonize Palestine — "Land without a people for a people without land" — is immoral. The Palestinian Arabs, many generations of whom toiled on scorched, rocky land were struck off the list of the living at the whim of Zionist leaders. Nor was this done figuratively alone.

The history of the Israeli rulers may safely be described as a history of international terrorism and brigandage. Here are but a few of the crimes committed by Israel's secret services:

In 1948 Israeli agents carried out "Operation Thief" by stealing in Italy the Syrian ship *Argyro* and sailing it all the way to Tel Aviv. The ship was carrying arms which Syria had purchased to defend itself against Israeli attacks.

During the night of April 9-10, 1948, terrorists from the Stern and Irgoun Tsvai Leumi gangs (the latter was led by Begin, now Prime Minister of Israel) massacred 254 inhabitants of the village of Deir Yassin. For more than 30 years now every Arab has winced at the mention of Deir Yassin as if stabbed in the back.

In 1954 the Israeli intelligence service launched "Operation Suzanne." The purpose of the operation was to discredit the young Egyptian revolution led by Nasser and destabilize the situation in Egypt. Terrorists trained in Israel blew up the General Post Office in Alexandria and buildings housing U.S. information services in Alexandria and Cairo (a frankly provocative act). The criminals were seized when they moved on to sabotage at railway stations and in cinemas.

About the same time, Israeli secret services mounted a vast terror campaign against participants in the incipient Palestine Resistance Movement (PRM) and its supporters in Arab countries. They made a "death list" which comprised not only PRM leaders but foreign specialists working in Egypt. Late in 1962 and early in 1963, bombs delivered by mail killed six people.

During the 1968-69 "war of attrition" Israeli planes dropped napalm bombs on a school in Bahr al-Bagan and a factory in Abu Zaabal. The victims were children and workers.

Terror assumed unprecedented proportions in the 70s. On October 16, 1972, Mossad agents killed Wael Idil Z'aitr, a Palestinian, in Rome. A few days later, Mahmoud Al-Himshari, another prominent fighter for the liberation of Palestine, fell at their hands in Paris. On January 24, 1973 Israeli terrorists killed Abbad Al-Shir in Cyprus and on April 6, 1973, Professor Basil Al-Kubaisi, an Iraqi, in Beirut. On April 9, terrorists raided in Beirut the homes of

leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and killed over a hundred people — all whom they came across.

In 1980 Israeli agents killed in Paris Professor Mexhad, an Egyptian scientist who cooperated with the Iraqi nuclear research center.

Lastly, in June 1981 (when these lines were written), Na'im Khidr, a PLO representative, was killed with five pistol shots in a Brussels street.

Piratical acts of terrorism also involve the armed forces of Israel. In the slightly more than three decades since the State of Israel came into being, it has unleashed two wars of aggression and grabbed over 50,000 sq. km. of Arab territory, or three times more than the internationally recognized territory of Israel itself.¹ Occupation was coupled with unparalleled acts of massive terrorism. This terror against the population of the seized lands and neighboring countries has been going on ever since. Here is an example. During the night of April 17-18, 1980, Israeli commandos landed from the sea on Lebanese territory. They killed the wounded and the medical personnel in the PLO hospital situated not far off. They also killed three adults and three children living in a nearby house. The Zionist militarists' incursions into Lebanon, far from stopping, became more frequent and brazen in the first half of 1981. And this apart from the fact that Israel lords it over the territory seized by its puppet, Haddad, in southern Lebanon.

Assassination and sabotage go hand in hand with international brigandage and piracy. In 1968 and 1969, Israeli agents operating in Switzerland stole drawings of the French Mirage plane. A few years later Israel used these drawings to make its "own" Kfir fighter-bomber. In 1969 "Operation Noah's Ark" was carried out — Israeli agents stole missile boats from the French port of Cherbourg; subsequently these boats formed the backbone of the Zionist regime's navy.

The policy of aggrandizement being pursued by the Zionist rulers of Israel and the cloak-and-dagger methods used by Israeli agents have discredited that country in the eyes of progressive mankind. However, this policy suits imperialist reaction, primarily U.S. imperialism, which constantly renders Israel enormous moral and material support.² It is due to U.S. backing that Israel's rulers dare ignore roughly 250 UN resolutions intended to normalize the situation in the Middle East and meet the legitimate demands of the Palestinian Arab people. This backing also enabled Israel to

raid the Iraqi nuclear research center. The raid was carried out by U.S.-trained pilots flying planes supplied by the United States; while it was on, American bombs exploded over the capital of a sovereign country.

This, then, is the kind of terrorism elevated to official policy.

Farid Mougahid
CC member, Egyptian Communist Party,
ECP representative on the journal

1. By decision of the UN (1947), the State of Israel was recognized at its founding to have an area of 14,100 sq. km.

2. This year the United States is to grant Israel \$2.2 billion by way of "support."

Peking's territorial claims

Of late, bourgeois mass media have been writing of "positive changes" in China's foreign policy, of China's peaceableness. It is asserted that since Mao's death China has "ceased pursuing a policy of imperilling peace and stability" and is only showing legitimate concern for its national security.

This assertion is based on pronouncements by high-ranking Chinese political leaders seeking to soften Mao's theory that "war is inevitable." Peking is maneuvering in an effort to adjust to public opinion with declarations that another world war can be avoided. However, some new elements in Peking's policy do not, regrettably, give grounds for expecting Mao's successors to renounce China's hegemonistic ambitions, its territorial claims on neighboring states, and its bellicose bid for world supremacy.

This is the subject of the following survey.

First, a quick look at history. In China it has long been held that the stature of a ruler is measured by how much foreign territory he conquers. Back in 214 B.C., troops of Qin Shihuang, the first ruler of the "Celestial Kingdom," invaded Aulac, the territory that is now Vietnam. Chinese chronicles are full of descriptions of wars of conquest against neighbors near and far.

In the 13th century Kublai Khan, the Mongol emperor of China, made an attempt to conquer Japan, Vietnam and Burma. In the 17th century China's Manchu emperors seized South and North Mongolia, and Korea, and in the 18th century they extended their empire to East Turkestan (Xinjiang) and Tibet. More, they tried to subjugate Burma, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Nepal and part of India, and ravaged the Russian settlements along the Amur.

An ideology was evolved to justify this policy of aggrandizement. China was considered the center of the universe (hence the name "Middle Kingdom"), around which all the rest of mankind would be on its knees. This policy

was pursued until the clash with the colony-hungry European powers in the 1840s.

But sinocentrism survived. An attempt to resurrect it was made by the right wing of the Kuomintang, the party of the Chinese bourgeoisie that ruled the nation until 1949. A book entitled *China's Frontiers* by Hua Qiyun was published in Shanghai in 1932. The dotted line in a map in this book is the "old frontier" that allegedly existed until 1840. The dot-dash line is China's frontier at the time the map was published. The hatching indicates "lost territories." These embrace Korea, the Ryukyu Islands, Taiwan (then occupied by Japan), Annam (Vietnam), Burma, Bhutan, Nepal, part of India, and vast territories in the Soviet Union (part of Kazakhstan and Central Asia, the Amur region, Primorye (Maritime Territory and Sakhalin). Without any explanation the whole of the Mongolian People's Republic is indicated as Chinese territory despite the fact that 12 years before Hua Qiyun's book appeared Mongolia had become an independent nation.

The ambitions of the feudal emperors and the Kuomintang overlords were inherited by Mao Zedong and his henchmen.

In *The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China*, published in 1939, Mao wrote: "After inflicting military defeats on China, the imperialist powers seized many states dependent on China and part of Chinese territory. Japan took Korea, Taiwan, the Ryukyu Islands, the Island of Penghu, and Port Arthur; Britain seized Burma, Bhutan, Nepal and Hongkong; France captured Annam; and a small country like Portugal gained control of our Aomen."¹ Mao's list thus coincides almost entirely with Hua Qiyun's list of "lost territories."

Mao stated his views even more bluntly when he came to power. "We should subjugate the whole world," he told the CPC Central Committee meeting in September 1959. "Our object is the entire globe, where we shall create

a great power. We should be resolute about this."²

The subjugation of the whole world. Neither more nor less. True, this is the maximum program. Chinese strategists see Asia as their starting point. "We should make every effort to conquer Southeast Asia, including South Vietnam, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia and Singapore . . . This is a mineral-rich area and the effort to conquer it will be more than repaid . . . After seizing Southeast Asia we shall be able to consolidate our strength in that region."³

A textbook entitled *An Outline History of Modern China* was published in Peking in 1953. Among the territories "seized by imperialists" it names part of Kazakhstan, the Soviet Central Asian republics, part of Afghanistan, Nepal, Bhutan, part of India, Burma, the Andaman Islands, Western Malaysia, Thailand, the countries of Indochina, Taiwan, the Pescadores Islands, the Sulu Archipelago of the Philippines, the Japanese Ryukyu Islands, the Soviet territories along the Amur, Primorye and Sakhalin. Mongolia, again without any explanation, is included in China. Although, in reply to criticism from the Vietnamese comrades, the newspaper *Renmin Ribao* maintained that the 1953 textbook was printed by a private publisher without the knowledge of the government, the claims have, in effect, not been recanted.⁴ This is evidence that this was not some private publication but a book printed by *Renmin Ribao* itself. "The Chinese people are morally prepared to fight to the last for the recovery of lost territories, of territories that had once belonged to China," it wrote in November 1966.⁵

Declarations in this vein were followed up with openly aggressive actions. China began armed provocations against neighboring countries in the mid-1950s.

1956. There was an attempt to annex 170,000 square kilometers, or one-fourth, of Burma's territory.

1959. Chinese troops attacked units of the Indian army in the vicinity of Longjiu and in a western sector near the Kongka Pass. The motivation was a claim to more than 130,000 square kilometers of foreign territory.

1962. Military operations in the Himalayas, along the Indian frontier. In some sectors Chinese troops penetrated between 80 and 100 kilometers southward.

1969. In March, Chinese troops ambushed Soviet frontier guards on Damansky Island in the Ussuri River, firing point-blank. Then regular Chinese army units, supported by artillery, attacked the Soviet troops guarding Damansky Island. In August several Chinese units in-

truded into Soviet territory in Semipalatinsk Region (Kazakhstan). In July 1974 *Renmin Ribao* reported that beginning with 1969, disciplines like political knowledge, history, geography, and even the Chinese language and arithmetic were taught in Chinese schools in accordance with a special curriculum drawn up on the basis of "documents related to the events on Damansky Island."⁶

1974. Chinese military units seized the Paracel Islands, which Vietnam regards as an inalienable part of its territory.

In the period between 1969 and 1978 Chinese troops violated Mongolia's frontier on more than 400 occasions, in some cases intruding into Mongolia to a depth of 15-20 kilometers.

Beginning and close of 1975, March 1976, February-March 1978. Pro-Peking forces engaged government troops in Burma in fierce fighting. Chinese military took part in these operations.

1978. In April, Chinese vessels intruded into the coastal waters of Japan's Senkaku Islands. In the spring of 1979 there were similar provocations in this region.

1979. In February, China invaded Vietnam to "teach it a lesson." The Chinese used 600,000 troops, hundreds of tanks, armored troop carriers, and thousands of pieces of artillery. They laid waste to four towns and 320 rural communities, destroying 735 schools, 428 hospitals, and thousands of houses and public buildings.

Two Chinese battalions penetrated the Laotian province of Luongnamtha. Seven Chinese divisions were massed near the Sino-Laotian frontier.

1980. Bandit gangs with many Chinese advisers systematically infiltrate into the Afghan province of Badakhshan bordering on China. The Chinese continued raiding Vietnamese territory.

1981. The Chinese unceasingly provoke armed clashes along the frontiers of Vietnam, Laos, Afghanistan, India, and other countries. The Chinese leaders threaten to teach Vietnam "another lesson." Last May, Chinese armed provocations along Vietnam's northern frontier, the Vietnamese press noted, reached their highest level in two years.

Preparations are under way for another aggression against India. Peking has lately increased its armed forces in Tibet along the Sino-Indian frontier. Military camps that can accommodate 40 divisions have been built in Tibet. Lately, there has been a perceptible increase in cases of intrusion into Indian air space by Chinese military aircraft. To this day China

remains in occupation of over 36,000 square kilometers of Indian territory.

This is a brief chronicle of the military brigandage by Mao and his successors. Thus, in this context, nothing has changed after the death of the "great helmsman." Hegemonistic, predatory ambitions are entertained by the present Chinese leadership as well. Evidence of this is a textbook, *A History of China*, published in Peking in 1978 for secondary-school senior classes. This textbook contains a map in which the cartographers have surpassed even the Kuomintang: they included as "part" of China the Soviet territory adjoining lakes Balkal and Balkhash, and also the Aral Sea.

Young Chinese are told that there is a "historical injustice" that must be corrected by incorporating huge territories of neighboring countries in China. The total size of these territories exceeds 10 million square kilometers, which is larger than the territory of China by nearly a million square kilometers. In addition to land areas, Peking lays claim to more than four-fifths of the South China Sea, recognizing only a

12-mile limit for the territorial waters of other coastal states.

Many of Peking's political attitudes are motivated by the striving for territorial expansion. These include the demonstrative non-recognition of the inviolability of frontiers and of the renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations, and China's opposition to the efforts of the Asian peoples to ensure security in their part of the world by joint efforts. Having inherited the predatory traditions of China's past rulers, from Qin Shihuang to Mao Zedong, the present Peking leadership is seen by the world as a proponent of international piracy and expansion.

Sein Maung
Burma

1. Mao Zedong, *Xuanji, Dongbei Shudian*, 1948.
2. Mao Zedong, *Sixiang Wansui*, Peking, 1967, p. 101.
3. *The Truth About Vietnamese-Chinese Relations During the Past 30 Years*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, 1979, p. 12.
4. *Renmin Ribao*, October 31, 1978.
5. *Renmin Ribao*, November 5, 1966.
6. *Renmin Ribao*, July 25, 1974.

Neofascism: a real threat

Our readers have expressed an interest in our publications on the resurgence of fascism.¹ A. Gomez (Argentina) says, for instance: "The conditions for the emergence of a fresh fascist threat are being created by the general political trend to the right in the capitalist countries, the attempts by the imperialist circles to return the world to the cold war period, the economic crisis, the unemployment, the inflation and the growth of prices. Is not evidence of this provided by the ever more frequent terroristic acts by right-wing extremists?" He wants us to consider the topic once again and to describe the specific activities of the right-wing extremist organizations. A similar request has come from J.P. Sanches of Spain, J. Cotret of Canada and other readers. Many of them believe that there is a direct connection between the growing neofascist threat and the "tough line" of the U.S. administration with its reactionary activities in the world arena.

In meeting these requests, we have not set ourselves the task of analyzing the origins of neofascism, but merely describe its present-day manifestations in Western Europe and its various organizational forms on the national and international scale.

"Brown" web

The readers who are reminded of the period of Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and Salazar are bound to ask this question: is fascism still alive in the former fascist countries? There is no doubt about the answer: yes, it is very much alive.

Consider the FRG. The fact that the "brown shirts" exist will be seen from the fact that, according to the Ministry of the Interior, which cannot be suspected of exaggeration, there are 75 neofascist outfits in the country with a membership of 19,800. That is apart from the roughly 2,000 "lone-wolf fighters." Neonazi ideas are being spread about by 34 publishing houses.²

Altogether, according to the FRG's democratic forces, there are 300 neofascist and militaristic organizations in the country, and their number has been steadily growing. Thus, over the past year, two new neofascist parties were set up: "National Socialist Democratic Labour Party" (NSDLP), and "People's Socialist Movement of Germany-Party of Labor."

In the countries which used to be the "stamping grounds" of fascism, over 20 right-radicalist (neofascist) outfits are active in Italy,

and nearly 100 in Spain. The heirs of Salazarism are, quite naturally, still very much alive in Portugal.

However, neonazi activities are being stepped up not only in countries with tragic periods of fascist dictatorship in their history. The "brown" web will now be found in roughly 60 countries in the non-socialist part of the world, with the fascist-type parties and groups being, perhaps, most active in Western Europe.

An eloquent example is offered by Britain, where nearly 200 neofascist outfits and groups have emerged since the war. The biggest of these are the Greater Britain Movement and the National Front, which resulted from a merger of the British National Party and the League of Empire Loyalists in 1967. The League of St. George is smaller and less well known. But it is connected with the National Front and actively spreads the "positive aspects of the activity of national-socialism." There is also the militarized Column-88, which advocates the establishment of a single national-socialist party in Britain. The "enthusiasts" of nazism within the SS Wotan-18 group have won notoriety for posting letter bombs to bookshops selling progressive literature. This list could well be continued.

Of course, one should not over-rate the strength and potentialities of present-day ultra-rightists, the political and ideological successors to the "old" fascism. But it would be a mistake not to realize that the atmosphere of economic and social crisis in the capitalist world, and the expansionist, aggressive policy of the most reactionary imperialist circles all help to step up the activity of neonazism.

Right extremists unite

A characteristic feature of the neofascist outfits is the ever more overt coordination of their activity on an international scale. Thus, the West German ultras have numerous ties with their fellows in neighboring states and on the other side of the Atlantic. FRG Minister of the Interior G. Baum, replying to an interpellation in the Bundestag, had to admit that "Neonazi groups, notably the National Democratic party and young national democrats maintain contacts with like-minded groups abroad, above all, in Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Britain, Austria, Switzerland, Spain and the United States."³

These contacts are effected mainly through the "Society of Mutual Assistance of Former Soldiers of SS Troops" (HIAG), which has roughly 300,000 members and which is officially allowed to operate by the West German authorities. It has a ramified network of organi-

zations in the FRG (nearly 120 local and district associations), and in many other capitalist countries. In order to involve the greatest possible number of former SS men, HIAG has a foreign "search service" among whose leaders one will find the names of diehard Hitlerites. In Italy, for instance, one such leader is R. Schulze-Kossens, a former SS Obersturmbahnführer and Hitler's aide-de-camp.

Among the international neofascist associations are the "European Order," "European National Party," "World National Socialist Alliance," "European Right," and the "Black International," which was illegally founded in Rome in 1950. The monthly *Nation Europa*, which is published in Coburg in the FRG, is regarded as the ideological center of present-day nazism. Its editor-in-chief is P. Dehoust, a member of the NDP Board, who maintains close ties with fellow-fascists in South Africa.

Another coordination center directing right-extremist organizations in Western Europe is located in Lincoln, USA, which sends out a large volume of propaganda material about the organization of the NSDLP of the neonazi G. Lauck.⁴ A West German magazine says that he also instructs German "führers." The American nazi may seek to set up a single national-socialist organization in Germany, but for the time being believes that a more rigid unification would be suicidal.⁵

The neofascists, while maintaining and strengthening their ties with each other, also try to coordinate their activity with other right-wing parties. Thus, the international "European Right" association, which includes neofascist parties like the "Italian Social Movement" (ISM),⁶ the French "New Forces' Party" and the Spanish "New Forces" group, has contacts with the CDU/CSU in the FRG. Through the ISM, the "European right" also established ties with the arch-conservative semi-fascist "pan European Union" set up by Otto von Habsburg, a scion of the Kaiser and a member of the European parliament, and with the right wing of the British Conservatives, to say nothing of the neofascist National Front in Britain. The latter, for its part, maintains ties with right-extremist parties and organizations in a number of European countries and the United States.

The neofascists stepped up their activities most noticeably during the run-up to the elections to the European parliament. They were defeated in most EEC countries, including France, the FRG, Belgium and Holland. But the Italian group of the "European right," the ISM, managed to win 5.4 per cent of the votes and to seat four deputies in parliament,

which gave it perfectly legal positions on an international level. It seeks to use this status for further uniting the neofascist outfits and groups in Western Europe.

Stake on terrorism and provocations

How do the "brown shirts" operate?

The methods used by present-day fascists were broadly used by their predecessors in the 1920s and 1930s: terrorism, provocations and fear, which the neonazi leaders hope will produce a sense of desperation and impotence, and disillusionment in the traditional bourgeois institutions, thereby paving the way for the establishment of a military dictatorship. That is why in the recent period neofascist provocations — bomb blasts, raids on the premises of left-wing organizations, attacks on democratic leaders, etc. — have become virtually commonplace in all the major capitalist countries.

Terrorism has assumed especially large proportions in Italy. Let us recall that over the past several years bourgeois mass media in that country have deliberately accentuated the exposure of leftist underground groups, while the crimes of the neofascists were played down. This gave public opinion and the magistrates their cue. Paese-Sera said that the authorities were making a bad mistake by turning a blind eye to the neofascist activities. The same point was made in the Italian Senate by E. Perna, chairman of the ICP group. In the course of an emergency parliamentary debate on August 4, 1980, he declared that the authorities had continued to underestimate the danger of rightist terrorism. This debate was held in view of the blast at the railway station in Bologna staged by the Italian neofascists.

The latter-day followers of Mussolini who commit such terrible atrocities can afford to act so brazenly because in most cases they are allowed to go unpunished for a long time or altogether. The investigation of the notorious blast of the *Italicus* train in 1974, for instance, dragged on for six years, although the culprits were soon discovered. It is hardly accidental that the crime in Bologna was committed virtually the day after the judgment was passed in the *Italicus* case.

Let us note in this connection that the bourgeois press is in the habit of presenting terroristic acts in Italy as sensations, so helping to popularize the murderers by surrounding them with a false aura of mystery and elusiveness. What is more, the terrorists' activity is being directly encouraged by some conservative politicians, as will be seen, in particular, from the statement by D. Cattin, the well-known Christian Democratic party leader, who

said that the country needed a "healthy gust of reactionary wind."⁷

The neo-fascists' bandit acts are also characteristic for the FRG. Late last September a bomb was detonated in Munich by the Hoffmann "military-sports group": 12 people were killed and 215 wounded. The bandits were caught. The FRG prosecutor's office under the Federal Court began its inquiry which, however, took a very odd turn. It is incredible but a fact, that the leader of the "military-sports group" Karl-Heinz Hoffmann and five of his accomplices, who were arrested by the police, were later released. Why? In view of the lack, according to a spokesman for the prosecutor's office, of "direct evidence that Hoffmann and the other neonazis were involved in the blast."

According to incomplete data issued by the FRG Ministry of the Interior, in 1980 over 1,500 neofascist acts were officially registered in the country (922 in 1978). Of these, 104 involved "the use of force" (52 in 1978). Over the past two years, according to the same source, 500 pieces of firearms were confiscated from the neonazis.

Nor is that in any sense a record. H. Pensky, an internal security expert with the SDPG group in the Bundestag, declared in August 1979 that the "neonazis of Germany are stockpiling their arsenals with weapons on a scale that hardly anyone imagines. This is confirmed by incontrovertible evidence. The police and the state security service have uncovered and confiscated from rightist radicals weapons in sufficient quantities to arm a whole troop to conduct civil war . . . It is known that the neonazis are ever more determined to use force and that the threats to which they resort today could develop into overt terrorism at any time. Those who make bombs are itching to explode them at some time."⁸

Terroristic acts, the destruction of anti-fascist monuments, and raids on the premises of left-wing organizations are also being staged by right-extremist groups in France. According to the Henri Curielle association, from June 1979 to September 1980, the neofascists carried out 159 terroristic acts. French Socialist deputy Jean-Pierre Chevenement noted in this connection that "the terroristic acts being committed by extreme rightist nazi or neofascist groups are gradually becoming commonplace in our political life."⁹ Add to this the fact that the activities of the present U.S. administration, which has tried to blame the USSR and other socialist countries for being involved in "international terrorism," have caused rejoicing in the camp of the right extremists and have generated a

fresh wave of terroristic acts not only in Europe, but also throughout the world.

Consequently, there is only one answer to the question of whether the fascist danger exists in our day. It is: yes, it does.

Democratic opinion in West European countries is resolutely rebuffing the neofascists' machinations. The communists are in the front ranks of these forces. In the summer of 1976, the Conference of 29 European Communist and Workers' Parties said, in particular, that for democracy and social progress, for the maintenance of peace and international relations based on mutual trust and friendly cooperation, there is a need to eradicate fascism, to prevent its revival whether in overt or covert form, and to fight against the organization and activity of fascist and neofascist terroristic outfits and groups.

The communist and workers parties of Europe have not changed their stand. The communists are sure that success in the struggle against the neofascist danger depends on

the cohesion of all the anti-fascist, peace-loving and democratic forces.

Prepared by S. Ullrich, research associate of the Institute of International Politics and Economics, (GDR) and the WMR Information Department

1. See, for instance WMR, April, May, August, December 1978.
2. *Jugendpolitische Blätter*, No. 4, 1980.
3. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, October 14, 1978.
4. G. Lauck is a leader of the National Socialist Party of America.
5. *Stern*, December 27, 1979.
6. The ISM's leader G. Almirante said that the association, officially founded in Rome in April 1978, was the "first nucleus of a much broader political alliance." In November 1978, the "European Right" published a "young rightists' charter," calling for the creation of a Europe that would be "free from materialistic ideologies, be it Marxism or liberalism ... and free from atheistical communism," and which would have the task of "cutting out the cancerous growth of the class struggle."
7. *L'Unità*, May 5, 1980.
8. *Sozialdemokratischen Pressedienst*, August 22, 1979.
9. *Panorama*, August 18, 1980.

Stop massive dismissals in the Sudan

AGAINST REPRESSION AND PERSECUTION

The closing days of last May saw the Sudanese authorities start on a campaign of massive dismissals hitting primarily patriots and trade union leaders from among workers, specialists, teachers and members of other professions. The campaign involves enterprises in the public and private sectors. All indications are that things will go beyond numerous people thrown on the streets being deprived of a livelihood. There are strong signs suggesting that the next move will be widespread arrests and other political steps intended to deliver a blow to the trade union movement and bring on disunity in the general democratic struggle of the masses.

The new round of repressive measures is due to the deepening crisis of the regime and the growing concern of imperialist circles about the regime's future in the face of mounting popular resistance to its arbitrary rule, the sway of monopolies, and U.S., Saudi Arabian and Egyptian plans to make the Sudan a puppet which the United States could use as a bridge-

head to implement its strategic designs on the Arab world and the African continent.

The trade union movement and the mass democratic movement show readiness to close their ranks in defending civil freedoms and the right to work, a natural and inalienable right of everyone whatever his ideological convictions and political affiliation. This is seen in determined actions against the campaign of arbitrary dismissals, among which the strike called by 43,000 railwaymen stands out.

International solidarity is expected to play an important role in backing the fight of the working people and democratic forces of the Sudan that is inexorably leading to the formation of a nationwide political front of the masses. It will help in achieving success in the bitter fight against the one-man dictatorship imposed on the Sudan and in re-embarking the country on independent development and social progress.

Ahmed Salem
Representative of the Sudanese
Communist Party on the journal

The present through the prism of history

On June 22, the 40th anniversary of Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union, the Editorial Council of *WMR* met in special session to discuss "The Lessons of History and the Contemporary Struggle Against the Danger of War." Following an opening speech by Editor-in-Chief Konstantin Zarodov, papers on various aspects of the Second World War designed to clarify its lessons for the present and coming generations, were presented by the representatives of the communist and workers' parties of Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czecho-

slovakia, Denmark, Egypt, FRG, GDR, Guyana, Iraq, Israel, Philippines, Poland, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, USSR, United States, and Venezuela. During a break in the sitting of the Editorial Council, its participants went to the Olsany Cemetery in Prague to lay a wreath on the graves of the Soviet soldiers who died in the war of liberation.

The proceedings of the Editorial Council meeting are to be used in publications in coming issues of the journal.



Despite "refutations" of Marxism

AN AUTHOR'S VIEW

A collective study titled *Working-Class Unity and the Ideological Struggle** has been or is soon to be published in a number of socialist countries. It is the work of scholars from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, and the Soviet Union, with the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPCz Central Committee acting as coordinator. The following are the questions put by *WMR* and the answers to them by the deputy director of that institute, Professor Milan Matous, who is one of the book's authors and scientific editors.

Q. What did you, as a team of authors, see as your principal aims?

A. We felt there was a need for a book that would help give people a theory-backed understanding of the changes taking place in the make-up, character, and social role of the working class, and also in the relations between its various national contingents. We gave strictly

scientific interpretation of objective facts, disproving the arguments of bourgeois, revisionist and reformist ideologists.

Underlying Marxism-Leninism is the scientific proof that the downfall of capitalism and transition to communism are inevitable, and also that the decisive role belongs to the proletariat, whose mission, as Lenin wrote, is to be the first to rise in revolutionary struggle against capitalism, unite all working and exploited people around itself, and become the motive force of the greatest change in history, namely, the abolition of exploitation of man by man.

The swift course of present-day developments not only constantly bears out this thesis but dictates the need for a profound analysis of the multiform activity, historical role, and political and ideological unity of the working class in the new situation.

An acute ideological struggle rages over the subjects discussed in the book. A segment of bourgeois theorists and propagandists persist in their efforts to "refute" Marxism, repeating the absurdity that the old prognostication of its "crisis" has at last come to pass. Others use the cloak of Marxism in an effort to reduce it from a

**Jednota Delnicke Tridy a Ideologicky Boj*, Praha, Svoboda, 1980, 280 pp.

science to a utopia, to turn it from an effective program of the international communist movement into bare theorizing that would be harmless to the bourgeoisie, to divorce it from the struggle of the working class, and transform it into an abstract theory of an ideal society, a theory stripped of revolutionary content and aims.

Our studies have been multiform and comprehensive. The first section of the book is devoted to the historical role of the working class and the crisis of anti-communism; the second deals with the specific impact of rapid scientific and technological development on the condition of the proletariat; and the third with topical theoretical problems of proletarian internationalism. The entire work is written in the form of a polemic with contemporary ideologists of the bourgeoisie. Far from confining ourselves to individual examples, we have tried to give the reader a generalized critical idea of the most widespread bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories of the 1970s.

Q. What were the forms of your joint work?

A. This work was prepared by 18 researchers at party and academic institutions in seven socialist countries. We started by forming a working group consisting of representatives from each country. This group was then enlarged with the enlistment of other authors.

Crisis of Capitalism and the Condition of the Working People

G. Chernikov

A book of immediate relevance to the working class struggle today.

— analyzes economic crisis in the capitalist world

— outlines the theory behind the main elements of the fightback of the working class movement in capitalist countries

cloth 252 pp \$5.00

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

Close constructive cooperation made it possible to conduct useful exchanges of views and experience. The authors were invited to a theoretical seminar at which they stated the substance of their views about the question being elaborated, spoke of the studies being currently conducted, and specified the conceptual apparatus. This discussion showed that there was an ideological consensus. From the extensive factual material at their disposal the authors were able to deduce conclusions which, we feel, are of no small significance for the theory and practice of the international communist and working-class movement.

A few words about these conclusions.

First, far from diminishing, as the adversaries of Marxism contend, the historical role of the working class is mounting with the unfolding of the world revolutionary process. The working class is growing numerically and acquiring increasing importance in material production. Contrary to the inventions of the social-reformists, rapid scientific and technological progress has not sapped the revolutionary spirit of the working class and has not changed its place in society.

Second, the actions against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and social progress are widening the front of the international proletariat's revolutionary allies and enriching the forms and methods of class struggle.

Third, the example of existing socialism is exercising an ever stronger influence on the part of the world still ruled by capitalism. To a large extent the social and political rights won by the working people in bourgeois society are due to the revolutionizing impact of the socialist community's achievements. In this situation the socialist countries are to some extent and in a unique way fulfilling the role of an international proletarian vanguard.

Lastly, the main thing is that the significance of working-class international unity has risen today. The militant solidarity, the internationalism of the proletariat is the foundation of the effectiveness and might of the progressive movement in each country and worldwide. The internationalization of the class struggle, we noted in the book, is making the results of the efforts of any national contingent in any sector of this struggle increasingly dependent on the overall state of the confrontation of forces in the world and these results, for their part, are exercising a direct influence on the further development of the world revolutionary process as a whole.

These, as I see it, are the principal conclusions of this collective work.

In defense of the April advances

Alvaro Cunhal, *Os Chamados Governos de Iniciativa Presidencial (So-Called Governments of Presidential Initiative)*, Lisbon, Avante, Vol. I (271 pp.), Vol. II (260 pp.)

Works by Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), hold a prominent place in the *Political Documents of the Portuguese Communist Party* series brought out by Avante Publishers, Lisbon. Two more volumes of his speeches, headed *So-Called Governments of Presidential Initiative*, came off the press at the close of 1980. They cover the period from July 23, 1978 to October 6, 1979.

In post-April Portugal this period was marked by an acute struggle against reaction's encroachments on revolutionary achievements, by the people's militant resistance to the policies pursued by the governments of "Presidential initiative."¹ The Nobre da Costa and Mota Pinto cabinets made no secret of their aim of restoring the positions of the capitalists and landowners, the economic domination of the monopolies linked to international imperialism. The two volumes we are reviewing show that the Portuguese Communist Party, vanguard of the working people of town and countryside, was the principal factor behind the fall of these cabinets, and that the Portuguese communists are the most consistent champions of the revolution's democratic achievements.

Many of Cunhal's speeches are linked to localities, where, to use his expression, "one of the most splendid achievements of the April Revolution," the agrarian reform, was born.² Had it not been for the savage resistance of the reactionaries, the reform might have dramatically improved the condition of rural workers and given Portugal more food. The agrarian reform, Cunhal said, emerged in the process of the democratic revolution as naturally and with the same insistence as life (Vol. II, p. 95).

Championing the vital interests of the rural proletariat and small middle farmers, the communists headed the movement against the assaults on the progressive changes in the Portuguese countryside. Cunhal's speeches are permeated with unshakable faith in the strength of the people, in ultimate victory. "We are firmly convinced, comrades, that the Heroic proletariat of Alentejo and Ribatejo,³ steeled in

the glorious, decades-long struggle for the abolition of the landed estates and the transfer of the land to those who till it, the proletariat, who has borne heavy casualties in this struggle, will unwaveringly continue the road of struggle, labor and faith, fearlessly facing difficulties and obstacles, and strong in its confidence that the agrarian reform will triumph and that the future belongs to it" (Vol. I. pp. 82-83).

Cunhal deals with other pressing problems of the nation's political life, particularly the defense of nationalized enterprises, workers' control, the unity of the working people, and the struggle against reformists. A point that he makes repeatedly is that nationalization was not decreed from above. It was the result of the revolutionary efforts of the masses, of their actions against the monopolies. In its attempts to destroy the young Portuguese democracy and its achievements, reaction had recourse to diverse methods of economic and political subversion, put forward deliberately unrealistic demands, factory owners laid off workers, provoked dissatisfaction, and left production facilities at the mercies of fate. The working people took over the management of idle factories and mills, started production, and showed a profit. When this happened the authorities began returning to industrialists the factories that were occupied and saved from ruin by workers. The prices of basic consumer goods were jacked up and an attempt was made to paralyze the trade unions and revive the practice of harassing trade union militants. The policy pursued by the governments of "Presidential initiative" struck a serious blow at the living standard of the people and led to a new explosion of unemployment.

The communists showed what was behind these ruinous actions and declared that without the working people and their party, much less in spite of them, Portugal would not extricate itself from the crippling economic crisis. Speaking in the town of Viana do Castelo in October 1978, Cunhal denounced the reprivatization of the ECRIL, Real Vinicola, and Abel Alves de Figueiredo, which, thanks to efficient management by the workers, avoided bankruptcy and regained their economic viability. "We are against and will continue to demand an end to," he said, "such acts of injustice, and insist on the observance and guaran-

tees of the rights of the working people" (Vol. I, pp. 113-114).

The General Secretary of the PCP exposes the unconstitutional character of the government's measures against the commissions of working people. During the bitter years of fascism the working people had been able to set up, protect, and ensure the functioning of these commissions, and it went without saying that now, after the victory of the revolution, they would not tolerate lawlessness on the part of the government and the reactionaries, which would like to see the abolition of these commissions.

The massive assault of the reactionaries on rights and democratic freedoms was facilitated largely by the stand taken by the Socialist Party (SP). Cunhal speaks of that party's divisive activities in the trade unions and its coalescence with the People's Democratic Party (PDP)⁴ and various leftist elements with the objective of undermining the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People — National Intersindical (GCPWP — NI). While condemning the concessions to the right-wing forces, the Portuguese communists invariably stress the importance of an alliance of all democrats and advocate cooperation with the socialists. Cunhal explains that criticism of the Socialist Party's policies and the struggle for unity of action between communists and socialists are two inter-related aspects of one and the same fundamental, consistent course pursued by the PCP. Before the Social-Democratic Center issued its ultimatum that led to the formation of the SP-SDC government coalition, the communists warned that the united front of the reactionaries had to be countered with a united front of democrats and anti-fascists. However, the socialists once again succumbed to pressure from the right-wing forces.

Why does the PCP, which sharply denounced the actions of the Socialist Party, believe that a parliamentary majority must be formed on the basis of communist and socialist mandates? The General Secretary of the PCP replies: "We do not confuse, do not lump together the PDP, SDC... and the Socialist Party, which includes and has the vote of many thousands of Portuguese interested in safeguarding the Portugal of the April Revolution" (Vol. I, pp. 126-27).

In urging closer unity among the working class, Cunhal pays special attention to the trade union movement, repeating that it is vital to reinforce the stability and unity of every trade union and also the General Confederation of Portuguese Working People, which is a large,

powerful, democratic, and unitary trade union center.

Of the many subjects dealt with in these two volumes we should like to underscore one more, i.e. the democratic character, patriotism, and internationalism of the Portuguese Communist Party. To use Cunhal's words, it is a "huge collective whose great achievements are the result of the work, ideas, energy, efforts and freely expressed views of its members" (Vol. II, p. 113). Inner-party democracy, collective work and conscious discipline give the communists their militant unity and enormous strength. "The respect, sense of brotherhood, and friendship that bind us," Cunhal declares, "are so great that each of us is prepared to give his life for the others. And not only for the others, but for our class, the working class, the class that has given life to our party and is the purpose of our existence. We communists are prepared to give our lives to our people because we are linked to them through all our organizations and through each of our members" (Vol. II, p. 123).

Addressing foreign guests in his closing speech at the ninth congress of the PCP, Alvaro Cunhal expressed the opinion of all Portuguese communists when he declared: "We should like to reassure our comrades and friends that they can always and under all circumstances depend on the internationalist solidarity of our party" (Vol. II, p. 113). In their dialectical continuity, precisely these are the features that make the Portuguese Communist Party the militant vanguard of the nation's working people and the main force in the struggle for a democratic and independent Portugal, for the attainment of the ideals of scientific socialism.

I heard some of the speeches included in this two-volume edition. As I re-read them I visualize the atmosphere of rallies — for instance, during *Avante!* anniversaries — at which hundreds of thousands of people gather under red-and-green and red banners⁵ and closely listen to the voice of the party. The most salient feature of these rallies, sponsored by the communists, is the people's faith in the April Revolution, their readiness to defend its achievements selflessly, and their pride in the party, which has thousands of threads to and faithfully serves them.

Domingos Lopes

1. Governments formed on the initiative of the President with the consent of parliament.

2. WMR, April 1981.

3. Southern provinces where the agrarian reform made the greatest headway.

4. Now it is called Social-Democratic Party.

5. Colors of Portugal and the PCP.

A unique monthly source of theory and information from the communist and workers' parties of the world.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

— *now with larger print*

INFORMATION BULLETIN

— *now bigger, brighter and easier to read*

Until the end of 1981 subscriptions for the two journals will remain \$7.50. As of January 1, 1982, subscriptions for the two will be \$12.50 (institutions, double rate).

Subscribe now and save \$5.00

PROGRESS BOOKS

**71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6**

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, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, South African Republic, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam.

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, Amharic, French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Por-

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, 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.



Editions of the journal **PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM**

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

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 Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Éditions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

Gestu BP 2678

Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban

32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc

Dar Al-Hilal

16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckach, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 København K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
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 Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya, English,
Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

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 EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

ROMANIAN 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. Cantacaro, Caracás, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlari, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

