

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

October 1981, Volume 24, Number 10 \$1.00





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

October 1981, Vol. 24, No. 10

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 The war danger:
its source and how to stop it
B. Ponomarev
- 12 Will disarmament begin from
Northern Europe?
L. Werner
- 15 EEC neocolonialism in action
L. Muller, F. Rische
- 21 Latin America: going
against the stream
C. Perez

The party

- 26 Poland: the socialist way —
the only way out of the crisis
S. Olszowski
- 31 Nigeria: the party lives and works
D. Fatogun
- 35 The 10th congress of the
Communist Party of Spain

Exchange of views

- 36 The international and the national in
the working-class movement
International theoretical conference

Viewpoints

- Down with imperialism's military plans*
- 52 Four lies of the White House
J. West
- 54 A mockery of common sense
E. Jorgen
- 56 Unity in an hour of trial
R. Samhoun
- 58 USA-China: a new dangerous move
S. Sudiman

Realities of socialism

- 59 Czechoslovakia:
society serves its citizens
T. O'Flaherty, K. Kervan
- 64 Romania: from equal rights to
full equality
A. Muresan
- 68 Greece: in the shackles of
technological dependence
G. Farakos
- 71 Some lessons of the
Labour Party split
G. Matthews

Facts and figures

- 77 The law: on whose side?
- 80 In memory of S.A. Wickremasinghe



The war danger: its source and how to stop it

Boris Ponomarev
CC Political Bureau Alternate Member,
CC Secretary, Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Millions of people on all continents are anxiously following the developments on the international scene. The fact that there has been a significant complication of the situation is being noted everywhere. There is growing apprehension over the destiny of détente and peace. This can be appreciated because humankind's very existence depends on whether a thermonuclear war is averted. As Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, for the Soviet people and for all the peoples of the world *no task is more important now than the defense of peace*. Having breathed easily during the détente years, the peoples are again extremely worried that any further aggravation of tension may have tragic consequences.

In this context, the fundamental question is what are the causes of the tension and who is responsible for them. Quite obviously, knowledge and a correct understanding of these causes are an important condition for preventing a world war, preserving peace, and normalizing relations between nations. The U.S. President's decision to go ahead with the manufacture of neutron bombs, which are the most inhuman of weapons, is further evidence of where the threat of war comes from. This sinister move has evoked a storm of protest throughout the world. But in Washington they refuse to reckon with anything, and this further fuels the anxiety of the people over the increased danger of war. An imperative of life today is to turn this anxiety of the masses into a powerful barrier to the forces of aggression and confrontation.

Of late, in the USA they have been talking endlessly about a "threat" to their security. But the fact is that nobody, no country whatever is threatening the security of the USA. To make it clear about who is upholding peace and actually fighting for the security of nations and who is provoking a confrontation and inflaming the threat of war let us compare the statements of persons in high office and the foreign policy moves of the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

We shall only take the evidence for 1981, i.e.,

beginning from the 26th congress of the CPSU and after the Reagan administration came to office in the USA.

At the 26th congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev put forward the Soviet Peace Program for the 1980s. Its points include:

- readiness for an active dialogue between the USSR and the USA at all levels, including the summit. "The USSR wants normal relations with the USA. There is simply no other sensible way from the point of view of the interests of our two nations, and of humanity as a whole" (from the report at the 26th congress);

- readiness to extend substantially the confidence-building zone in Europe;

- readiness to hold concrete talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East with all interested nations;

- readiness to settle the situation around Afghanistan as a separate issue and also together with questions of security in the Persian Gulf;

- readiness to continue talks with the USA forthwith on strategic armaments while preserving all the positive elements that have so far been achieved in this area;

- readiness to negotiate the limitation of all types of weapons, including new submarines and the missiles for these submarines;

- setting a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missiles of the NATO countries and the Soviet Union;

- forming a competent committee that would demonstrate the vital necessity of preventing a nuclear catastrophe;

- calling a special session of the Security Council with the participation of the top leaders of its member-states in order to look for keys to improving the international situation and preventing war;

- a proposal for returning to collective quests for a Middle East settlement and convening a special international conference for this purpose.

Further, it should be stressed that all earlier

Soviet proposals remain in force: ending the manufacture of nuclear weapons and reducing stockpiles of such weapons up to their total destruction; banning all other types of weapons of mass destruction, including neutron and radiological; a commitment to desist from first strikes against each other either with nuclear or conventional weapons; the simultaneous disbandment of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or, as a first step, the dismantling of their military organizations; and other proposals.

In Leonid Brezhnev's statements after the 26th congress of the CPSU, the peace proposals of the congress were complemented with initiatives calling for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe and the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of lasting peace and cooperation.

Upon coming to office the new U.S. administration announced that SALT-2 would not be ratified. It unilaterally suspended the talks on questions concerning the Indian Ocean, on limitations on the sale and delivery of conventional weapons, and on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

The USA blocked the talks on a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The USA adopted a course toward protracting the talks on a further limitation of strategic weapons and on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The USA and NATO rejected the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

The USA took a negative stand toward the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe.

Washington went to all lengths in Madrid to prevent agreement on enlarging the confidence-building zone and the convocation of a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe.

The USA refuses to consider a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and is increasing its assistance to Afghan counter-revolutionaries. The allocations for this purpose amounted to \$93 million in 1981.

The U.S. administration obstructs a political settlement in the Middle East, encourages Israel in its acts of barbarous aggression against Lebanon, Iraq, and other Arab nations, and supplies armaments for this purpose.

The military allocations in only the budget of the U.S. Defense Department for the next fiscal year have been increased by more than \$40 billion and now amount to \$226 billion. Altogether, the USA plans to spend \$1.5 trillion for

this purpose in the period up to 1986. The increased military allocations include funds for the manufacture of new strategic bombers, including those with an anti-radar system, and the new MX intercontinental missiles.

On August 6, memorial day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, U.S. President Ronald Reagan decided to proceed with the production of neutron bombs.

A rapid deployment force is being formed hurriedly. "The U.S. must be prepared to move forces to any part of the world if it is going to fulfil its global mission" (General Bernard W. Rogers, the Supreme NATO Commander in Europe, March 24, 1981).

On June 16 the U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig declared that the USA was prepared to sell advanced American weapons, equipment, and technology to China. At the same time it was learned that China and the USA have a secret agreement under which the USA has set up two radar posts on Chinese property to gather military spy information about the Soviet Union.

At the back of these two foreign policy lines, the distinctions between which have been demonstrated by the facts cited above, there are *diametrically different foreign-policy strategies*. This is illustrated by the following comparisons:

The Soviet Union advocates the preservation of the existing military and strategic parity, is opposed to military superiority, and urges a lowering of the level of military confrontation.

"The military and strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, objectively serves to safeguard world peace. We have not sought, and do not now seek, military superiority over the other side. That is not our policy. But neither will we permit the building up of any such superiority over us" (Leonid Brezhnev, 26th congress of the CPSU).

"Every country strives to ensure its security dependably. But in the nuclear age this cannot be achieved by hoping to win an arms race. In our day security can be realistic and durable only if it is based on the existing approximate military parity of the opposing forces and on a gradual reduction of their level. Otherwise nobody will feel secure" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Pravda*, July 1, 1981).

"There is no type of weapon which the USSR will not be prepared to limit and prohibit on a mutual basis by agreement with other states. The important thing is that everything should be done without prejudicing the security of anybody, on terms of complete reciprocity of

countries possessing the corresponding armaments" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 7, pp. 353-54).

The incumbent U.S. administration is determined to upset the military balance and achieve military superiority by escalating the arms race and conducting a policy from positions of strength.

"The argument, if there is any, will be about which weapons and not whether we should forego weaponry for treaties and agreements" (Ronald Reagan, May 28, 1981).

"The increases that the President has proposed are designed to strengthen our forces" (Caspar Weinberger, April 30, 1981).

The USA has replaced the double pillars of détente and defense with two fundamental principles: reciprocity and strength (Alexander Haig, January 12, 1981).

Parity or adequacy in naval forces does not suit the United States. It must and will have naval superiority (Caspar Weinberger, April 26, 1981).

"We will work for agreements that make world peace more secure by reinforcing deterrence" (Alexander Haig, July 14, 1981).

Manifestly, arms control agreements cannot and do not guarantee the peace" (Eugene Rostow, July 24, 1981).

The neutron bomb has a most definite effect of deterring the USSR (Caspar Weinberger, August 10, 1981).

The USSR urges the prevention of nuclear war, of military conflicts.

"They want people to believe that nuclear war can be limited, they want to reconcile them with the idea that such a war is tolerable.

"But that is sheer deception of the peoples! A 'limited' nuclear war as conceived by the Americans in, say, Europe, would from the outset mean the certain destruction of European civilization. And of course the United States, too, would not be able to escape the flames of war. Clearly, such plans and 'doctrines' are a grave threat to all nations, including the people of the USA ...

"To try and outstrip each other in the arms race or to expect to win a nuclear war is dangerous madness" (Leonid Brezhnev, 26th Congress of the CPSU).

"In recent years, as you know, flashpoints of military conflicts, often threatening to grow into a major conflict, flared up now in one and now in another region of the world. Experience has shown that it is not easy to extinguish them. It would be far better to take preventive meas-

ures, to forestall their emergence" (Leonid Brezhnev, 26th congress of the CPSU).

The USA takes as its point of departure that a nuclear war is permissible, believes it can be won, and provokes military conflicts.

"We will maintain sufficient strength to prevail if need be" (Ronald Reagan, January 20, 1981).

"And they (the new nuclear missile systems) are our best hope in fighting outnumbered and winning" (Caspar Weinberger, June 22, 1981).

"Of particular importance is the requirement that a significant part of our strategic forces should be capable of enduring survival, even in the cataclysmic event of a protracted nuclear war" (Caspar Weinberger, June 18, 1981).

"We must be prepared for waging a conventional war that may extend to many parts of the globe" (Caspar Weinberger, May 5, 1981).

"It would not be misleading as much as it would be uninformative to categorize ours as a 1½ or 2½ strategy ... We have thus instituted strategic changes to give us the option of fighting a long war" (Caspar Weinberger, June 22, 1981).

The USSR sees equitable and constructive talks as the only possible way of settling international problems.

"It is universally recognized that in many ways the international situation depends on the policy of both the USSR and the USA. As we see it, the state of relations between them at present and the acuteness of the international problems requiring a solution necessitate a dialogue, and an active dialogue, at all levels. We are prepared to engage in this dialogue" (Leonid Brezhnev, 26th congress of the CPSU).

"We are offering the USA and other Western countries to join us in honest and constructive talks, a quest for mutually acceptable solutions of practically all the major issues between us. We are for a joint search for ways to a lasting peace and to mutually beneficial cooperation" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Pravda*, June 10, 1981).

"Our proposals have in view the settlement of the most urgent, of the most crucial international problems to the consolidation of peace. And we are offering the interested parties businesslike, constructive talks on these problems at any level without any preliminary conditions whatsoever. If anybody has reasonable proposals we are, for our part, prepared to consider them ... efforts are being made to impose terms, preliminary conditions on us ... This is ludicrous, to say the least" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Pravda*, April 8, 1981).

"Broad international exchanges and live

political contacts between statesmen of countries with different social systems are particularly valuable and necessary in the present complicated situation" (Report of a meeting between Leonid Brezhnev and Erich Honecker, *Pravda*, August 4, 1981).

The USA sees talks in the context of a policy from positions of strength, creates an atmosphere of uncertainty relative to talks or makes preliminary conditions for them, or seeks to use them as a screen to win time for the implementation of military programs.

"The search for peace must go on but we have a better chance of finding it if we maintain our strength while we're searching" (Ronald Reagan, May 28, 1981).

"We are going to be better able to enter into a renewed negotiating stance when approval has been received for the (new weapons) systems" (Alexander Haig, March 27, 1981).

"Diplomacy without force behind it is impotent" (Eugene Rostow, July 24, 1981).

With the Soviet Union talks can be conducted only from strength (Richard Allen, May 10, 1981).

"I don't believe there is any sense in sitting down at a table with them unless there's some evidence that they're changing their attitude and their activities" (Ronald Reagan, March 15, 1981).

"Linkage is the basic concept of this administration, and this means that talks, their course, volume, and level will depend on the Soviet Union's behavior on the international scene in the broadest sense of the word" (Alexander Haig, April 18, 1981).

To a question whether it is generally possible to have talks on the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, Eugene Rostow replied: "No. It is a commitment, a decision adopted by NATO" (Interview with the journal *Der Spiegel* in July, 1981). True, the U.S. administration agreed to the Haig-Gromyko talks during the UN session in New York and to the resumption of the Geneva negotiations that were broken off by the USA in October 1980, but its intention is obviously to drag out the negotiations until the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe becomes a *fait accompli*. They are beforehand removing from the negotiations agenda the question of American forward-based missiles, in other words, they are making deliberately unacceptable preliminary terms.

The Soviet Union respects the lawful rights and interests of developing nations, wants mutually beneficial cooperation with them,

and recognizes the legitimacy of the movements for national and social liberation.

"As in all cases in the past, the USSR stands for the strict and complete observance of the principle of equality and universally accepted norms of international law.

"We believe that in the present situation the application of these norms relative to the new states of three continents signifies roughly the following:

— "Recognition of the right of each people to decide its internal affairs without outside interference; renunciation of attempts to set up any form of domination or hegemony over them or to drag them into the 'sphere of interests' of any power.

— "Scrupulous respect for the territorial integrity of these countries, for the inviolability of their frontiers; no outside support for any separatist movements aimed at fragmenting these countries.

— "Unconditional recognition of the right of each country in Africa, Asia, and Latin America to equitable participation in international life, to the promotion of relations with any countries.

— "Full and unconditional recognition of the sovereignty of these nations over their natural resources, and also recognition in fact of their full equality in international economic relations; support for their efforts to abolish survivals of colonialism and uproot racism and apartheid in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions.

— "Respect for the status of non-alignment chosen by the majority of countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; renunciation of attempts to draw them into the military-political blocs of the powers" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Pravda*, April 28, 1981).

"We do not consider we have any right to the natural wealth of Middle East countries . . . We only want one thing — a just and lasting peace in the Middle East" (Leonid Brezhnev, *Pravda*, May 27, 1981).

The USA flouts the basic interests of developing nations, sets above all else its egoistical "vital interests," so-called "spheres of influence," tags the label of "international terrorism" to the national liberation movement, and enlarges its military presence in different parts of the world.

"I will say that today the main threat and preoccupation in the "free world" is the eruption of international terrorism and the associated cases of unlawful interference, the so-called national liberation wars" (Alexander Haig, January 31, 1981).

"Western industrialized societies are largely dependent on the oil resources of the Middle East region and a threat to access to that oil would constitute a grave threat to the vital national interest. This must be dealt with; and that does not exclude the use of force if that is necessary" (Alexander Haig, March 11, 1981).

"Many of the resources that we need for energy, and many essential strategic minerals are found thousands of miles from our shores . . . If we are to safeguard our access, and the access of the free world to these resources, we must increase our military and naval strength" (Caspar Weinberger, April 28, 1981).

And lastly:

Leonid Brezhnev, the most authoritative representative today of Marxism-Leninism, of socialism: "Peace is an unfading value for humankind." "No issue is more crucial, more important to any nation than the preservation of peace, than ensuring the cardinal right of every person — the right to life" (Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, *Pravda*, June 23, 1980; 26th congress of the CPSU).

Alexander Haig, representative of U.S. imperialism, the most powerful imperialism of our times: "There are more important things than peace" (in testimony before the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the approval of his candidature for the office of Secretary of State, January 10, 1981).

All these are undeniable facts. They prove irrefutably that the mounting threat of war comes precisely from imperialism, Washington, the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. This is a threat not only to the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries, but to all the countries and peoples of the world. Small wonder that many leading personalities of a number of capitalist countries publicly state their apprehensions about the destiny of their countries.

Why had the threat of war begun to mount at the close of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s?

In world politics, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th congress, two trends have come into collision: "On the one hand, the course toward curbing the arms race, strengthening peace and détente, and safeguarding the sovereign rights and freedoms of nations. On the other hand, the course toward undermining détente, escalating the arms race, a policy of threats and interference in the affairs of others, and the suppression of the liberation struggle."

These two trends did not take shape today or yesterday; the latter is linked to the very nature

of imperialism, and has led to two world wars.

The situation is now different, the sphere of imperialist domination has diminished significantly. World development, including the question of whether there is to be a world war or not, is no longer determined entirely by the laws or will of monopoly capitalism. Nonetheless, the nature of imperialism has not changed and, consequently, there remain deep-going socio-economic motivations for military preparations and an aggressive policy. These have even grown and become stronger.

First, a military-industrial complex has taken shape in imperialist countries on the basis of the further concentration of production and the fusion of the monopolies with the state and the reactionary political forces. The U.S. military-industrial corporations, which are linked by hundreds of threads to the political hawks in the Congress, the government, and the Pentagon are particularly powerful. They manufacture armaments to orders from the military department and virtually grow fat on the sale of weapons of mass annihilation. To illustrate: they are to make \$33 billion on MX missiles, over \$4 billion on Cruise missiles, \$11 billion on the Trident submarine nuclear-missile system, and another \$12 billion on a new strategic bomber. With the installation of the Reagan administration the military-industrial corporations have secured a firm promise that these programs will be put into effect.

The American concerns are making enormous additional profits from the export of armaments. According to the journal *Fortune*, the leading U.S. military-industrial corporations are major exporters as well. These include General Dynamics, Lockheed, Boeing, and McDonnell Douglas.

In other NATO countries, too, the military-industrial concerns have become more active. Scandalous details have come to light about the export of armaments by West German concerns. Recently, according to the newspaper *Christian Science Monitor*, Japanese corporations have likewise announced that they intend to take a much larger part in the military preparations in their own country and in the USA.

Second, imperialism is going to all lengths to preserve or retrieve its domination over regions rich in energy and other raw materials. Above all, this concerns the "big seven" transnational oil concerns, chiefly of the USA. Counting on curbing the independent actions of the oil-producing nations, they are openly orchestrating the U.S. military presence in the Middle East, the formation of a rapid deployment force (in particular, for the seizure of oilfields), and the intensified arming of Israel and Egypt.

The monopolies want their hand not only on oil. Speaking in the Congress in March 1981, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Paul Volcker revealed a plan for turning many African countries, chiefly those with large reserves of copper, cobalt, uranium ore and other minerals, into an American sphere of influence.

Third, imperialism's class nature gives rise to a policy of using any means, including military force, to halt the national liberation movement, to prevent radical social changes. In this area, too, U.S. imperialism acts as the principal assault force seeking to crush the revolutionary struggle of peoples and undermine progressive regimes (Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Mozambique).

Fourth, and most important, is that the most intense hatred of imperialist circles is evoked by the existence and growth of the socialist system and of the Soviet Union as its mainstay and the principal obstacle to imperialism in its attempts to regain world supremacy. Hence, the positions of strength policy, and the "massive relation," "rolling back," and all sorts of other doctrines that change with time but not in substance, the blackmail and the whipping up of the arms race in the hope, in particular, of economically "exhausting" socialism and eroding its social stability. Taken together, all this spells out material preparations for war and creates a real threat of a world nuclear war that would be catastrophic to civilization.

Such is the sum of the deep-lying factors leading to a growth of the war threat to peace from the imperialist circles of the USA and NATO.

The ideological, propaganda screen for the war preparations is the specious allegation that there is a "Soviet military threat." This ill-intentioned and dangerous story has nothing in common with the actual situation, with the facts. As was reiterated this summer when Leonid Brezhnev met with leaders of fraternal parties and countries in the Crimea, the socialist states hold that relations between countries with different social systems should rest on the principles of peaceful coexistence. This means reducing the level of military confrontation, a continuing constructive dialogue, and the promotion of mutually beneficial peaceful cooperation.

It is true that the Soviet Union is compelled to spend large sums of money on defense, including the development of new types of weapons. But the initiators in this race have always been the USA and the aggressive circles of NATO. Knowing that in its class blindness and hatred for socialism, imperialism can rush headlong into any gamble, the Soviet Union

has ensured an overall parity with the USA in strategic armaments, which was recorded in SALT-2 in 1979 and has not changed since then.

The Western hawks are today endlessly repeating the allegation that the Soviet Union has "upset" the parity in Europe — in medium-range nuclear missiles — in its favor. These allegations are based on falsifications produced by the Pentagon. Marshal D.F. Ustinov's article in *Pravda* on July 25, 1981 gives the lie to these fabrications.

For a number of years there has now been an approximate equilibrium in Europe — about 1,000 carriers of this weapon on each side, with both sides proceeding with modernization within the framework of this equilibrium. While modernizing its missiles the USSR keeps an eye to preserving parity: the range of new missiles remains that of the old, and the aggregate megatonnage is even being reduced, while the number of carriers remains unchanged, because when a new missile is deployed one or two old missiles are removed, dismantled, and not deployed anywhere else.

Parity will indeed be upset if the USA forces some 600 new American missiles upon Western Europe. This would also change the overall strategic equilibrium in favor of the USA, for the medium-range American nuclear missiles can reach Soviet territory, while the analogous Soviet missiles cannot reach U.S. territory.

From the aforesaid it is evident who is actually threatening whom, who is in fact out to achieve military superiority and from whom the nuclear threat emanates.

Humankind's hopes, its salvation from the inestimable calamities of a third world war, and the very possibility of global social progress are today linked to the fact that there is a powerful socialist community for which the preservation of peace and a policy of peace are natural and organic. Thanks above all to socialism there is a huge distance between the intentions of imperialism's bellicose strategists and the actual possibilities for carrying out their designs. In a situation where imperialism is increasingly orienting itself on strength in international affairs, the military and strategic equilibrium is a factor restraining its aggressive ambitions and a necessary stage on the road to the total exclusion of the use of force in international relations.

It must be stressed most emphatically that the Soviet Union by no means regards military and strategic equilibrium as an end in itself, much less as a springboard for the attainment of military superiority. If peace is to be really lasting, Leonid Brezhnev said as early as 1973, "it

must rest not on any poles of strength and rivalry, about which it has lately become fashionable to talk, but on respect for the rights, sovereignty, and legitimate interests of all countries without exception, whether they are 'big' or 'small' and are members of political groups or not. What I am saying is a matter not of learning a more subtle method of manipulating the so-called balance of strength but of excluding the use of strength from international relations" (*Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 4, p. 389).

Socialism and peace are indivisible, both in concept and in living practice. Let us see why this is the case.

Peaceful conditions are the most conducive for the establishment and comprehensive, full-blooded development of the socialist system, which is vitally interested in concentrating material and intellectual resources entirely on creative work, for this is a people's system, which expresses and champions the basic interests of the working masses, who have throughout history suffered most from wars and who do not need wars. The capitalist world is constantly forcing on socialist countries a "contest" on the field of battle or in the arms race. But these are not at all the areas in which the Soviet Union would like to compete. Peace and genuinely peaceful development are the conditions under which the advantages of the socialist system are most effectively demonstrated over the capitalist system from the standpoint of the interests of the working masses.

War and the arms race only obstruct and complicate socialism's progress. "One involuntarily thinks," wrote Leonid Brezhnev, "of what we could have accomplished, of how far we would have advanced in both social and economic development, had we not been hindered, had not spokes been put in our wheel, had we not been diverted from peaceful endeavor and not been forced by the arms race to make large outlays of effort and money for the country's defense. One can have nothing but admiration for the strength of the Soviet system and of our people, for despite all hindrances and barriers we have achieved an extremely high level of economic development, science, and culture" (*Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 7, p. 95).

The peaceableness of socialist countries rests on the absence in socialist society of classes and strata interested in foreign expansion and profiting from war preparations. It has no people, strata, or circles for whom the manufacture of armaments is a means of making profits, of accumulating material wealth.

Socialist countries have no motivations for forcibly breaking into sources of energy and fuel outside their frontiers. The USSR, and the whole socialist community have enormous natural wealth.

The Marxist-Leninist concept of the historical process, a concept underlying the foreign policy of socialist states, proceeds (and the communists have substantiated it scientifically) from the possibility of excluding a world war from the life of humankind in the modern epoch. The communists are certain — and this certainty is increasingly borne out by practice — that all peoples will ultimately arrive at socialism. But they most emphatically reject the idea of "export of revolution." As Lenin wrote, "revolutions are not made to order, they cannot be timed for any particular moment; they mature in a process of historical development and break out at a moment determined by a whole complex of internal and external causes" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 547). Engels wrote that "the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing" (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Correspondence*, p. 351).

Ideologically and politically the socialist countries have always been and remain the bulwark of peace, determined opponents of war.

The educational work conducted by the CPSU and the communist parties of other socialist countries is directed entirely toward giving the peoples of their countries a sense of friendship, international solidarity, and respect for the national sovereignty of other peoples. Had our party and the socialist state been indeed preparing for a war of conquest, for the subjugation of other countries, as the disseminators of the "Soviet military threat" story allege, all our propaganda and ideological work would have been aimed at fostering hostility and hatred for other countries, at instigating wars. But not only is this not the case, it is categorically forbidden and punishable by law. The Soviet constitution says: "In the USSR war propaganda is banned . . . The internationalist duty of the citizen of the USSR is to promote the development of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of other countries, to maintain and consolidate world peace."

Had the USSR been preparing to start a nuclear war it would have been in its interests to obscure, to conceal from the people all the consequences that may come out of it. As *The New York Times* wrote justifiably on August 4, 1981, had the Soviet leaders planned a nuclear

war "they would surely condition their people to accept the use of nuclear weapons, not to regard them as ultimate horrors." The newspaper acknowledges that in the Soviet Union wide media coverage was given to the international conference of physicians, held last March in the USA, which convincingly showed how catastrophic a nuclear war would be. In the USA, however, this conference was ignored. "The peoples must know the truth about the destructive consequences of a nuclear war," Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th congress of the CPSU. In keeping with this line, the USSR proposed setting up an international committee of scientists, whose findings would be brought to the notice of the whole world.

The heightening significance of the socialist community countries as the mainstay of peace springs also from the growth of their economic potential, which in the détente years became a key component of the entire international system of economic relations. In its turn, mutually beneficial economic cooperation between socialist and capitalist states gives the latter a practical interest in continuing and deepening the policy of détente and peaceful coexistence. Indicative in this respect was the Ottawa meeting of seven capitalist countries in July 1981, at which the representatives of West European countries virtually rejected Reagan's insistence on "hardening," i.e., folding up economic relations with the Soviet Union.

Unquestionably, the growth of the economic might and defense capability of the socialist countries strongly influences the international situation. This influence is a deterring factor for war adventurers. The foreign policy initiatives and programs of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are viable and effective because they rest on a scientific knowledge of the main trends of world development, on an account of the actual potentialities of the forces of peace and democracy as well as of the forces of war and imperialism.

Alongside socialism as the main factor of peace, other important factors operate in our day in favor of peace.

Among them the policies pursued by the new independent nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are increasingly becoming more visible and influential. There are now more than 100 such countries pursuing a foreign policy of peace. Their voice, especially of those that have opted for socialist development, resounds with determination in the UN and other international forums.

A tangible contribution to the defense of peace, to curbing the arms race is being made by the nonaligned movement, which unites the

majority of the liberated countries. In its foreign policy actions today one clearly discerns the approach that was formulated by India's outstanding statesman, Jawaharlal Nehru. Peace, he said, is not a simple renunciation of war but an active and positive approach to international problems that leads to a relaxation of tension through the settlement of problems by negotiation, through expanding international cooperation in diverse fields.

The interest of the new states in consolidating world peace, in limiting and ending the arms race has compelling motivations.

First and foremost, they have seen from their own experience how closely the struggle for independence and for consolidating national sovereignty is linked to the general state of the international atmosphere. Cold war policies nourish imperialism's aggressive actions against militarily and economically weaker nations. On the other hand, the successes of the policy of détente, as, in particular, the experience of the 1970s demonstrated, open up wide possibilities for the realization of the independent and growing role of the new nations in world politics, for the championing by them of their economic and political interests in the international community.

In the new states there is growing understanding that the efforts to ensure security in their regions (the conversion of the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean into peace zones, a Middle East settlement, peaceful coexistence in South and Southeast Asia, and so forth) can be dependably realized only in close connection with the strengthening of world peace, of the security of all nations.

Lastly, the arms race deprives the developing countries of resources vital to the solution of the problems of backwardness, hunger, poverty and public health. For instance, the well-known scientist R. Sivard has estimated that the money spent to manufacture one mobile intercontinental missile would be enough to feed 50 million starving children or build 65,000 hospitals or 340,000 elementary schools.

The democratic anti-war movement has been and remains an extremely important part of the peace potential. It is now once again gathering strength and wide scope, especially in West European countries.

What is the spur for this? On the one hand, the serious misgivings of the population about U.S. policy and, on the other, the impact of the peace initiatives of the socialist countries that are opening up realistic possibilities for eliminating the threat of war.

The anti-war movement has been joined by

diverse political forces; the communist parties, large segments of social democrats, and the "green" movement; also some circles in a number of bourgeois political parties, including those that belong to government coalitions. It is extremely symbolic that an ever larger role is beginning to be played in the anti-war movement by prominent military men, who in the past had held important posts in their armies and in the various NATO headquarters.

Under present-day conditions there has been a sharp growth of the tendency toward the internationalization of the anti-war movement, whose character is frequently continental, so to speak. An example is the Peace March-81, which started out on June 22 from Copenhagen, moved across the territory of the FRG, the Netherlands and Belgium, and ended in Paris.

In Western Europe the anti-war struggle has reached a pitch that is making some NATO political and military leaders realize that it cannot be off-handedly ignored and discounted, especially as it has assumed concrete and effective forms. Participants in rallies and demonstrations urge the population to occupy grounds designated for the deployment of American missiles. Municipal bodies are passing decisions to ban the deployment of missiles on territory within their jurisdiction. A campaign is gathering momentum in support of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe, against the extension of the NATO sphere of action, and for the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of lasting peace and cooperation.

In Japan the movement's slogan is "three don'ts": do not manufacture, do not bring, and do not deploy nuclear weapons on Japanese territory. The anti-war movement is fleshing out in the USA as well.

The working class and the trade unions are a major factor of peace. The working class is already now experiencing the direct burden of the militarization of the economy: the climbing cost of living, unemployment, growing taxes, and cuts in allocations for socio-economic purposes. The many workers, engaged in the war industry, are compelled to manufacture with their own hands the very means of mass destruction that contain the potential of exterminating the working masses in the first place. The understanding that an end must be put to the arms race is reaching the working class of capitalist countries. However, this process is slower than the situation demands, and the gap between the economic struggle of the working class and the anti-war movement is still very

perceptible. This is inflicting harm, weakening both the former and the latter.

Growing anxiety over the escalation of nuclear armaments is also being voiced by scientists, including those working in the areas directly drawn into military preparations. In the USA and other NATO countries, tens of thousands of scientific workers are devoting their minds, abilities, and knowledge to the development and sophistication of weapons of mass death. They should realize that they are thereby creating the scientific and technological prerequisites for the preparations for and conduct of a nuclear war, which would bring about the annihilation of humankind and themselves. They are the ones turning a miracle of nature, the human brain, into a means of self-destruction, of wiping out life itself. The war industry employs one-fifth of all American engineers, one-fourth of the nation's physicists, and nearly half of the scientists and engineers of the aircraft industry.

Who if not these scientists should be aware of the appallingly disastrous effects of a new spiral of the arms race? It is no accident that eminent American scientists, Nobel Prize laureates among them, have lately begun to protest against this anti-human activity, against the "cannibalization" of academic thought. They do not want their knowledge to pave the way to a nuclear catastrophe.

Much can be done by social democrats to preserve détente and improve the international situation. In many ways the direction in which the international situation will develop now depends on them.

Leading social-democratic circles and the Socialist International are worried about the prospect of a new spiral in the arms race, about the increased threat of war. This found expression in the recent visit to Moscow by Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and in a series of meetings and conferences of social democratic leaders over the past few months. Socialists, social democrats, and Labourites have begun to take a more clear-cut stand in favor of détente, an end to the arms race, and disarmament.

However, in view of social democracy's potentialities, it could do much more in this direction. This would be consonant with the common interests of all working peoples, of all nations. The CPSU, as was stated at its 26th congress, attaches great importance to cooperation with social democrats, with all democratic and peace forces in questions related to preventing war and strengthening peace and it is prepared to give its active support to all steps

promoting the cause of peace and democracy.

The realistically-minded section of the ruling class in capitalist countries is also acting to prevent a nuclear war. These people understand that an adventurist foreign policy has no prospects, that it is fraught with risk, and may even spell disaster. They see that a policy of "anti-détente" can trigger a sharp exacerbation of social problems in their countries up to the elimination of the system that generates wars.

The danger of a nuclear war is seen vividly by members of the most humane profession — doctors and medical scientists. This important contingent of the scientific intelligentsia has lately begun to join more and more broadly in the struggle against the nuclear threat. An international movement, Physicians of the World for the Prevention of a Nuclear War, has emerged with the aim of informing all peoples and governments of the actual dangers of a nuclear conflict, of the pernicious influence of the arms race on the state of public health. In many countries doctors have eagerly responded to the call of this movement. A, Physicians for the Prevention of a Nuclear War Committee has been set up in the Soviet Union. A conference on the subject Consequences of a Nuclear War, attended by nearly 500 American doctors, chemists and biologists, was held recently in Chicago.

The peoples do not want war. But far from in all countries do they determine the policies of governments and the decision whether there is to be a war or not.

The Address of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the parliaments and peoples of the world of June 23, 1981 is of major significance in the efforts to achieve a radical improvement of the international situation. This document lucidly identifies the key issue over which a political struggle is unfolding in connection with the most diverse controversial situations in the world. The Soviet Union, and this is particularly important, wants not merely talks, but constructive talks that would yield positive results, not merely to institutionalize the existing military and strategic parity, but to lower, and lower dramatically, the level of the opposing military potentials.

The question of talks has ranged beyond the walls of diplomatic chambers and moved into the focus of attention of the broadest public opinion in the world. Moreover, it is extremely important that the anti-war movement not only demands the earliest commencement of talks but actively debates their content and aims and formulates concrete terms that, in its view, must be agreed upon at the talks.

Thus, in the political, the material, and the

ideological spheres the forces of war are opposed by powerful forces of peace. However, this by no means signifies that peace is guaranteed. The forces prepared to sacrifice peace to their mercenary, anti-humane, and class interests are still much too strong and influential. In leading NATO circles there are quite a few fanatics urging a nuclear missile war and prepared to use the huge accumulated arsenal against peace-loving countries and peoples.

Peace can be ensured and consolidated if its entire potential is brought into play, if all the factors of peace are set in motion. In other words, the idea of an all-embracing anti-war coalition that would include the actions of the broadest strata of the population, of the maximum spectrum of political forces, is becoming urgent — more than ever before. Is this feasible? Yes, for the platform for forming such a coalition has, essentially speaking, been worked out by life itself. To outline the main points of this platform it is enough to ascertain the main ideas and demands currently being put forward by the most diverse peace forces. They are:

- the understanding of the need to bring home to the peoples all the acuteness of the threat of a nuclear war. The alarm must be sounded so that every person realizes that time does not wait;

- faith and conviction that it is really possible to prevent a world conflict under the present balance between the factors of war and the factors of peace;

- the will to move to this aim along all directions: to secure a halt to the arms race and a reduction of the level of military confrontation, a settlement of existing local crisis situations and the prevention of new ones, an extension of confidence-building measures, the preservation and development of everything of value yielded by détente, particularly the mechanism of political consultations between countries, and the promotion of all-sided mutually beneficial cooperation between them;

- given all ideological differences and simple prejudices, to persistently lay bare the actual causes of the growth of international tension, reveal who is profiting by the arms race, who is trying to revive the "positions of strength" policy and who is rejecting this policy, and who is indeed interested in peace and working for it with the utmost energy. It is necessary to expose the dangerous falsity of the "Soviet military threat" story and its special purpose as a propaganda screen for the material, political and moral preparations for war;

- the demand for talks, above all on problems related to nuclear missiles — honest,

equitable, constructive, productive, and without procrastination;

— understanding of the simple truth that humankind's task of preserving peace demands humankind's efforts, that its attainment — however heavy the burden of contradiction and mutual distrust — requires a dialogue between different trends and movements, and not only a dialogue but also joint or parallel actions, with the participation of communists, social democrats, liberal and national-democratic parties, trade unions, business circles, religious leaders, scientists, and youth, women's, cultural and other organizations regardless of their ideology.

With a certain degree of cooperation, of coordination of their actions, and activity of these forces within the national framework and on the international scene, the battle for peace, for a better and safe future for humankind can be won. And, conversely, a lowering of the general level of struggle as a consequence of scattered action by different anti-war forces may only help to increase the possibility of nuclear shambles.

The formation of an anti-war coalition means surmounting passiveness, realizing the fact that the time has passed when the question of war and peace was decided by "the powers that be," and dropping the illusion that all will take care of itself in the quiet of diplomatic chambers or in the halls of international conferences. Every person must realize his or her own responsibility for the destiny of peace and understand the significance of his or her personal contribution.

A titanic struggle is unfolding in the world between the forces of war and the forces of peace. In our nuclear age the outcome of this struggle will in fact determine the question of the prospects for preserving human civilization and, more, the future of all humankind.

The task set by Lenin of revealing to the people the "secrecy in which war is born" has in fact evolved into the task of showing the masses the "secrecy" in which is created the threat to the existence of nations. It is created by the plans and options for a "pre-emptive strike" that allegedly can forestall a response, plans and options painstakingly elaborated by the general staffs of the NATO member-states. But these plans are illusory.

They are illusory in the respect that not a single continent, not a single nation will escape the lethal breath of a nuclear war. The "secrecy" in which the threat to the destiny of humankind is created is that the public mind is purposefully being made to "conceive the inconceivable," namely, that nuclear war is

acceptable as a means of achieving political aims. It is also created out of the narrow class view that "balancing on the brink of war" — to which the pursuit for military profits and saber-rattling lead — can go on indefinitely, that there will always be time enough to stop at the threshold of the point of no return.

The "secrecy" must be brought into the open before "weighty," i.e. military arguments are given for an unleashed world conflict.

It is the high mission of communists to bring to the masses, to public opinion the truth about the overhanging catastrophe and the answer to the question of how it is to be averted. But one cannot fail to see that many other forces have come to realize this truth.

"All of us are aware," Leonid Brezhnev said, "that today the forces of peace opposed to the potential aggressor are stronger than ever before."

"But there is something else that we know: the very character of modern weapons is such that if they are used the future of all humankind will be in jeopardy."

"There is only one conclusion from this: everything must be done now, today, to close the road to lovers of boundless armaments and military gambles" (*Pravda*, June 24, 1981).

Life shows that the bosses of the military-industrial complex and their representatives in the U.S. administration refuse to reckon with the will of the peoples for peace. They refuse to see the huge anti-war movement, the thousands of rallies and meetings, resolutions, appeals, and other expressions of the people's mind. Intoxicated by the power that has fallen into their hands and having staked on strength, on weapons of annihilation, they are not conscious of their responsibility for this course toward disaster. These warmongers must therefore be made to understand that they bear a stern responsibility for the calamity threatening humankind. The time has passed when the powers that be unleashed wars and doomed millions of people to annihilation with impunity. For the first time ever, by the will of the peoples, war criminals were branded for starting the Second World War and the calamities brought by it, and those guilty were given the punishment they deserved. This should be vigorously reminded to the demons of war in the world of today.

The battle for peace will not be an easy one. But it can and must be won. The growing anxiety and alarm of hundreds of millions of people must materialize into practical deeds, into concrete, meaningful effort, into mass actions aimed at preventing war — such is the imperative of our day.

Will disarmament begin from Northern Europe?

Lars Werner

Chairman, Left Party — Communists of Sweden

An important question in the present chill international climate is whether the Nordic countries will break the deadlock over disarmament and pave the way for talks and agreements on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. The majority of the population of our region wants Northern Europe to be a non-nuclear zone. The ultimate goal is to rid the whole of Europe and the world of nuclear weapons. The communists, who have long been campaigning for this, have made substantial advances and enjoy the support of a growing number of people and organizations. The proclamation of a nuclear-free zone would mean a breakthrough in disarmament and create a climate conducive to new agreements on nuclear arms limitations and other steps in the direction of military détente.

New dangers threatening the north

Ours is in fact a nuclear-free region. Neither Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, nor Iceland has nuclear weapons, nor do they intend to acquire any. In a war situation, however, the three NATO countries — Iceland, Norway and Denmark — might be compelled to deploy nuclear weapons on their territory. Preparations for this have been going on for years. Military hardware is stockpiled in increasing quantities, radar and navigation stations are being set up and airfields are under construction.

The pressure being brought to bear on our countries is mounting visibly. In 1979 NATO decided to increase its nuclear arsenal in Western Europe by adding medium-range missiles. Northern Europe is thereby being made dependent on a new nuclear strategy and turned into a region of high tension. This spells an end to the prevailing system of guaranteeing security and stability. The region is now in greater danger, since in the event of a nuclear war between the great powers it is bound to be dragged into that war in its very first phase.

NATO in our region

While the NATO decision does not provide for the siting of medium-range missiles in Northern Europe in peacetime, it seriously jeopardizes, nonetheless, the security of our region. This

threat is primarily from the Cruise missiles, a new U.S. weapon. The Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces of Sweden has stated that these new weapons "create partly new problems."¹ The Defense Commission of the Swedish Riksdag, for its part, has pointed out that "Cruise missiles can be launched from submarines or aircraft in the Norwegian Sea and fly eastward over Swedish territory at a low altitude."²

Indeed, these missiles, if launched from the Norwegian Sea on their programmed trajectory, would overfly the northern areas of Sweden and Finland. Sweden's anti-aircraft defense in that area is inadequate and our frontier guards might be unable to detect them. It is worth noting in this connection that NATO has bought detailed maps of northern Sweden from a government agency through the U.S. Embassy in Stockholm. The maps were made on a special order and never went on sale. Furthermore, the captions were translated into English. What the maps are intended for is "not realized," probably only by the Swedish government.

Changed situation

In terms of Northern Europe's security, Cruise missiles would dramatically change the situation. They would pose the greatest threat to Sweden and Finland, as I have noted. These two countries want protection against this new, more destructive weapon. Many military and security experts who understand the situation are warning against the likely consequences. "When recalling the developments of the past 40 years," writes Torsten Nilsson, the former Social Democratic Foreign Minister, in his recollections, "I cannot help stopping to think, neither Sweden nor other countries can any longer base their security on factors that were valid in 1940. Yet the debates on our defense bear the mark of helplessness and reluctance to face the truth."³

Unlike politicians and statesmen, the peoples of the Nordic countries do realize the nature of the change. The scale of the peace movement is growing. More and more people are protesting against nuclear armaments. The

paramount demand is that Northern Europe should remain a nuclear-free zone. This implies that the countries of the region must not purchase nuclear arms and that they should not allow their deployment on their territory in time of peace or war. As for the nuclear powers, they must be induced to guarantee that they will never use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against our countries.

Proclaim a nuclear-free zone

This proposal is not new. It was submitted to the UN General Assembly by Östen Undén, the Swedish Foreign Minister (Social Democrat), as far back as 1961. The proposal was that this zone should comprise Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. Ever since 1963, President Urho Kekkonen of Finland has been the most vigorous champion of this proposal. It is actively and consistently supported by the communists of the Nordic countries.

In 1978 the problem of nuclear arms and the dangers they present to mankind was discussed in detail at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, so far the most representative international meeting on this problem. The session approved a final document setting out an action program. The document notes, among other things, that the establishment of nuclear-free zones is a major step toward disarmament and that it should be encouraged as part of the effort whose final objective is a world entirely free of nuclear weapons (Articles 60 and 61).

There are now two agreements on nuclear-free zones. One is the 1959 Treaty on the Demilitarization of the Antarctic and the other, the 1967 Tlatelolco Treaty banning the deployment of nuclear arms in Latin America. It has been proposed that there should be nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe, in Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia. However, nothing is being done about them. As for the UN action program, it has apparently been shelved even by many of the countries that voted for it.

The proposal for a Nordic nuclear-free zone has powerful popular support. Last spring it was approved by the prime ministers of all the Nordic countries. However, they failed to come to agree on the ways and means of putting it into effect mainly because of resistance from two NATO countries, Norway and Denmark, and the bourgeois government of Sweden.

For many years the communists of Northern Europe have steadfastly advocated the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. Their sustained efforts have lately produced visible results. The peace movement and women's

organizations of Northern Europe are now campaigning for signatures to the demand for a nuclear-free zone. Last spring this demand got the backing of the trade unions and social democratic parties of the Nordic countries. Not long ago the Riksdag unanimously resolved that Sweden would step up its effort to establish such a zone and maintain a high degree of preparedness for negotiations.

Thus considerable progress has been made. Growing public pressure is forcing parliaments and governments to reconsider their negative or passive stance.

The interview granted by Leonid Brezhnev, head of the Soviet state, to the Finnish daily *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti* was a valuable contribution to the effort to strengthen the security of the North. The Soviet Union, he said, was willing to commit itself to abstain from using nuclear arms against North European countries that joined a nuclear-free zone. Nor did it rule out the possibility of considering some measures concerning Soviet territory adjacent to the nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe.⁴ These proposals offer our nations new opportunities to solve the difficult problem of eliminating the nuclear threat.

Die-hard adversaries

However, there are those who steadfastly oppose the proposal for a nuclear-free zone. True, tactical considerations and fear of a strong public opinion and political isolation prevent them from operating openly, and so they concentrate on blocking or complicating constructive initiatives and specific measures. This explains why they would like to shelve Undén's and Kekkonen's proposals and why they favor the idea of a larger zone extending beyond the Nordic region. Besides, the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone is made conditional on an agreement between the great powers to limit nuclear arms. This approach is an obstacle to effective steps.

The Left Party — Communists of Sweden (LPC) has said in no uncertain terms that declaring Northern Europe a nuclear-free zone should be a step toward a Europe free from nuclear arms and then toward a complete ban on such arms. It follows that we have nothing at all against a larger zone but reject all obstructions by advancing proposals that are unworkable at this stage. The plans proposed by Undén and Kekkonen are the most realistic today and they therefore have the whole-hearted support of the communists.

"Thinning-out zone"

In connection with the problem of a nuclear-

free zone the LPC has, in common with some other parties, once again raised the question of "thinning out" the nuclear armaments stockpiled on the periphery of Northern Europe. This applies to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization submarines carrying nuclear weapons, preparations to bring nuclear weapons to Nordic countries, the advance storing of military hardware, radar and navigation stations, and so on. The LPC considers that all nuclear-armed submarines should be withdrawn from our region. The LPC Board has sent a relevant letter to the CPSU Central Committee.

There has been a favorable response to these proposals. However, some people are trying desperately to use them as a means of preventing the implementation of constructive ideas. By making the establishment of a nuclear-free zone conditional on a "thinning out," they betray their real aim — preventing agreement — more than ever.

From words to action

It is high time to move from words to action. NATO will begin deploying the new missiles in 1983. This will not only increase the threat to the North but make the establishment of a nuclear-free zone difficult. The nuclear arsenal will grow. Government options for making decisions on a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe will be reduced. This is why the time left before the NATO decision is implemented must be used for practical measures.

At the Nordic Council's⁵ Copenhagen session last spring the LPC proposed convening a conference of the Nordic countries that could be attended by representatives of governments, parliaments, parties, the military, peace organizations, the trade union movement, and so on. The purpose of the conference would be to discuss problems of establishing a nuclear-free zone: differences, points of agreement, and joint efforts to carry out initiatives assuring progress.

Many participants in the session appreciated our proposal. It won the support of many press organs. However, the Swedish government turned down the LPC recommendation to take the initiative of holding the conference in Stockholm. Thereupon we proposed forming a parliamentary commission of representatives of all parties under the chairmanship of the Foreign Minister to explore the problem of setting up a nuclear-free zone and give the Riksdag a larger role in its solution.

The need to spur the activity of peace supporters and increase pressure on the Nordic governments is perfectly obvious. The gains

made so far add to our confidence in the eventual success of our work and convince us of the correctness of the road we have chosen, of the possibility that further headway can be made in the immediate future.

Tasks of the peace forces

If the governments cling to their inflexible position, refusing to go over to action and hold the conference, we believe the peace forces of the Nordic countries should consider taking the matter into their own hands. It would be worth inviting governments to attend the conference along with other participants. The conference should discuss the possibilities of drafting an agreement on a nuclear-free zone acceptable to all Nordic countries and come to terms on the security guarantees to be provided by the nuclear powers. The convocation of such a conference would noticeably hasten the implementation of the proposal advanced 20 years ago and help step up the effort for disarmament.

Setting up a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe is an increasingly insistent imperative. For our countries it is the only way of dissociating from nuclear war plans and safeguarding the security of our people. If set up, the zone would help stabilize security in Northern Europe, contribute to détente, and make far-reaching disarmament in the North possible. It would benefit the whole of Europe and pave the way for Norway, Denmark and Iceland to withdraw from NATO.

The Nordic countries annually appropriate enormous funds for military purposes and, moreover, their military spending shows a marked uptrend. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone would help to further détente and improve the outlook for disarmament, which would lead to a reduction of military spending. The result would be the release of large funds needed to overcome the economic difficulties besetting our countries and meet important social needs that are still ignored. It would become possible to render more aid to Third World countries.

The deadlock can be broken

Our party and the communist parties of the other Nordic countries are stepping up their activities in support of a nuclear-free zone. There is a fair promise of early success.

We feel certain that the establishment of such a zone would in large measure contribute to the drive for disarmament throughout Europe and strengthen the all-Europe movement against nuclear weapons and the arms race. It would

help break the deadlock in the disarmament talks and pave the way for their resumption and for new agreements on nuclear arms reduction in Europe, or, in other words, for disarmament, which is so indispensable. All the indications are that disarmament could begin from the North. We will spare no effort to help bring this about.

1. *Den militära överbefälhavarens perspektivplan 1980*. Part II. Liber forlag, 1981, p. 21.
2. *Sakerhetspolitik och totalförsvar*. Liber forlag, 1981, p. 11.
3. Torsten Nilsson, *Människor och handel i Europa*. Tiden forlag, 1978, p. 65.
4. *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti*, June 26, 1981.
5. A consultative body representing the parliaments and governments of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Finland, and Sweden. — Ed.

EEC neocolonialism in action

Ludwig Müller

Board Presidium and Secretariat member, GCP

Fritz Rische

Head of the Politico-Economic Committee
under the GCP Board

The change of the global balance of forces resulting from the birth of the socialist system and the collapse of colonialism has forced international monopoly capital to resort to new forms of struggle for a redivision of spheres of influence, especially in the so-called Third World. In the face of the mounting national liberation movement, it more actively seeks a new strategy and ways of coordinating and tying in the conflicting interests of the capitalist powers. This has been manifest in the processes of West European integration.

The formation of the Common Market did not remove the instability and contradictions inherent in the capitalist system, as will be seen from the change in the behavior of FRG imperialism. It is now seeking to move beyond the national territorial boundaries, to act more vigorously in EEC markets, and to achieve hegemony by extending its sphere of influence and domination in the newly liberated countries at the expense of its European rivals. At the same time, the monopolies — whether British, French or West German — guided by their neocolonialist aims and their common urge for expansion, are akin in their common stake in resisting the newly liberated countries' struggle against inequitable economic relations.

All these years, collective neocolonialism has been the predominant line in EEC policy. Overseas markets and rich sources of raw materials have become one of the most important conditions for the functioning of the whole capitalist organism of the EEC. In the middle of the 1970s, Western Europe received almost 80 per cent of its raw material and food imports from the less developed countries. Overall exports of the EEC to these countries went up from 50.9 billion European Currency Units

(ECU)¹ in 1976 to 61.8 in 1977, and 66.5 in 1978.

The former metropolitan countries, France in the first place, were the chief initiators of the policy of neocolonial enslavement. A convention on the association of a number of African countries with the Common Market was concluded in Yaounde (Cameroon) in 1963.² It was a thinly disguised neocolonialist agreement. Even so, the neocolonialists agreed to extend financial aid to the former colonies, and to lower import duties on their goods giving them a restricted access to the European markets.

With the entry of Britain, Denmark and Ireland into the EEC (1973), the policy of association with less developed countries acquired a new scope. A new agreement between the Nine and 46 states in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (the ACP countries) was signed in Lome, the capital of Togo, on February 28, 1975, and the next agreement was signed five years later.³ The Preamble of the first Lome convention said that the participating countries undertook to create a new model of relations between developed and less developed or underdeveloped states, seeking to establish a just and balanced world economic order.⁴

However, while an overwhelming majority of the developing countries take that statement as offering an important perspective, the policy of the EEC and its member states has been guided by other considerations. The activity of the FRG monopoly circles has been especially pushy. They have acted as the EEC's locomotive in the fight for a redivision of the shrunken spheres of imperialist influence. The trend toward external economic expansion has been steadily growing in the course of the concentration of production and capital and the consoli-

dation of economic strength of the Federal Republic. By 1977, West German investments abroad had reached 66 billion marks.⁵ Of the nearly 12 million persons employed by leading FRG concerns, over a quarter work abroad, with the annual sales of these concerns there coming to over 58 billion marks by 1977. Big business' mass media note with some pride the exceptionally high rate of growth in the export of bank capital (25 per cent a year), which is faster than in any other sector.⁶ The following symptomatic admission comes from *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*: "In the international financial world, the German credit institutions once again have a prominent role to play, despite the relatively short period of their existence, which is equal to the life-time of a man born after the Second World War. Roughly one-eighth of all the transactions of the German credit system now involves operations abroad. Their total volume is probably higher than 250 billion marks."⁷

These eloquent figures confirm the general trend toward the stepped-up foreign trade and economic expansion and export of capital by the West German companies which have grown into international monopolies. For the newly liberated countries, this signifies a deepening of economic dependence and a curb on the potentialities for pursuing an independent economic policy.

This question may arise: why do developing countries enter into broad economic relations with the EEC, despite their inequitable character? Have they failed to notice the self-seeking purposes and the dangerous political motives of the West European monopolies and their integration headquarters in Brussels?

Obviously, in this case, there is a need to reckon soberly with the highly complicated process of liberation from the old total economic dependence and with the traditional ties between the former colonies and the imperialist powers in Western Europe. Within the framework of their continuing ties with the world capitalist economy, the ACP countries seek the most favorable conditions for marketing their products and obtaining technical and financial aid. Having inherited from colonialism the heavy burden of socio-economic backwardness, they seek to overcome it by every means, including compromise agreements. That path is not an easy one and abounds in contradictions and disappointments.

But there is also growing understanding in the young states that the preferences they have obtained on the EEC market as a whole do not help to overcome the colonial one-commodity structure of their exports (raw materials, food-

stuffs, etc.), which are especially affected by fluctuations in market demand and the diktat of the European monopolies. These states are constantly facing attempts to impinge upon their interests. Association with the Common Market has failed to ease, let alone eliminate, one of the crucial problems: the worsening of the terms of trade. The newly liberated countries continue to suffer huge losses in consequence of the growing gap between the prices of manufactured products and the agricultural and raw materials they export. Nor is there any ground for pinning hopes on the aid coming from the EEC in building some industrial and infrastructural installations in the less developed countries: it is insignificant in scope and is frequently used for the benefit of the foreign monopolies.

The negotiations on the conclusion of a new agreement between the Lome convention signatories, which opened in the summer of 1978, proceeded in an atmosphere of conflict and complication. The African, Caribbean and Pacific countries demanded that the agreement should take account of the developing countries' interests and that it should be based on respect on both sides. For example, the Foreign Minister of Jamaica's anti-imperialist government and Chairman of the Council of ACP Ministers, P. Patterson, declared: "We cannot allow the inclusion of provisions which could be given all kinds of readings to harm the sovereign state's right to do as it sees fit."⁸

The EEC bosses set themselves other goals. They clearly had no intention of extending financial and technical aid to the ACP countries. They agreed to negotiate in the hope of keeping intact the provisions of the old convention under the pretext that, as FRG Foreign Minister Genscher said, there was a need to "consolidate" the ranks of the participating countries. The Brussels bureaucracy demanded the multilateral approval of an article concerning the protection of European capital, and insisted on the adoption of a human rights clause within the framework of contractual relations. That would have enabled the EEC to decide at will which of the ACP countries "deserve" trade preferences and which do not. Apparently, the idea was to set up a mechanism of pressure and interference in their internal affairs. However, attempts to change the convention failed having met with legitimate resistance.

The EEC bureaucracy tried to step up the negotiations and to have them completed in its favor before the year 1978 was out. When this failed, another move was used: negotiations were unilaterally broken off. But the compli-

cated economic situation in the EEC countries ultimately forced them to resume the dialogue. Its participants discussed, among other things, the activity of the special fund, instituted within the framework of the Lome convention, a system known as Stabex, designed to compensate (under certain conditions) exporting countries for losses resulting from a decline in the world prices of raw-material commodities and other goods and shrinking volumes of exports. But the compensation was to be paid only when the share of a commodity came to 6.5 per cent of a given country's total exports to the EEC market. As a result of the developing countries' perseverance, additional types of agricultural raw materials were included in the list of commodities to which this rule applies. There were also demands for the inclusion of tobacco, citrus fruits and certain other produce.

The capitalist powers were unable to impose on the ACP countries their conception of industrialization with emphasis solely on private investments by transnational corporations with guarantees of their stable positions and dominance in the ACP countries. The latter stood up for their rights to take independent decisions on whether they required investments or not, and on the form in which these were to come.

The negotiations resulted in an increase in the EEC's financial assistance: in the current five-year period, it is to come to 4.7 billion ECUs, with borrowing at 885 million. But the size of grants and soft loans has been cut with the result that the total financial aid for the new five-year period falls far short of the developing countries' expectations. The EEC also flatly rejected, on the FRG government's insistence, the demands for free access of the ACP countries' agricultural produce to West European markets, and refused to allow full compensation in the event of raw-material price fluctuations or to agree to tie in raw-material prices with the prices of manufactured products. The new Lome convention attaches somewhat lesser importance to cooperation between the two groups of states in the industrial field. It provides mainly for the long-term and guaranteed development of mineral resources and their delivery to Western Europe. The EEC-sponsored system for stimulating the mining industry and the energy sector testifies to its urge to assure itself of long-term access to the ACP countries' rich raw material deposits.⁹

Consequently, the new Lome convention, which resulted from intense and complicated negotiations, still bears a clear imprint of neo-colonialist pressure. But one thing is certain: despite the considerable differences in eco-

nomic levels and potentials of the liberated countries taking part in the convention and the dissimilarity of their political orientations, the negotiations with the EEC have shown that these states are capable of acting in a common front and resisting the imposition of diverse discriminatory demands. Protests against such demands and the EEC's protectionist trade policy are now ever more frequently voiced by far from anti-imperialist regimes, say, those within the framework of ASEAN.

The Common Market has been steadily expanding the geographic zone of its neocolonial activity. From 1974 to 1976, it concluded agreements on trade cooperation with Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The West European monopolies are casting a greedy eye on the ASEAN countries, which produce 80 per cent of the non-socialist world's natural rubber, 70 per cent of its tin, 75 per cent of its valuable species of wood, and have rich deposits of bauxites, zinc, oil and cobalt. The foreign monopolies are lured by the cheap local labor, and the possibility of making miserly allocations for social services when setting up subsidiaries. The geographical proximity of Southeast Asia to Japan, Australia and China is not at all seen by the EEC as an obstacle to strengthening its positions in that part of the world. In its drive against its rivals — Japan and the United States — in Far Eastern markets, the EEC has, in the recent period, got down to more vigorous action under pressure from Bonn. It is the FRG which insisted on the conclusion of an agreement between the EEC and the ASEAN countries — Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines. A step toward such an agreement was made in the form of the Second Conference on Development of Industrial Cooperation held in Djakarta in February 1979; and in early March 1980, the two economic groupings signed a five-year agreement.

In the EEC countries there is a clear and growing urge for political expansion. They have tended to be more active in developing countries, notably in areas where the liberation battles are intense and where the positions of foreign monopolies are in jeopardy. In Southeast Asia the Common Market has used its economic ties with the ASEAN countries in an effort to prevent the normalization of their relations with socialist Vietnam, people's Laos and Kampuchea. Evidence of the EEC's growing political activity in the Third World also comes from the Middle East policy of its members, which have now launched a broadly advertised "European initiative." Behind its vague formulations lurks an obvious unwill-

ingness to advance along the road of a truly just settlement entailing an end to the Israeli occupation, the withdrawal of the aggressor's troops from all the Arab lands it has occupied, and recognition of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, including the establishment of its own state.

Much more importance is now also being attached in capitalist Europe to the military-political aspects of the neo-colonialist line.¹⁰ This will be seen, for instance, from the visit by FRG Defense Minister Apel to a number of countries in the Pacific area in April 1980. The purposes of his trip were not confined to probing the possibilities for economic and other types of cooperation; he also discussed the extension of military aid to some countries where faith in the "United States, the protecting power," was badly shaken after its crushing defeat in Vietnam. The aggressive right-conservative groups of German capital make no secret of this. Here is what *Die Welt* wrote about Apel's tour: "One-half of mankind lives in the area whose shores are washed by the waters of the Pacific and on its numerous tiny archipelagoes. In the Pacific basin and around it lie 37 states. This basin is of tremendous strategic importance: Europe must see to it that the incipient turn here should not develop to the detriment of the community of Western states." In the course of his trip to the region, *Die Welt* continues, Apel came to the conclusion that "Europe is responsible for the whole world. It should not connect its security only with the narrow framework of NATO. Through its own economic might, Europe must help to stabilize the politically and economically restless zones."¹¹

More and more new facts show that the NATO countries and the EEC are trying to concert ever more closely their military-political activity in the Third World, arming the most reactionary regimes, for instance, the Pretoria racists confronting freedom-loving Africa. The system of bases set up by imperialism to encircle the socialist countries is simultaneously aimed against the peoples which have won political freedom and are fighting for economic independence. The expansion of U.S. and West European capital has a grave effect on the working people both in the developing and the developed capitalist states. The arms race, which is being whipped up by NATO, leaves less and less opportunity for using the vast resources it swallows up to revive the economic outlook in the EEC countries or to render economic assistance to African and Asian countries. That is not the least reason for the growing resistance to this policy everywhere. In the developing

world, progressive trends are gaining in depth, and this is manifested in the steady growth of the movement for a radical restructuring of international economic relations with the capitalist powers (the struggle for a new world economic order), in the growing influence of the nonaligned countries on world processes, and in the successes of the peoples fighting for political and economic independence. The ruling circles of capitalist Europe must reckon with the radically changed world role of the former colonies.

The worldwide battle between the forces of imperialism and the forces of social progress clearly demonstrates that the working class in the developed capitalist countries and the national liberation movement objectively have common goals. These are the goals of the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic struggle aimed to complete the process of genuine national liberation, to surmount neo-colonialism, and win economic independence.

It is true that historically the class bonds between the working people of all the regions in the non-socialist part of the world are burdened with contradictions produced by the old system of exploitation of the colonies by West European and U.S. monopolies. The workers' "own" bourgeoisie was capable of allowing them handouts from the huge profits in order to maintain a "class peace." Let us recall that the superprofits exported from the colonies provided a substantial economic basis for the emergence of opportunism, which led to the split in the working-class movement.

But in our day, neocolonial suppression and oppression are aimed not only against the exploited masses in the developing countries, but ever more frequently also directly affect the lot of various contingents of working people in Western Europe and the United States. The export of capital from the industrialized capitalist countries, which leads to the winding up of enterprises in these countries and the establishment of subsidiaries in the Third World (for the purpose of increasing the rate of profit through the use of cheap labor), frequently turns out to be the cause of acute class conflicts. The reduction in the number of jobs and other burdens caused by the outflow of capital frequently prevent the working people in the capitalist countries from finding a common class stand and hamper their joint struggle against the transnational corporations. Indeed, the monopolies, resorting to social pressure methods, consciously fan hostility between various national contingents of the working class in and outside the EEC.

The international concerns maintain low

wage levels in the developing countries and refuse to extend to their working people the trade-union and social rights which have long since been won by the working-class movement in the capitalist West. The "divide and rule" policy is frequently effected in Africa and Asia with the help of the local ruling classes and reactionary regimes, which receive aid, including military aid, from imperialism. Hence the need to pool the efforts of the working people in the industrialized capitalist and the developing countries. A common stand must be taken against international capital and its henchmen: such is the communists' steadfast stand.

In championing the ideas of anti-imperialist solidarity, the communist and workers' parties have always advocated joint action against international reaction, for peace, national independence, social progress, democracy and socialism. They support the developing countries' legitimate demands. The Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties held in June 1976 emphasized: "The democratization of international relations and the development of international cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual advantage for all the peoples are important goals in the struggle for the establishment of an international community free from imperialism and neocolonialism in which the deep-seated disproportions between the developed and the developing countries will be overcome, and which will be based on the complete independence of each nation, and on its active participation in solving the problems of mankind."¹² The socialist states, the non-aligned movement, the revolutionary and progressive forces in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist world are carrying on a persevering struggle to implement these principles.

In the light of these problems, considerable importance has recently been attached to the stand taken by European social democrats, who now give a heightened attention to ties with the developing countries.

The attitude of the social democratic and socialist parties to the national liberation movement is a highly contradictory one. They give it verbal support and approve the people's action in defense of economic and state independence. Practice is a different matter: the social democrat-led governments continue to be a mainstay of international capital. They frequently take action, including patently coercive action, aimed against the independence and sovereignty of the newly liberated states.

This policy is encouraged above all by NATO; it is designed to stimulate socio-economic processes in developing countries suitable to imperialism, and to help consolidate the power of anti-popular circles. An example is the aid being given by the FRG's social democrat-led government to the reactionary regimes in Pakistan and Turkey.

Nevertheless, in the recent period Bonn's official line with respect to the developing countries has become more flexible (and this is also characteristic of the other EEC members). This is due, on the one hand, to Western Europe's growing dependence on raw material supplies in conditions of the aggravated energy crisis, and on the other, to the growing independence of the young states in international affairs as witnessed, among other things, by their activity at the UN and its agencies.

The "new conception" announced by the FRG government in July of last year is designed above all to give a new emphasis to the flexible strategy adopted by the FRG government, it implies supporting the "consciously reformist and democratic governments in the Third World." This orientation is characteristic of the general line of the Socialist International, which has now set up in Africa an inter-African group of political parties, including ruling parties, on the basis of the notorious "democratic socialism" doctrine.¹³

Another line of social-reformist activity in the past few years is encouraging research into the "North-South" problem, which is also a reflection of the Socialist International's present efforts to convince the ruling circles of the imperialist West that there must be greater flexibility in relations with the developing countries. It is suggested that a "new partnership" with the former metropolitan countries is possible. The main idea of this activity is to produce concrete recommendations so as to somewhat ease the grave ills of the colonial past and the neocolonial present, without essentially changing the exploitive system of monopoly capital domination and the policy of neocolonialism, a fact which is usually passed over in silence.

Rather symptomatic in this context is the appearance of a report of the so-called Commission on International Development entitled "To Ensure Survival." The report was drawn up by a working group, or the "North-South Commission", as it is also called, headed by SDPG Chairman Willy Brandt who is also President of the Socialist International. This detailed document gives a critical characterization of the ties which have taken shape between the "North and South" and contains

interesting empirical data. It shows that the economic relations between the developing countries and the capitalist world are fraught with crises and upheavals. As an alternative, its authors propose some sort of third way (not defined in detail) and refer to a "new responsibility" and "a community of interests."¹⁴

Brandt urges the convocation of an international conference to discuss these problems ("A North-South Summit for Survival") and proposes that the population of the industrialized countries should carry a heavier burden in order to increase aid to the less developed countries. In class terms, however, such appeals are misleading because they leave in the shadow those who are making fat profits on the decades-long exploitation of the developing countries, namely, the transnational corporations. It is from them that the capitalist governments more often than not take their cue. It is not without the intervention of the TNCs that Washington, which until recently boycotted the North-South negotiations, has taken to talking about their resumption. A "dialogue" on relations between the developing and nonaligned countries, on the one hand, and the industrialized capitalist states, on the other is to take place at an international conference in Mexico. It is notable, however, that President Reagan is opposed to the participation of Fidel Castro (and the leader of socialist Cuba is the current president of the nonaligned movement). This is prompted, firstly, by the aim of weakening the anti-imperialist thrust of the entire movement for radical restructuring of the international economic relations, and, secondly, by fear in the face of exposure by consistently anti-imperialist forces. The latter have opened the eyes of many developing countries to the methods of imperialist domination and the power of the transnationals, and the goals and motives behind neocolonialist "altruism."

What can one say about the "common interests"? Such interests undoubtedly exist, if by them are meant the interests of the working people of the developing and the capitalist countries, who are equally oppressed and exploited by international monopoly capital. But if this declared strategy is neutral in class terms, no amount of "third ways" can help to remove the contradictions between the poverty and wealth considered by the authors of the report. In the final analysis, the interests of national independence and social progress are absolutely incompatible with the transnationals' urge for domination, for maximum profits and military-political expansion.

Speaking more concretely — that is, about

the FRG — one has to emphasize that under the SD-led Schmidt-Genscher government, too, its ruling class has been moving into an ever sharper contradiction with the aspirations of the newly liberated states, which want an end to neocolonialist exploitation, equitable terms of trade, respect for the sovereignty they have won, and their inalienable right to dispose of their national resources as they see fit. The program of the German Communist Party reads in part: "Imperialism in the Federal Republic has become a major exploiter of developing countries. The concerns have expanded their investments, the extraction of raw materials and their share of the markets in African, Asian and Latin American countries. The monopolies and the state are organizers of neocolonialism. They enter into alliance with fascist and racist regimes and try to impede the development of progressive trends."

It is important, at the same time, to reckon with the fact that in the social democratic and socialist parties of the EEC countries there are forces which now voice more resolutely than ever before their disagreement with the imperialist line and the policy of neocolonialism. In other words, there is a real and objective basis for joint action by the communists, revolutionary movements in the liberated countries, and socialists and social democrats. And in common they are capable of doing a great deal in resisting the practices and methods of imperialism and neocolonialism. A joint discussion could more fully bring out the points of contact and formulate demands more fully. Particular importance is attached to overcoming anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, which are the greatest hindrance in the way of consolidating anti-imperialist solidarity.

The German Communist Party has always resolutely advocated such a discussion and cooperation on an anti-imperialist basis for the purpose of giving support to the national-liberation movement. The establishment of common positions could help to elaborate a joint strategy, start anti-imperialist action and strengthen the forces which want to help the developing countries' struggle for a radical restructuring of international economic relations.

1. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, November 1, 1979. One ECU is worth about 2.5 FRG marks and over 1 dollar. The value of the ECU is annually recalculated.

2. The associated members do not take part in the work of the governing organs of this monopoly association.

3. The Lomé Convention now involves 60 developing countries with a population of over 300 million.

4. ACPEE-Convention of Lomé; *The Courier*, No. 31, Lomé-Dossier, March 1975, p. 9.

5. In 1980 the FRG's direct private investments overseas increased by 8.1 billion marks. The total direct overseas investments since 1952 have reached 74.1 billion marks. (*Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung-Aktuelle Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik.*) No. 24/1981, April 9, 1981, p. 2.

6. *Wirtschaftswoche*, September 24, 1976.

7. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 6, 1980.

8. *IPW-Berichte*, Berlin 3/1980, "Der Kompromiss von Lomé II", p. 50.

9. This purpose is, in effect, to be served by Sismin, a system of financial subsidies for suppliers of mineral raw materials, set up within the framework of the second Lomé convention. These will be made available in the event of a reduction of output or export by at least 10 per cent (as a result of natural disasters, accidents or political upheavals, and also as a result of a protracted decline of prices). Let us note that this fund was set up at the insis-

tence of the West European Nine, notably the FRG, and not on the initiative of the ACP countries, which has proposed that earnings from the sale of mineral raw materials should be stabilized through an extension of the Stabex system — Ed.

10. Y. Dadoo. "The Military-Political Trend in the Strategy of Neocolonialism," *WMR*, May 1981, p. 32.

11. *Die Welt*, April 8, 1980.

12. *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe. The Results of the Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties*, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976.

13. "Africa in the Early Eighties. A Political Survey." *WMR*, No. 9, 1981.

14. Bericht der Nord-Süd-Kommission, "Das Überleben Sicheim-Gemeinsame Interessen der Industrie- und Entwickler" bei Kiepenheuer und Witsch. Köln, 1980, pp. 26, 29, 32.

Going against the stream

Cesar Perez

CC Member, Dominican Communist Party

EXHUMING THE MONROE DOCTRINE: TO WHAT EFFECT?

This year's developments have furnished ample evidence of a shift of U.S. policy toward further militarization and abuse of force, of its scorn for the will of peoples and interests of peace.

The U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, has sanctioned an unprecedented increase in military spending and given the go-ahead signal for the production of neutron weapons. The Pentagon is forming a rapid deployment force as a punitive corps for putting down liberation movements in African, Asian and Latin American countries. Its strength is to be brought up to 230,000 effectives. Aggressiveness is the keynote of the course taken by Reagan and his Cabinet on cardinal international issues, and it is seen in imperialist actions on different latitudes. This is very much in evidence in Latin America and the Caribbean, a part of the world where the Republican administration has decided, beginning with El Salvador, to "teach a lesson" to peoples rising against the dictates of the local oligarchy and foreign imperialists.

During his election marathon, Reagan declared that no region of the world can have "higher priority than the one in which we live." This was emphasized by the U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who told the Americas Council on June 3, 1981 that Reagan's election was a mandate to seek peace and protect American interests overseas, and that nowhere

else was it more important to fulfil that mandate than in Latin America and the Caribbean. The words about looking for peace should delude nobody. The heart of the matter is not in these words but in "American overseas interests," which were paramount in the minds of Bush's audience at the Americas Council, which brings together more than 200 U.S. corporations operating south of the Rio Grande.

The beginning of a new political cycle was highlighted in Washington by an acceleration of the shift begun under Carter. Today there is no doubt at all that on the international scene the present administration is pursuing an extremely aggressive course that seriously imperils world peace and the sovereignty of developing nations, including those of Latin America. The monopoly circles, whose spokesman is President Reagan, are renewing their efforts to place the USA in a position to impose their order on the peoples of the planet.

White House policy today draws on the theories being evolved in the most conservative "brain trusts" and research centers, where a spirit of anti-communism reigns and the American bourgeoisie's imperial ambitions are galvanized.¹ Most of the members of the Reagan entourage are from these centers.² Another hallmark of the present administration is the militarization of its foreign policy apparatus and the promotion of military and CIA to top jobs. They are particularly numerous among those dealing with Latin American countries.³

Most of the Reaganites represent two trends

of bourgeois political thought in the USA: "the new right" and "the neo-conservatives." The former take an ultra-reactionary stand on international issues. Confirmed militarists, they are obsessed with a mania for military superiority over the USSR. "The new right" urge a steady growth of the military budget and the formation of large rapid deployment units. Resorting to despicable methods, they stigmatize Americans who are worried about the fate of détente. "The neo-conservatives," less bellicose but no less dangerous, are engaged in providing the ideological framework for domestic policy. Which is not to suggest that they stay out of international affairs, in which they favor dictation from a position of strength.

Despite some political and ideological distinctions, all the organizations and trends in the Reagan camp agree that the USA should have the strength to keep its allies in check, dictate its will to them, and manipulate their economies (this applies both to Latin America and to the Caribbean). They are unanimous in supporting the absurd course toward confrontation with the Soviet Union. All are obsessed with the belief that every aggravation of the class struggle stems from "Cuban and Russian intrigues."

The methods used by the Washington administration in our region are based on clearly obsolete stereotypes to which U.S. Latin American policy has been tailored long ago. The pivot of this policy was the Monroe Doctrine put forward in the 1820s, when the Latin American and Caribbean peoples were looking for ways of achieving national independence. James Monroe, who was the U.S. President at the time, proclaimed what seemed to be a legitimate slogan, "America for Americans." But coming from Monroe, it articulated the aspirations of America's rapidly burgeoning bourgeoisie, which was out to halt the operations of its European imperialist rivals, enlarge its own sphere of influence, and seize control of the markets and natural resources of Latin America and the Caribbean. By the turn of the century the USA had become the dominant power on the continent. In line with the big stick policy, the logical extension of the Monroe Doctrine at the imperialist stage, more and more investment and loan capital was funneled into the countries of the region and this brought fabulous profits.

The big stick, which imperialism has never renounced, has again been raised over our heads. Big business and the military, who are at the helm of Washington's policy, are once again resorting to the Monroe Doctrine methods. The situation has changed, of course,

and the concrete tasks of the U.S. strategists have changed accordingly. The days of unchallenged imperialist rule has passed long ago and the world is living in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Today the U.S. ruling circles need a Monroe Doctrine-style policy in order to prevent significant social changes such as have taken place in Cuba and are now taking place in Grenada and Nicaragua, changes that inspire the liberation struggles of all the peoples of the continent.

Washington's threats to independent states, to peoples fighting for liberation are obviously relapses of the mania possessing not only "the new right" but also "the neo-conservatives." This mania has entrapped the minds of most of the USA's rulers. The roots of this affliction go deep into the past.

Let us look at the facts. They are given, for example, by the American scholars Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman, in a book that was the first major exposure of U.S. imperialist policy (it was published in 1925 and has since had repeated printings in many countries). It quotes Secretary of State Richard Olney, an assiduous proponent of the Monroe Doctrine, who in 1895 declared: "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this (American — S.P.) continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition. Why? It is not because of the pure friendship or good will felt for it. It is not simply by reason of its high character as a civilized state, nor because wisdom and justice and equity are the invariable characteristics of the dealings of the United States. It is because in addition to all other grounds, its infinite resources combined with its isolated position render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable against any or all other powers."⁴

From this maniacal belief of exclusiveness and preeminence springs the belief that it is the "natural" right of the USA to dictate its will to other countries, peoples, and governments and that U.S. expansion is both necessary and legitimate. Claims of this kind are to be heard in many of the speeches of the incumbent U.S. President and other ranking Washington officials, just as they were to be heard in Theodore Roosevelt's message to the Congress in 1904: "Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such

wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power."⁵

A more cynical statement, it would seem, could hardly be found. But here is another specimen of cynicism — the attitude of the Monroe Doctrine proponents to the USA's Central American neighbors. As they see it, the "feeble governments and low civilization of Central America must in time disappear. With the completion of an isthmian waterway we will be brought in more immediate contact with those people . . . and ought to have more to say about their future destiny than any other power."⁶

The present version of the Monroe Doctrine implies subordination of the Latin American countries' foreign policies to the interests of U.S. imperialism, to its militaristic adventurist course, and the suppression of all attempts to maintain détente and of all manifestations of solidarity with embattled peoples. It spells out pressure on governments "breaking" the blockade of Cuba and the erection of barriers to normal relations with Cuba.

The Dominican Republic is a case in point. In the recent election campaign Antonio Guzman, who became President, promised to restore diplomatic relations with Cuba. But with Washington breathing down his neck he had to "forget" this pledge. Guzman now unabashedly says he "will normalize relations only after this is done by the USA."

Everybody is well aware that the Washington administration has hardened its anti-Cuban stand to the limit. The attacks on the first socialist state in America are couched in a style reminiscent of the first generation of heirs to the Monroe Doctrine, of those who said it was necessary "to buy Cuba because of its nearness to our coast; because it belonged naturally to that great group of States of which the Union was the providential nursery; because it commanded the mouth of the Mississippi whose immense and annually growing trade must seek that way to the ocean, and because the Union could never enjoy repose, could never be secure, till Cuba was within its boundaries."⁷

Historically, of course, the point of departure for the Monroe Doctrine could not have been anti-communism (it was anti-Europeism). Even so, anti-communism has long been central to the system of values constituting that doctrine's present substance. Along with its other elements, it has been purposefully integrated into the "national security" concept espoused by military dictatorships, and into the political platform of the Organization of American States (OAS) dubbed "the U.S. Department of Colonies." Thus, the Caracas Declaration of the

OAS (1954) reads in part: "The domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international communist movement, extending to this Hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of American states, endangering the peace of America."⁸ This traditional note has been raised to fortissimo in U.S. policy today.

As regards the Latin-Caribbean region, the anti-communist theme is presented mainly through the "Cuban danger" allegedly representing a projection of the "Soviet danger," and, more recently, also the "Nicaraguan danger" (the latter, of course, a projection of the "Cuban-Soviet threat"). An artificially fostered myth is thus used to obscure the fact that the real danger to Latin American and Caribbean countries comes from U.S. imperialism.

Assessing Reagan's attitude, the French monthly *Le Monde diplomatique* wrote with good reason that "his anti-communism has found a particularly appreciative audience in the ruling circles — both military and civilian — of dictatorial regimes."⁹ The ultra-right forces in Latin America and the Caribbean, ever a mainstay of imperialist domination, saw the advent of the new President to the White House as a good opportunity to bolster repressive regimes, shake and remove democratic governments, and launch a general onslaught against the revolutionary movement. Reagan had signalled his partiality for the ultra-right before he was elected, when in no uncertain terms he accused Carter of having turned away from friends in the Hemisphere, encouraging destabilization of their governments, and allowing Soviet and Cuban influence to grow.

It is not accidental that the putschists in Bolivia, who in 1980 prevented a lawfully elected president from assuming power, openly linked their hopes to the election of the Republican candidate. The governing oligarchy of Guatemala bluntly declared that it was hoping it would get more military aid from the USA than before. Its members did not conceal their joy when they said that armaments would now cost less because it would be cheaper to transport them. Previously, they came mainly from Israel. Pinochet, too, has voiced complete satisfaction over the change of the U.S. leadership. The USA and Chile, the dictator said, had settled the misunderstanding that had crept into their relations after Carter proclaimed his "human rights" doctrine.

During his visit to the USA the Argentine President, General Roberto Eduardo Viola, was assured of support to his government if it step-

ped up its drive against "subversive communist activity." Pledges of this kind are certain to elate the most die-hard reactionaries in Argentina. The Somoza thugs entrenched in Honduras, where they are getting special training for an invasion of Nicaragua, have lately come much more into the open. Their craving for vengeance was reinforced when the new American President refused to give the people's government in Nicaragua the \$75 million promised to it by Carter (as a face-saving gesture) and in fact readdressed the money to the military in El Salvador.

As well as supporting reactionary dictatorships, imperialism continues its experiments in installing "moderate" right-wing regimes. Evidence of this is the lavish financial and political assistance to Jamaica's new ruler, Edward Seaga, who, with his eyes hopefully on Reagan, conducted his election campaign in a spirit of unbridled anti-communism, resorting to terror and falsifications. Washington's present policy-makers grant recognition also to "limited democracy" regimes provided their leaders follow in the wake of the imperialists. On the other hand, Washington pressures countries seeking to regain sovereignty over their national resources and diversify their external economic and diplomatic relations.

Reliance on "regional policemen" is an important element of imperialist strategy. This policy was initiated by Nixon in the late 1960s. The doctrine, which was named after him, envisaged (in relation to African, Asian and Latin American states) the sharing of responsibility "for the maintenance of security and stability." The underlying motive is obvious: by transferring control over large and small territories to underlings, the imperialists hope to conceal their own presence. In the second half of the 1960s and in the 1970s the USA believed it had as its strongest card Brazilian "subimperialism." Now Venezuela has been singled out for special attention. Influential circles of the Venezuelan bourgeoisie, who back the present Social-Christian government, have struck an alliance with Washington, receiving as a result some prerogatives in the Caribbean which they regard as their "natural market."¹⁰ These circles are conducting a massive anti-Cuban campaign in order to undermine Cuba's prestige in the eyes of Latin American and Caribbean peoples. Caracas and Washington have now adopted an identical posture on the question of support for the El Salvadoran junta. The course currently pursued by Venezuela in the Caribbean unquestionably dovetails with the USA's imperialist goals.

A similar situation is taking shape in the

relations between the Dominican government and Haiti's dictatorial regime. The stated readiness of the Dominican generals to extend aid to Duvalier and the agreements signed by the two countries on joint suppression of "subversive activity" reflect Washington's diplomatic efforts aimed at using the stronger Dominican army in the event of a revolutionary explosion in Haiti. That is particularly important for the USA because the Pentagon plans to use Haiti as yet another strategic base (in addition to 50 bases and other large military facilities it already has in the region). Hence the well-wishing attitude toward Duvalier and the absolution of his sins, lamented in Washington when it was conducting its "human rights" campaign.

The Pentagon has always kept a watchful eye on the Dominican Republic, but today that attention is conspicuous. The Pentagon generals have been making more frequent inspection visits to that country and there is now a military mission at the U.S. embassy. Last April, on the 16th anniversary of the landing of U.S. marines in Santo Domingo, American naval ships entered the capital's port on a "friendly visit." Mass protests ensued and in their wake came repression. The final tally was four dead, scores of wounded, and hundreds of arrests. The Political Bureau of the Dominican Communist Party has made it clear that there was a direct link between that action and the general "escalation of interventionism to halt the revolutionary movement in Central America and the Caribbean — the struggle for self-determination and renewed independence for our peoples."¹¹

The desperate attempts to bring back the days of imperial diktat are at odds with present-day realities. There is an obvious gap between the aspirations of the right wing of U.S. monopoly capital and that country's objective potential and place in the modern world.

The United States is past its peak of "pre-eminence" and no longer commands absolute leadership in the capitalist system. West European and Japanese monopolies have achieved a competitiveness enabling them to penetrate not only into the "backyard" (this is how the Washington strategists refer to Central America and the Caribbean) but even into the "house," i.e., the United States itself. The rate of production growth in the USA has dropped sharply, eight million people are jobless, and inflation runs at an annual rate of more than 12 per cent.¹² In the USA a serious political crisis followed the Vietnam debacle. The Watergate scandal revealed corruption and arm-twisting methods in the top echelons of power. Scandals in the "respectable" Carter family and, more

recently, the exposures of the machinations of the new CIA chief, William J. Casey, were sensitive blows to the Establishment's moral image. The people have become deeply disenchanted with the basic institutions of American society.

The Republican administration is going to all lengths to drum up support for its aggressive foreign policy. However, huge sections of American public opinion are sick of new adventures. By staging mass demonstrations demanding the termination of aid to the El Salvadoran junta, the people of the USA clearly expressed their attitude to the attempts of the Washington military to draw the country into another Vietnam.

Labor is making ever more significant gains in its historic confrontation with capital. The socialist community, represented in the Western Hemisphere by heroic Cuba, is growing. The liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is mounting. In the capitalist system more and more countries are refusing to take orders from the main imperialist center. Marxist ideas are spreading in the world. All this cannot but affect the Latin and Caribbean countries and contribute to the general strengthening of the progressive forces and their influence even in American society.

To sum up. Objective conditions are drastically limiting the realization of U.S. imperialist interests. In what is a clear instance of wishful thinking, Reagan and the monopoly capitalist circles backing him are in effect going against the stream of time. Small wonder that after a tub-thumping start the Republican administration's foreign-policy machine is misfiring. It misfires in the face of opposition from West European allies, the independent opinion of immediate neighbors on the continent, and the staunchness of the revolutionary forces in Central America.

Even the small Caribbean states resent imperial dictation. In July the members of the Caribbean Development Bank unanimously rejected Washington's terms whereby Grenada was to be stricken off the list of recipients of American financial aid distributed through the bank.

Imperialism no longer has the strength to realize its plans of world domination. But it is not yet so weak as to be unable to perpetrate further crimes against nations.

In the present tense situation a special responsibility devolves on the communists. This situation demands uncompromising ideological struggle. In the Latin American and Caribbean countries, it is of paramount importance to expose the allegations about Cuban and Soviet "subversion." And the communists are steadfastly explaining that these countries

hold the attention of the masses because of their profound social transformations and their indisputable advances in creative endeavor, which are a fascinating example for the nations of the world. Moreover, it is vital to combat the reformist illusions still influencing a large proportion of the politically active population in the countries of our region. We unconditionally reject the false recipes for "economic recovery," no matter how attractively they are packaged.

The communist parties have amassed considerable experience of struggle for national independence and basic civil rights. We have always upheld the principle that sovereignty must be respected, and it is not for the pseudo-intellectuals of the U.S. subversive centers to teach us national pride. The communists in Latin American and Caribbean countries, like the majority of their fellow countrymen, are firm in our determination to safeguard the national dignity and national heritage of our people against encroachment by the Reagans and the Haigs, and we esteem those who are sincerely in solidarity with the struggle of our peoples.

The convergence and fusion of different revolutionary trends are decisive in political terms. But unity does not rule out, but in fact implies discussion in the course of which the conviction should grow that the claims of the imperialists to supremacy in our region cannot be rejected by "moderate" governments solely as a result of changes in the form of bourgeois society. Genuine independence can be achieved only by sweeping away the diseased political structure and fundamentally restructuring property relations. Only then will there be an "America for Americans" — not in the sense Washington reads into it, but in a truly revolutionary sense.

As never before, anti-imperialist goals are linked with the defense of peace on a regional and global scale. The Washington dissemblers portray the anti-dictatorial uprisings in Central America as a clash between "global forces" and thus would like to have a pretext for "internationalizing the conflict" and further fueling war hysteria. The monopolies in the U.S. military-industrial complex are out to benefit by the demand for armaments not only in the USA but also in the countries of our region. More, this demand is provoked by kindling conflicts between countries (Peru and Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela, Venezuela and Guyana, Argentina and Chile, and so on). Venezuela's intention to buy a large number of new U.S. F-16 fighter-bombers and the increasing arms sales to Guatemala, El Salvador and

Honduras spell out handsome profits for the U.S. arms manufacturers. On the other hand, all this shows that Latin American nations are being drawn into the militaristic race.

Political intolerance, saber-rattling, threats and blackmail relative to Latin American and Caribbean people — the revival of the moth-eaten Monroe Doctrine leads into a historical dead end. U.S. imperialism's present policy will not help it to retrieve the positions it has lost and will not bring it any political dividends. All this policy is doing is generating a real danger to the lives and sovereign rights of our peoples, a danger which in the prevailing situation transcends the boundaries of our continent.

1. Among them is the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace created back in 1917 to combat the "vicious theory of Marx," Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies (which is providing a "scientific" basis for a hard line in world affairs), the American Enterprise Institute (which wants the government to take a tougher stance in protecting the overseas interests of the monopolies), and an organization calling itself the Heritage Foundation, which has considerable influence on Capitol Hill. Set up fairly recently, the latter has already made its mark with recommendations for

streamlining the special services and broadening the range of their foreign policy functions.

2. Those directly involved in the USA's Latin America and Caribbean policy, include Richard Allen, Brzezinski's successor, Roger W. Fontaine, member of the National Security Council, Edwin Meese, a presidential adviser with the rank of State Secretary, Jeane Kirkpatrick, the U.S. Ambassador to the UN, and Terry Dolan, the U.S. representative on the Security Council. Vice-President Bush, once active with the American Enterprise Institute, is not to be left out of the list.

3. Retired General Gordon Sumner is now special adviser (of ambassadorial rank) to Thomas Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Secretary of State Alexander Haig avails himself of the consultations of special adviser on Latin American affairs Vernon Walters, a retired general and former assistant director of the CIA.

4. Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman. *Dollar Diplomacy. A Study in American Imperialism*. London, 1927, p. 248.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 261-262.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 257.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 241.

8. *A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties*. Prepared by the Committee of Santa Fé. Council for Inter-American Security. Washington, 1980, p. 4.

9. *Le Monde diplomatique*, April 1981.

10. On this subject see Eloy Lanza, *El subimperialismo venezolano*, Caracas, 1980.

11. *Hablan los comunistas*, April 9-16, 1981, p. 5.

12. Reagan himself admitted in his inaugural address that the USA is in economic decline.



The socialist way: the only way out of the crisis

Stefan Olszowski

CC Political Bureau member,

CC Secretary, Polish United Workers' Party

The ninth extraordinary congress of the Polish United Workers' Party took place in Warsaw on July 14-20 of this year in a situation unusual for our country.

Poland is experiencing a deep economic crisis. Moreover, phenomena threatening socialism have accumulated and counter-revolutionary activity is mounting. In Poland developments took this unfavorable turn at a time when imperialism's aggressive ambitions had become increasingly more pronounced on the international scene and begun to imperil peaceful coexistence, the security of peoples and peace throughout the world.

The overall balance of strength in the world is changing in favor of peace, progress and socialism. This stable trend determines the direction of humankind's development. How-

ever, the imperialists are growing more active in their efforts to halt and even reverse progressive processes benefiting the peoples. Efforts of this kind are the main threat to peace.

Imperialism is trying to recast the balance of strength along two directions equally menacing to peace on our planet.

First, attempts are being made to give a new dimension to the arms race, further evidence of which is Ronald Reagan's decision to begin the production of neutron bombs. Here the motivation is to tilt the present military balance between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization in favor of the USA.

Second, in their calculations the imperialists are increasingly counting on counter-revolution, and this dangerously intensifies tension in international relations.

On many points these directions intertwine closely. Impelled by cold war thinking, reactionary imperialist circles are whipping up the arms race in the hope that a new spiral will exhaust the socialist community countries economically and thereby increase the chances for attaining counter-revolutionary aims.

During the past decade the situation in Poland had developed in a way that took the country into a deep crisis. This was mainly the result of serious errors by the former party and government leadership, of errors in the political, social and economic spheres. The roots of the miscalculations are not only and even not so much in an underestimation of the Polish national specific as chiefly in a retreat from the general, law-governed principles of socialist construction.

The party's leading role weakened through distortion of the methods on which its leading position in society is based and disregard of the time-tested norms of party life. This was accompanied by a serious deterioration of ideological work in the party itself and also by a diminution of its influence on the public consciousness and on the stand of the working people in the obtaining situation. The party's links with the people were shaken. The socialist state was unable to perform its socio-economic and political functions effectively. This opened the door for anti-socialist forces actively supported by foreign subversive centers.

The special significance of the ninth extraordinary congress of the PUWP can be properly assessed only if all this is taken into account. Its central task was to define the ways and conditions for a return to socialist, Leninist principles in politics and economics — there is no other way to surmounting the crisis. It was in this that not only the Polish communists and the working people of our country but also the forces of socialism, of progress throughout the world saw the significance of this highest forum of our party. This was expressed as follows at the congress by V.V. Grishin, who led the CPSU delegation: "We sincerely hope, comrades, that the extraordinary forum of the Polish communists will prove equal to its historical responsibility and adopt resolutions that will help to normalize the situation in the country. This not only conforms with the aspirations of millions of your fellow countrymen but will be welcomed by the peoples of the USSR and other socialist community countries, by all the forces of progress."*

In this context the congress justified the

hopes placed on it as marking a turning point in the struggle for a way out of the crisis. After a broad, comprehensive debate the delegates passed the program for the Development of Socialist Democracy, the Consolidation of the PUWP's Leading Role in Socialist Construction and in the Stabilization of the Socio-Economic Situation in the Country. Moreover, the congress adopted other program documents, namely: On the Centenary of the Polish Working-Class Movement, On Drawing Up a Long-Term Program of the PUWP, and the Address to the Polish People. The latter gives a generalized assessment of the socio-political situation and defines tasks that may be regarded as typical of the results of the congress proceedings. Noting the present threat to Poland's national existence and future, the address declared: "The present crisis is not the result of the functioning of the socialist system but, on the contrary, the outcome of a departure from the ideological principles of socialism, which had always been the guiding star for the working-class movement, a departure which brought Poland misfortune." In amplification of this thesis it stated that "only the Marxist-Leninist party can guarantee successful socialist renewal and the realization of the line of agreement, and ensure the dependable security of the state and the sovereign existence of the people."

The congress accomplished much, but above all it unambiguously reaffirmed the party's fidelity to the principles of socialism, which create the conditions for ending the crisis and for the nation's further development. This is the only way society's confidence in the people's power can be restored and consolidated. As the Program for Development notes, this process must proceed under conditions of socialist democracy, whose perfection is demanded by socialism's political organization. The work of all democratic institutions will acquire an ever more profound socialist content. We shall take vigorous action against any attempts to debilitate the party's influence, to destabilize individual elements of our political system. This, the congress documents note, must be accompanied by resistance to the striving to turn some sections of the trade-union movement into a weapon against socialism in Poland, into an opposition political organization.

The principal guarantee for ending the crisis lies in the unity and strength of the PUWP, which has the leading role to play in socialist construction. This role of the Marxist-Leninist party, of the vanguard of the working class that most fully expresses the basic interests of the entire people, is a vital condition of socialism's development in Poland, the Program for

*Trybuna Ludu, July 15, 1981.

Development says. The party holds key political positions in our society by virtue of its working-class character, and for that reason the congress documents accentuate the need to strengthen it. Steadfastly relying on Marxist-Leninist theory, which is the ideological basis of its activity, the PUWP will concentrate on implementing such fundamental tenets and values of socialism as equality, social justice, power of the people, legality, and the extension of civil rights and freedoms. It will bend every effort to preserve the significance of work as the source of strength, the welfare of the people, and the social confidence of all of society's classes and groups.

Economic problems were high on the list of priorities at the ninth congress and in its resolutions. Delegates were handed two documents drawn up by the government of the Polish People's Republic: the Government Report on the State of the Economy and the Government Program for Ending the Crisis and Stabilizing the Economy. Endorsing the recommendations in these documents, the congress reiterated the need for energetic and speedy measures to ease Poland's economic difficulties without delay, in the first place, and for long-term solutions aimed at restoring our economy to total health, in the second.

Prominence was given to enforcing an economic reform, which the congress assessed as the basic condition for the successful fulfillment of the program for ending the crisis. The fundamental aim of the reform is to bring the character of the mechanisms ensuring effective social returns from economic activity into harmony with the basic principles of socialism's socio-economic system. A draft of a law on state enterprises granting them more independence and also of a law on workers' self-management ensuring broader participation of work collectives in the management of production are now being drawn up to this end.

It has been found both imperative and urgent to increase marketable output, expand the services industry, speed up the output of competitive exports, and increase the production of fuel and raw materials while using them economically.

At the congress economic questions were considered in close relation with the underlying principles of social policy. In defining the orientation in fields such as housing construction, medical care, and allowances for young families and for families with many children, the party emphatically demonstrated a return to social justice, which had been violated in recent years. In particular, this concerns distribution. It was emphasized that work re-

garded as both a right and a duty is the main source and size criterion of incomes. The government has been charged with modifying the system of remuneration for work with emphasis on narrowing the gap between minimum and maximum pay.

Considerable attention was given at the congress and in its resolutions to problems of agriculture, for today the people's living standard depends heavily on this sector of the economy and on the food industry. Stress was laid on the need to increase investments in agriculture and also to create the material, technical and socio-cultural conditions conducive to the effective growth of agricultural production.

A hallmark of the ninth congress and its resolutions is the reiteration of the internationalist and socialist principles of our party's international activity and of the nation's foreign policy. In the CC report it is stated that "the deep socio-political and economic crisis and the accompanying changes and transformations have not only left the principal factors of the foreign policy of People's Poland intact in their entirety but more strikingly than ever disclosed and reaffirmed its basic guidelines. The general line of our foreign policy, determined as early as at the birth of People's Poland, stemmed from the historical experience and vital interests of our people, from their freedom-loving, democratic and internationalist traditions, from the ideology of socialism. The immutable factors determining this line are friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union, membership in the community of socialist nations, participation in the military-political Warsaw Treaty Organization, cooperation in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and solidarity with all the forces of progress in the world."

Having reaffirmed the fraternal relations and alliance with the USSR and the entire socialist community on the principles of internationalism and Marxist-Leninist ideology, the congress declared that our party would continue working for the realization of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations. It stated clearly and unambiguously that Poland is and will remain a strong element of the socialist community of nations, an element of the broad, worldwide front of struggle for peace and progress.

The results of the extraordinary congress of the Polish communists may be considered from the viewpoint of the party's strategy as confirmation and specification of its general line for the country's socialist development, and also from its stand toward the solution of current problems that have piled up before it and

the entire Polish people. We make no secret of the fact that these difficulties have become acute and for that reason short-term tasks are given priority in the period immediately after the congress.

First and foremost, these are placing crisis processes under control. These processes have led to an increasingly visible decline of the national income (almost 15 per cent this year) and a painfully felt deterioration of the day-to-day life of the working people and their families. This was due to a shortage of staple foods, medicines, items of personal hygiene, and so forth. As I have already noted, the PUWP feels that an economic reform aimed at rationalizing labor and production and the attainment of a higher level of economic activity everywhere is the principal way out of this extremely difficult situation. On this road our party will have to stand two serious tests in the immediate future.

First, the efficacy of the economic reform depends on radical price reform, which must create the conditions for the rational management and extension of material production. Although the drafts that have been drawn up envisage fair monetary remuneration, especially for the lower-income groups, this will be a painful measure and it will inevitably be accompanied by a temporary decrease of the people's real incomes. To enforce this reform and, in particular, to persuade people that it is necessary and win society's support constitute one of the most pressing and exceedingly difficult tasks of our party, a task that is not merely economic but, to a large extent, political as well.

The other test is linked to the struggle over the question of self-management at production facilities. In the congress decisions it is seen as an essential element of the economic reform: in the draft proposed by the PUWP the personnel of enterprises are to be vested with wide powers and responsibility in questions of production, employment, the formation and distribution of social funds, and the selection of executives. However, in opposition to this concept a version of self-management has been put forward which would change the character of property at state enterprises, from socialist to group property, which conflicts with the basic principles of socialism. Thus, already today we are faced with yet another urgent task: winning the active support of the working class for the concept of self-management formulated by the party. Obviously, this problem ranges beyond the purely economic sphere, and is directly linked to curbing the anti-socialist forces in the country.

Despite the assurances to the contrary that one sometimes hears, anti-socialist forces — diverse in character and political origin — do exist in Poland. In the present difficult situation they are trying to benefit by the crisis and the disaffection of the mass of working people. Not shrinking from any means, they are conducting an ideological and political assault on the party, on the foundations of our social system, and on our international alliances. The tactics of this assault are aimed at creating the mechanisms hindering the work of local organs of power, paralyzing the work of law enforcement bodies, and enervating socialist elements in the social consciousness. By acting in this way, the anti-socialist forces blackmail people who speak out in defense of the principles of socialism and the party's policy. Some groups in Solidarity are being used to turn it into an opposition political party.

All these destabilizing actions are unquestionably not an end in themselves. They serve as preparations for a so-called second stage, at which the foundations of the socialist system, particularly the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, would be quite openly called in question and an attempt would be made to seize power "peacefully."

Awareness of this danger and also the readiness to counter it resolutely, live in the party rank-and-file as was clearly demonstrated by the ninth congress of the PUWP. "Our party," the CC report stated, "should, more effectively than hitherto, organize the entire front of defense of socialism, conduct a political offensive against its enemies, clamp down firmly on transgressions of law and order, and oppose any acts aimed against the constitutional functions of the organs of state power. A counter-revolution stands no chance of success in Poland. Our government, supported by the party and all the forces guided by reason and responsibility, will not let itself be diverted from the socialist road."

The extraordinary congress has made the life of the party itself healthier. The amendments introduced into its rules have created the conditions for a return to Leninist norms of party life. The PUWP has purged — and will continue to purge — itself of people who flout the political, ideological and moral principles of socialism and thereby prejudice the party and socialist construction in Poland.

The thing now is that the healthy changes should spur energetic and effective action. While reinforcing democratic centralism and the party's unity and rejecting the trends of ideological capitulationism, we are mobilizing the entire party for a determined drive to im-

plement the decisions of the ninth congress. This is indispensable for the success of the efforts to take the country out of the socio-economic crisis. Today, more than ever, the Polish communists see their duty in adopting, wherever the future of our socialist system is being decided, a militant and forward-looking stand conforming to the principles of socialist ideology. This conclusion stems from the work of the congress.

The PUWP considers the consolidation of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other fraternal CMEA member-states a key direction of the fulfillment of the congress decisions. Here we are not only guided by the objective laws of development but feel a direct and extremely pressing need for cooperation in view of our present difficulties. The PUWP is seeking to surmount the present crisis through the efforts of Polish society itself. Inseparable relations with fraternal parties and countries and their political, ideological, moral and

economic support are a vitally important factor and condition of precisely this solution of the problem.

During the past year the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, have extended tangible economic assistance to Poland. We are highly appreciative of the confidence of our friends, their understanding of our problems, and at the same time acknowledge that there is every justification for the apprehensions expressed by them in connection with the development of the situation. The profoundly internationalist character of the fraternal bonds between the socialist community countries and their Marxist-Leninist parties is to be seen most strikingly in this present time of difficulty for us. The maintenance and consolidation of these bonds remain a historical aim of the PUWP.

The decisions of the ninth extraordinary congress and the most important tasks that have arisen after it confirm that there is a close interdependence of the internal and external factors determining our prospects. In the 37 years of its postwar development People's Poland has become a major link in the alliance of socialist states. As a country situated in the center of the European continent, as a country with a large population and a considerable economic potential it enjoys prestige on the international scene and has made a not inconsiderable contribution to the consolidation of the socialist community, which is the main force of the world front of socialism and progress, to the shaping and development of cooperation and economic integration within the CMEA framework, to the creation, strengthening and perfection of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and to the struggle for détente, peaceful coexistence and a restriction on the arms race. Having thus defined its place in the socialist world, Poland has been able to make historic advances in surmounting the social and economic backwardness it had inherited from the capitalist system.

Fulfillment of the task facing the Polish communists and the entire Polish people — the defense of these achievements against the consequences of the errors of the 1970s and also against the destructive activities of anti-socialist forces — requires the all-sided strengthening of relations with the socialist community. This is the patriotic and internationalist duty of the Polish communists, who are implementing the course charted by the ninth extraordinary congress of the PUWP, a congress that has defined the ways and means out of the crisis, a congress that has upheld the achievements of socialism in Poland.

Nations and Internationalism

V.S. Semyonov

A valuable overview of many recurring questions

- how did nations and nationalism arise
- reactionary and progressive nationalism
- what is internationalism

Includes specific overview of the national question at different stages of Soviet history — an example worthy of study.

cloth 303 pp. \$5.50

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst St.
Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

The party lives and works

Dapo Fatogun
CC General Secretary,
Socialist Working People's Party of Nigeria

A contradictory process of change has been going on in Nigeria, Africa's most populous state, since a civilian administration took over from the military in 1979.

An intensely corrupt military government, leaving the political scene, handed power to a bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie on the understanding that the country would continue on the capitalist road. A new constitution, tailored in the style of its U.S. counterpart, opened the country to "free enterprise" and geared its development to a "mixed economy."

The political system underwent some changes and several new parties were formed. However, only five of these parties were officially registered before the 1979 general election. Our party, the Socialist Working People's Party of Nigeria (SWPP), was not registered, obviously because of what we stand for.

Important changes came about in the trade union movement. The innumerable house trade unions were reorganized and 42 industrial unions came into being. One trade union center, the Nigerian Labor Congress (NLC), emerged from the debris of four warring labor centers. Since the reorganization, the NLC has held two congresses at which the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist forces won majority votes and retained their leading position.

The registered parties divided power among themselves in the 19 states. The National Party of Nigeria (NPN), the most reactionary of them, allied itself with the Nigerian People's Party (NPP), a smaller party adhering to the same ideology, to form a national government (December 1979).¹ The new government, which came to power through a highly questionable electoral arrangement, resorts to extremely undemocratic methods to retain its power. The NPN is at an unending "war" against all progressive forces everywhere — in the universities, trade unions, student organizations, patriotic parties, etc.

This, then, was the situation in which the SWPP took shape and developed its activity in the period of transition to civilian government. In November 1978, our party held its first congress, which was attended by delegates from 14 states of the country. The congress adopted a

constitution and a program and elected the party's governing bodies.

The SWPP is a Marxist-Leninist party consistently opposing imperialism and the capitalist order. It considers that socialism alone can bring real emancipation to the working class and other working people on Nigeria. This is the same stand as was taken in the past by the banned Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party of Nigeria (SWAFP). When a new situation developed and the transition to civilian government began, the military authorities refused the old parties official recognition. The SWPP took up the cause of the SWAFP. Students are widely represented in the SWPP alongside workers, and the party's influence in the working people's movement has been growing.

The fighters for the cause of the Nigerian working people have had to face many trials. At the time it was banned (1966), the SWAFP had been in existence for barely three years and was only just beginning to gain strength although it enjoyed considerable influence, especially in the trade unions. It set up its own training center for cadre, the Patrice Lumumba Labor Academy, and published a weekly newspaper, the *Advance*. The coup ushered in a period of work in difficult conditions.

During the civil war,² which threatened to dismember the country, the party was divided both ideologically and geographically. Some of its leaders assumed that the people of Eastern Nigeria could realize their right to self-determination by seceding from the country. This was a backlash of the national question inherited from British colonialism. The urgent problem of re-establishing party unity had to be tackled across the battlefield. We also had a crisis of leadership when the party's General Secretary resigned. There was a lot of slander against SWAFP members and many of its leaders were arrested and jailed.

With the years, Nigeria underwent various changes, as has been said. There came the "oil boom" which stimulated rapid industrialization, accelerated the development of capitalist relations with all their usual negative attributes — armed robbery, corruption, growing social inequality and tribalism. Nigeria leads

the African countries in the number of millionaires in the 35-40 age group who made their fortunes in a matter of years. Most of them were military men or bureaucrats in power during the 13 years' army rule.

On the other hand, the changes in the economy led to quantitative and qualitative changes in the working class. In the early 1960s, Nigeria had just over 100,000 organized workers; today there are as many as four million. At that time there were only four universities, and today there are more than 13. The student population has quadrupled. Our party used these new opportunities to step up its organizing and educational work in the growing trade union movement and on the university campus, where progressive intellectuals are now much more influential than before.

An important fact is our activity in labor organizations aimed at strengthening working-class unity. Until 1975, there were four trade union centers; all of them but one were affiliated to major international federations: the WFTU, ICFTU and WCL. The left-wing trade union center which we supported — the Nigerian Trade Union Congress (NTUC) — was the strongest, and it took the initiative in uniting workers' organizations. A Unity Congress was held in Lagos (1975). But even before it was over, the military moved in, instigated, I think, by the bourgeoisie, which was very much afraid of workers' unity. They stopped the congress and announced that they would not recognize the leadership of the new center, claiming that the whole affair was inspired and organized by the communists. The legally elected union leaders were removed from their posts and some others were barred from the trade union movement.

Afterward the government decided to organize new elections for the governing bodies of a united trade union center. The elections were held in 1978 under the supervision of the armed forces. Despite attempts by the military and the capitalist class to help the right-wing forces to take over the leadership of the trade union center, it turned out when the votes were counted that our comrades had even greater backing than three years earlier. At the next elections, held in Kano, the left swept the polls of the Trade Union Congress.

When the military decided to hand power to the civilians we began to work hard to unite and organize all progressive forces so as to pave the way for their activity in the new conditions. The military were in a hurry to give up their powers and to "quit" politics, for socio-economic contradictions were growing fast in the country and the army was unable to cope with

them. But we were well aware that even if the military relinquished power they would do so in favor of the class that would continue to protect what they had looted. Naturally, this circumstance had an imprint on the transition from military government and led to new difficulties for the progressive and democratic forces.

On announcing its decision to hand power to the civilians, the military government laid down a number of conditions for the political forces to accept.

The Federal Electoral Commission set up by the ruling circles decided that any political party or group which intended to contest the election for the National Assembly and State Assemblies and the presidential elections must first be organized in at least two-thirds of the states, that is, in 13 of the 19 states. This meant that a duly organized and equipped secretariat of the party had to be set up in each of the 13 states. Similar secretariats had to be set up in all 350 local government townships. This entailed outlays running to several million naira which only a party of wealthy people could afford.

The SWPP succeeded in setting up its organizations in 13 states. We informed the government accordingly, providing the required figures in the forms. We invited the Electoral Commission to go round the country and verify the authenticity of our figures. The Commission did this but declared in the end that, first, our offices were insufficiently equipped materially to qualify for the certificate of recognition, and second, it could not recognize our party because the SWPP constitution did not allow it to keep an open door for all citizens (this was one of the authorities' main demands on the parties, including ours).

The class logic of disqualification is quite obvious. Everyone knows that any Marxist-Leninist party worth its name is guided by definite principles in admitting new members; it admits the best sons and daughters of workers, peasants and intellectuals who accept its constitution and are willing to work with dedication for its progressive goals. What the government tried to impose on us were principles adopted by bourgeois parties.

We argued our case, saying that the SWPP was a party of a different type guided by the advanced Marxist-Leninist ideology and loyalty to the interests of the working people and not by a bid for material wealth. We also said quite clearly that we did not intend to change our policy on admission. At the same time, we informed the Electoral Commission that the SWPP was not going to contest the elections, and not only because the Commission had dis-

qualified it like many other unregistered parties. We realized that the elections could not result in establishing a genuinely democratic state, for under the corrupt capitalist order existing in Nigeria it meant "selling democracy to the highest bidder." Events before, during and after the elections proved us right.

Let us now have a look at the parties that were officially recognized and allowed to take part in the elections. Incidentally, the registered parties are headed by prominent politicians who more than 10 years ago held posts in the first civilian government and even led the country.

First of all, most of these parties are oriented upon capitalism and express the interests of the bourgeoisie. They came out with high-sounding programs lavishing promises right and left. The NPN promised to turn Nigeria into a country "where the welfare of every citizen will be a prime concern of the state, while private enterprise and initiative are fully recognized." Afterward it won the greatest number of votes but not a simple majority. It rules in coalition with the NPP. The latter says in its manifesto that it intends to create "incentives to encourage foreign investment" but will also devise a system giving the workers what it believes to be a guarantee of income protection. The actual effect of these measures is extremely doubtful while the penetration of foreign capital into the economy is a very real thing. The NPP now controls three of the 19 states of the Federation.

The Great Nigeria People's Party declared its allegiance to both public and private management of the economy. It pledged to seek the introduction of free and high-standard education at all levels, and free and better health services. This party is in power in two states.

Among those who took part in the election campaign were parties declaring their "dedication to the interests of the people," of all working men and women. They even advanced some socialist slogans to catch working-class votes. Thus Obafemi Awolowo, the prominent politician who leads the United Party of Nigeria (UPN), criticized the capitalist system, calling its principles "false" and "untenable." "Once in office," he writes in his book, *People's Republic*, "the capitalists use their control of the government machinery to boost their business and their profits..." In its manifesto, the UPN promised that if voted into power it would introduce free education and medicare for all, develop the countryside and the infrastructure, and tackle the problem of food and a number of other urgent socio-economic problems.

However, the UPN is a bourgeois party having capitalists and feudal chieftains in its ranks.

Awolowo kept saying at election meetings that he did not expect to nationalize multinational corporations if voted into power. One thing that remained obscure was where his party intended to find the money needed to put through its ambitious program of reform if nationalization was not going to be part of its strategy of keeping the multinationals' profits in the country. The UPN's well-publicized program of reform helped it win the elections for State Assemblies in five states. The party has since had a hard time trying to find money for free education and medicare.

Some may have seen as revolutionary the electoral declarations of the fifth party involved in the power contest, the People's Redemption Party (PRP). The PRP program says it would expropriate all unearned income, peg prices for essential consumer goods and moderate rents on dwelling houses. It claims commitment to scientific socialism and promises to fight apartheid, Zionism and imperialism. On coming to power in two states, the PRP split; one part tried to pull it into an alliance with the ruling NPN while the other sees the alternative in co-operation with the UPN. However, it is gradually becoming clear to the majority of the people that a party which proposes no cardinal changes in the economic and social system and tries to foist reformist illusions on the masses can hardly expect to realize its program.

There is no doubt that the stand of these parties is a far cry from that of the working class and that their policy is inconsistent in many respects. On the other hand, one cannot but accept their anti-imperialist position and their spirited condemnation of apartheid and Zionism. We consider that some groups and elements that are willing to support a progressive program for joint action against domestic reaction, capitalist exploitation and imperialism could be drawn into our planned united front of left and democratic forces.

The positions of the national bourgeoisie were strengthened as a result of the transition to a civilian regime. The regime wants to establish greater control over the economy and win economic independence. Its aspirations are reflected in the federal government's program calling for industrialization and a "green revolution" to achieve self-sufficiency in food. The government has been curbing the activities of imperialist monopolies, especially in oil extraction, and intends to build up the role of the state sector and the positions of the bourgeoisie. It has announced a housing program and a more extensive system for training national personnel. However, a number of factors limit the possibilities of implementing

large-scale state plans. The Shagari government, which has emerged from the election, is unwilling to nationalize major multinationals and therefore has difficulty in financing its numerous projects in spite of the obvious petro-naira affluence³ (in 1978 and 1979, \$1.75 billion had to be spent for paying off the external debt). In an effort to secure funds, the Federal administration has had to take the lion's share of the revenue and to starve the states of funds. This has strained relations between the states and the government.

State control is resisted by the transnationals of the United States, Britain, West Germany, France and other capitalist countries. They objectively have an ally — the middlemen who made their fortunes during the civil war and the "oil boom," in business between foreign companies and the federal government, and who have a direct stake in growing cooperation with the transnationals. Having important connections and influence in the state apparatus, these businessmen look to the industrially developed imperialist powers and take a stand against a consistent policy aimed at winning economic independence. In other words, the prospects and possibilities of state control are limited by the very nature of the bourgeois class, a section of which wants a deal with international capitalist business. The latter, for its part, has been generous with promises of "profit sharing" to involve the Nigerian bourgeoisie in its well-tried policy of exploiting developing countries rich in natural resources.

Lastly, the future of the socio-economic policy announced by the government cannot be considered outside the context of the harsh realities of the country, which is tightly leashed to the world capitalist market. Nigeria is inevitably affected by the ups and downs of the capitalist economy because its home market is open to foreign capital, and by the consequences of rampant inflation and other crisis phenomena.

In the 1970s, Nigeria's capitalist development meant economic growth, the emergence of new industries and foreign-exchange earnings. On the other hand, the shady sides of this development stood out; there was a decline in agriculture accompanied by an eight-fold increase in food imports (1970-76), inflation (20 per cent a year) and unemployment coupled with an eight per cent annual growth of the urban population due to the exodus of millions of peasants from the countryside.

All these problems need to be solved and are a heavy burden for the people. The low-income groups of the population have to

spend over 25 per cent of their incomes on food, up to 35 per cent on housing and the rest mainly on transport. Wages are still low, and this is a cause of growing discontent. Nigeria is one of the African states where the union-led strike movement had lately assumed great scope. The strikers protest against unlawful layoffs and demand higher pay. There have even been direct clashes between workers and management.

Our party strives to organize and direct the working people's struggles. Although it remains unregistered even under civilian rule and only has the status of a political association — a status curtailing our rights — the government is compelled to reckon with the opinion and activity of the forces of which the SWPP is the vanguard. The Nigerian Labor Congress, which we support, has issued a "Charter of Workers' Demands." The Charter demands higher wages, additional pay to cover growing transport costs, and lower rent. The government has had to meet some of these demands.

The SWPP gears its activity primarily to the interests of the working class. We have reliable support from the workers and have recently formed new party branches in some enterprises of Lagos, the capital. Where the proportion of workers is great the party invariably gains in influence. We attach special importance to winning a large following among the masses and have been successful in a number of cases. One was the celebration of this year's May Day which drew more participants than ever before.

The party's ideological work proceeds from the need to urge the working people to fight for long-term goals going beyond the purely economic sphere. Our press and activists cite concrete examples to explain the class and political aspects of the current struggle and clashes with the employers, the real causes behind labor disputes, which are ultimately due to the antagonism between the exploited and the exploiters. As a result, many workers come to realize why development on the lines chosen by the ruling classes is bound to reproduce all the basic contradictions of capitalism and why the capitalists, domestic and foreign alike, will continue to make maximum profit. Awareness of this is a requisite of struggle for a radical change in the existing system, a deep-going transformation of society for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the people, above all those whose labor creates Nigeria's wealth.

Our party expresses the interests and aspirations of the working people, with whom it is linked by strong bonds. It is the only political organization to have won the support of the

working class, progressive students and democratic intellectuals. We are now taking steps to increase its influence among the peasants.

The SWPP is a multinational party of members of diverse tribes and ethnic groups. We counter tribalism, separatism and religious isolationism by calling for the cohesion of the working people and all patriots to fight against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism, for real economic independence, peace and social progress.

As before the transition to civilian rule, our fundamental line today is to use every opportunity of advancing the cause of scientific socialism. For us Marxist-Leninists, the main task today and tomorrow is to organize the masses and actively promote socialist ideas among the people. We have taken the initiative of setting up a united front of left-wing and democratic forces and put forward a seven-point program as the basis for the broadest possible left and democratic unity.

The front program calls for united action on the following lines:

- popular struggle to defend advanced democracy at a time when democratic rights and freedoms are continuously subverted by a reactionary government;

- mobilization of the masses to defend labor against the offensive of capital, all the more since the workers have begun a new movement for their rights;

- mass struggle against capitalist "values," in defense of progressive ideals; exposure of the doctrine of "free enterprise;" action against bribery, corruption and crime;

- defense of a progressive foreign policy of peace and non-alignment; active resistance to

every form of imperialism, colonialism, apartheid, Zionism, neocolonialism, and fascism; resolute support for the peoples of South Africa and Namibia; increasing solidarity between the working people of Nigeria and the international working-class movement; solidarity between the socialist forces of Nigeria and the mainstream of the world revolutionary process.

Uniting all left and democratic forces under a common program is a task of vast importance. It necessitates mobilizing and organizing work by the party. Broad-based left and democratic unity can hardly be achieved through top-level negotiations between diverse progressive organizations and left-wing groups. They are still divided by sharp differences over key political issues as well as by persistent opportunist trends and anti-communist prejudices, and this creates a further difficulty. Top-level negotiations may, of course, be held. But it is only patient and persevering work among the masses and powerful campaigns and other actions by the working people that can lead the front to unity. Our party's independent initiative and hard work must play the decisive role in forging the alliance of left and democratic forces in Nigeria.

1. Last summer the NPP resolved to withdraw from the government coalition. — Ed.

2. Meaning the 1967-70 war, which came after a separatist attempt to sever Eastern Nigeria from the country and the proclamation of the so-called Republic of Biafra. — Ed.

3. Since the beginning of the year, daily oil exports have fallen off by more than half. This is due to a drop in demand artificially brought about by the imperialist powers. Taking advantage of the relatively low prices of Saudi oil, they want to force other oil producers — Libya, Algeria, Nigeria and Mexico — to drastically cut prices. — Ed.

The 10th congress of the Communist Party of Spain

1,214 delegates attended the 10th congress of the Communist Party of Spain which took place in Madrid on July 28-August 1. The report of the Central Committee of the CPS, delivered by the party's General Secretary Santiago Carillo, set out the CC's position on the contemporary international situation, the country's domestic problems, in particular, the crisis, autonomy, terrorism and the threat of a government coup,

with separate sections devoted to the work of the party and its leadership and the development of inner-party democracy.

The congress approved the political theses and a new charter of the CPS. It elected the governing bodies of the party. Dolores Ibarruri was re-elected President of the Communist Party of Spain and Santiago Carillo its General Secretary.



The international and the national in the working-class movement

This is the final instalment of a survey of proceedings at the international theoretical conference on "The Dialectics of the National and the International in the Working-Class Movement. The Shaping of Internationalist and National Consciousness and the Behavior of the Working Class in Present-Day Conditions; Ways and Experience of the Communists' Struggle."* The conference was held in Hungary in May 1981 and was co-sponsored by the HSWP CC and WMR.

Dialectical interconnection or "hierarchy"?

The discussion focused on the relationship between the national and the international and whether one of these interconnected elements could be regarded as being more important than the other. The conferees exchanged views of the problems bearing on the general uniformities and the specifically national elements in the concrete experience of the revolutionary forces and the blend of the communist parties' independence and their international solidarity.

James West, member of the Political Bureau of the CC, CPUSA, gave a historical overview of his party's struggle against various revisionist and opportunistic deviations and stressed that the party's line had always been rectified through an internationalist approach to the emergent problems. Experience suggests, therefore, that internationalism plays the key role in the party's life and activity.

Sarada Mitra, member of the National Council, Communist Party of India, cited a different example. He recalled that in 1975, his party, while justifiably supporting the government's progressive foreign policy, failed to take the necessary critical attitude to the authorities' anti-democratic actions at home. As a result, the party suffered considerable political losses. The gist of the mistake was that the party had allowed the national aspects to be overshadowed, as it were, by the international aspects, so that the correct balance between them was upset.

*See WMR, August, September 1981.

Many speakers noted the exceptional significance of developing the national-patriotic component of the communist parties' ideological and political struggles in combating bourgeois, anti-communist propaganda, which seeks to represent the communists as an anti-national force allegedly bending their peoples' interests to some alien, external will. Concrete examples were cited to prove the falsehood of such accusations. Numerous facts were presented to show that it is the communists who have upheld their people's national interests and rights and that they have done so with greater consistency and dedication than other organized political forces.

Even such a small party as ours, said Franz Parteder, member of the CC, CP Austria, plays the role of a motive and guiding force of national progress. We use the example of the struggle against fascism to show that the CPA has always acted in the interests of Austria and that in the struggle against Hitler's fascists it was the communists who made the most sacrifices. It was the communist Alfred Klahr who advanced scientific arguments to prove that the Austrians are a distinct nation in its own right. The CPA is a national force, an organic part of the working class and of the people of Austria. We believe it is important to bring these facts home to the Austrians as a part of our work in shaping the socialist consciousness of the working class. That is why, in particular, our draft program speaks of "socialism in Austria's national colors."

Khristo Maleyev, deputy head of the Foreign Policy and International Relations Department of the Bulgarian Communist Party's Central Committee, said that by ascribing anti-national attitudes to communists, their political opponents also try to capitalize on the instances in which the revolutionary forces, in the course of their theoretical and propaganda activity, substitute simplistic, one-sided formulas for dialectical assessments of the correlation between the national and the international. This may be an argument, albeit not the main one, in showing that one should not insist on ranking the international above the national. One won-

ders how valid it is, in general theoretical terms, to try to find out which of the two sides of the dialectical unity of the national and the international should be regarded as primary and which as subordinate and secondary. I think that, in considering the interconnection of the national and the international, it would be more correct for us to concentrate on the inseparability of these apparently equal important elements.

This question should be considered from the angle from which it is presented by life itself. One must recognize the equal significance of the two truths: that the revolutionary movement can develop only on the national soil, and that it cannot develop successfully otherwise than in close international interaction with similar and kindred movements in other countries.

When Bulgaria was about to start on the construction of a socialist society, Georgi Dimitrov wrote that there can be no genuine national patriotism without international solidarity, just as there can be no genuine international solidarity without genuine national patriotism.

Karoly Lipkovics, member of the WMR Editorial Board representing the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, expressed the view that the question of the priority of the one or the other element in the relations between the national and the international should be decided in accordance with the concrete historical situation. It is a fact that at one time in the past our movement set its internationalist interests above the national interests. But as we are now talking about the present time, I would go along with the view that national and international factors carry equal weight.

Luis Filipe Pizarro, Director of the Political and Ideological Education Department of the MPLA—Party of Labor, said that in his party's view internationalism does not cancel out the national. There is a dialectical unity between these two concepts which in actual life and political activity go hand in hand. Since its inception, our party has given much attention to this problem. In its 1956 Manifesto, the MPLA called for the unity of all the patriotic forces in Angola in the struggle against Portuguese colonialism and urged the need for cooperation between the peoples of the colonies and the working and exploited masses in the metropolitan country.

As the national liberation struggle developed, our party has been able to put in a proper perspective the connection between the dynamic of the people's war and international solidarity. In considering the problems of "Full and Immediate Independence," "National

Unity," "Enlarged Front" and "Social Policy," its action program linked those questions with the principles of proletarian internationalism. That sound perspective facilitated the MPLA—Party of Labor's connections with the progressive parties and organizations of the whole world and assured it of constant international support.

Erkki Kauppila, member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Finland Central Committee, said that the Finnish communists have always taught the workers the principles of proletarian internationalism, even when the party had to operate in the underground. The party continues to value highly that tradition and cherishes it as its most precious asset. At the same time we believe that the communists must be a truly national force. The party cannot gain political influence unless it concentrates on the solution of outstanding national problems and believes that its duty is to develop the progressive components of the national heritage.

We feel that today there are better prerequisites than before for the communist parties and other revolutionary movements to combine national and international efforts. True, new and frequently difficult problems keep cropping up hampering the use of these opportunities.

Replying to the question put to him about the essence and specific features of Arab patriotism, Naim Ashhab, member of the Political Bureau of the CC of the Jordanian Communist Party, noted that national movements in all Arab countries have the specific feature that they tend to run on three levels: the local, the pan-Arab and the international. Here is an example to illustrate that complex phenomenon. Representatives of some reactionary movements currently lay emphasis on pan-Arab solidarity. What is their purpose? They want to impose their hegemony on the local national movements, say, on the Palestinian movement. Another trend linked with over-emphasis of pan-Arabism has come to light since the Camp David deal. Its proponents claim that the pan-Arab resources will be adequate to the struggle against the USA-Israel alliance. That is, of course, the cover-up for an attempt to disrupt the friendship and cooperation of the Arab countries and peoples with the Soviet Union and the socialist community states.

If the liberation movement is to be a success in these conditions, it is necessary to coordinate the approaches corresponding to the above-mentioned three levels. Neither local patriotism, nor pan-Arab solidarity, nor inter-

nationalism in the broader sense should suppress or infringe upon one another.

In the opinion of *Farook Ali Ahmed*, head of the propaganda and agitation sector of the ideological department of the CC Secretariat, Yemen Socialist Party, on the abstract theoretical plane there can be no doubt about the "equality" of the national and the international. But in the final analysis the problem must be considered in the light of the concrete historical conditions. In the present-day conditions, priority should go to international concerns. International aspects are of tremendous importance even in the solution of purely national problems.

The need to reckon with the nature of the present epoch when discussing the interconnection between the national and the international was also pointed out by *Leonardo Paso*, alternate member of the CC, Communist Party of Argentina. The fact that the interconnection is indissoluble does not mean that greater attention should not be given to the one or the other factor, depending on the actual situation. Here, there can be no absolute, preconceived stand. In considering the connection and interaction between the national and the international, one has to deal not only with that dialectical pair but with what one might call a third and more important element, namely, the class relations and interests, the alignment of class forces.

Helmut Steinbach, deputy director of the Institute of the International Working Class Movement of the Academy of Social Sciences under the SUPG CC, formulated his stand on the question under discussion. The ideological work of molding patriotic and internationalist consciousness and behavior, he said, is nothing but the effort to promote an awareness of the concrete objective reality of the social situation, the conditions of struggle and the consequent interests of the working class. The key is provided by the understanding that the national exists only in virtue of the existence of the international, and vice versa. Neither the national, nor the international exist in a "pure form," the one cannot exist without the other. The demarcation between them can be no more than relative. They are in constant interaction, enriching each other along many facets. Consequently, they can neither be schematically opposed nor rigidly postulated in subordination to each other. The truly dialectical approach to the correlation between the national and the international must always be guided by their interpenetration and mutually conditioned role in the revolutionary process.

Hans J. Kleven, Deputy Chairman of the

Communist Party of Norway, said that his party had gone through periods when one of the elements constituting the unity of the national and the international was seen to be more important than the other. In some cases that led to grave left-sectarian or right-opportunistic mistakes. We have now worked out a fundamentally correct line on this question, emphasizing the need to take a scrupulous class stand in the approach to national and international problems.

In our view, it is the class approach that regards the international as the key, primary element in the correlation of the national and the international. I disagree with the comrades who believe these to be magnitudes of the same order. I think the national relates to the international as a part to the whole, as the particular to the general.

The idea that the social and class considerations have primacy over the national and the international was elaborated by *Roland Bauer*, member of the SUPG CC. As regards the actual relationship between the national and the international, said Bauer, I do not think it is covered by the philosophical categories of the particular and the general. Nor do such concepts as part and whole, form and content fit here. The interconnection of the national and the international appears to be dialectically far more intricate, so much so that it is not encompassed even by the unity of opposites. After all, the national can, in effect, become the international and, conversely, the international can fit within the national. In practice, both these elements tend to acquire a growing significance, which is why it serves no useful purpose to try and arrange them in a hierarchy.

We have all agreed, noted *Ib Norlund*, member of the CC Political Bureau and Secretariat, Communist Party of Denmark, that there is an indissoluble interconnection between the national and the international and that this interconnection is dialectical. We have established that the one cannot develop without the other. That is a conclusion of no small importance, and having arrived at it, there is hardly any point in going on to argue about which came first, the chicken or the egg. In the light of the current discussion, however, this question moves to the foreground: how should one use this dialectics in our practical activity in the interests of the struggle we are waging.

The conferees noted that the correlation of the national and the international is not an abstraction of merely academic interest. On its comprehension depends the solution of the most vital problems of the communist and revolutionary movement. One such problem

springs from the application, in concrete national conditions, of the general laws of the revolution and socialist construction, and from the use of international or "others'" experience in the specific local situation.

We are sometimes confronted with the assertion that the socialist countries' experience is unsuitable for the conditions of other countries, remarked Sandor Lakos, member of the HSWP CC, Director of the Institute of Social Sciences under the party's Central Committee. Honestly, I cannot understand such a statement. What experience do they have in mind? One, ten or a thousand different experiences? After all, even the experience of one country comprises an infinite multitude of experiences. So, if we are not to confine ourselves to generalities, we must identify the boundary-line between the concepts of specific experience and experience of international relevance.

What is the underlying basis of our scientific world view? It is the generalization of the experience of the working-class movement, which is always concrete and specific. But in this exceptional diversity of specific features, we discover a uniformity, and it is this that gives real substance to the category of the international and universally relevant experience.

Jean Rhein, representing the CC of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, spoke of his impression that in recent years unjustifiably great significance has been attached in the international working-class movement to the national and emphasis of national specifics. Now and again there is even a tendency to promote to the rank of the internationally relevant, something that should more properly be rated as a concrete national form in which general uniformities are manifested. We in our party interpret the international and law-governed as being the result of collective cognition of the experience of the revolutionary movement. But that is not a compendium of abstract rules. It is a guide to action which in every particular instance takes the form which meets local conditions.

From the recognition of the objective laws of the socialist revolution and socialist construction follows the need to work out policies for their realization in the concrete national conditions. In practice, the socialist countries have been shaping socialism as an international general phenomenon. This is so despite the fact that each of these countries contributes to the building of socialism much that is specific and unique.

The experience of the USSR and the other socialist countries is of tremendous international importance, Hassuren Lhamdorzh,

executive secretary of WMR's Mongolian edition, emphasized. For all the specifics of our conditions, we rely on that experience which is the common international heritage of the communist movement. The question of the use of international experience takes the problem of the correlation of the national and the international from the sphere of theory into the field of practice. Today the practice of socialist-oriented social transformations has been enriched. In this connection I should like to pose a question, say, to the comrade from Yemen; which concrete elements of the experience of socialist construction in other countries do you consider as particularly useful and applicable in your conditions?

Farook Ahmed. I could say a great deal in replying to that question. Let me confine myself to a couple of examples without going into detailed explanations because I think the comrades here can draw their own conclusions.

We in our country argued at length about whether it was at all possible to undertake the construction of socialism in Yemen. Why did such doubts arise? For one thing, our country is small, underpopulated and has few natural resources. One must also bear in mind the fact that the regimes in the neighboring countries are not the most progressive, to put it mildly. The question of transition to socialism was also considered in the context of the unity of Yemen, North and South. If you consider all this, you will easily understand the tremendous benefit we have derived from the study and comprehension of the experience of the socialist countries, notably Cuba and the GDR.

One more point. Ensuring the leading role of the working class is a general requirement that must be complied with if the goal is to build socialism. For a long time we were not quite clear as to the practical measures to be taken in the light of that requirement. Once again we turned to the socialist countries' experience and now we have launched a big effort which precisely in the light of that experience, helps markedly to improve our party and state construction and strengthen the party's positions in the state.

Pierre Joye, member of the CC, Communist Party of Belgium, suggested that every revolution has such unique national colors and reveals so many specific features that it seems to deny the general laws of revolutionary development and the building of a socialist society. Every crucial step toward socialism cuts across what was then considered as being the general uniformities, he said.

This prompted the following rejoinder from Norlund: If you asked those who carried out

those revolutions and brought them to victory, they would have disagreed with you, comrade Joye.

Many conferees stressed that the inevitable specifics of every revolution and the unique features of socialist construction in individual countries cannot be an argument for denying the general uniformities that objectively govern these processes. That would, in effect, amount to opposing the national and the international which would immediately divert us from the scientific view of reality and could entail serious political miscalculations. It was noted that the dialectical link between the objective laws of social development and the concrete forms in which they are manifested poses before the revolutionary movement practical problems in solving which, both voluntaristic neglect of international universal experience and its dogmatic adoption as a ready-made recipe for all cases are equally intolerable.

The experience of every party and every revolution and the transformations effected on the way to a communist society enrich the theory and practice of socialism, multiply its wealth and diversity, said *Khristo Maleyev*. At the same time, every socialist revolution and every socialist society reveals the common substance of all socialist revolutions and socialist societies, the general uniformities inherent in this type of social revolution and social system. In that sense, socialism is one and indivisible. In that sense, the October Revolution and the other socialist revolutions that followed reveal the general uniformities despite the difference in time, place and circumstance. General laws are also manifested in the course of the building of the new society in the various countries.

One is faced with different situations and they are, in my view, becoming more diverse, said *Daniel Debatisse*, member of the French Communist Party CC's Foreign Policy Department and one of the leaders of the Institute of Marxist Studies. That accounts for the diversity of conditions in which the communists carry on their struggle, of their strategies and ways of developing the socialist society. The national situation, traditions and history must be taken into account. That is why it is not enough to apply the general laws of scientific socialism. They exist, but their content is historically relative. The nature of the laws of scientific socialism confirms our view that there can be no universal model or strategy in the struggle for socialism. That is not to suggest that we should disregard the accumulated experience and similar features in the activity of communist parties confronted with situations that are common or similar in some ways.

Our party's commitment to internationalism has never hindered it in its creative work or influenced its choice of orientation and goals in keeping with our national reality, *Alvaro Mateus* of the Portuguese CP CC emphasized. Our party believes that the peculiar situation in which capitalist production relations have reached their peak without a corresponding development of the productive forces, ensured an organic link between the main political goal of the democratic revolution (the gaining of political freedom) and radical transformations of the socio-economic structures (elimination of the monopoly groups and large landed estates) and brought closer democratic reforms (the freedoms and the electoral system) and socialist reforms (land reform and nationalization of the main economic sectors). A number of such deep-going reforms were carried out at its first stage by the Portuguese revolution, which helped to bring down colonial rule and to establish diverse and overt ties with all the countries of the world. In the face of all the hardships, the Portuguese people have continued to defend successfully the radical transformations enshrined in our constitution and paving the way for socialism.

The Portuguese revolution has thus proved that revolutions are not copied and cannot be imitated. However, there are uniformities and characteristics that are common to all revolutions. In this respect, the development of the political process in Portugal and the toughening up of the reactionary forces' stand showed once again how hard it is to defend the gains of the revolution without the power of the working people, without the destruction of the old state machine and the creation of a new state serving the interests of the revolution, without measures to cut short and put down counter-revolutionary activity.

The Portuguese communists are seeking approaches and ways corresponding to their specific conditions, while constantly studying the lessons of history, the conclusions drawn by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and the experience of the international revolutionary movement. We have worked out our own program for building socialism in Portugal. For all the national features it reflects, this program can by no means be regarded as an alternative to existing socialism. But it is an alternative to the capitalist society as such, whatever its political set-up.

Some papers and speeches by participants from socialist countries drew attention to the words of Leonid Brezhnev, who said in the report to the 26th congress of the CPSU that "all the socialist countries, in fact, carried out the

revolution in their own way," and stressed that this assessment of the actual historical shaping of socialism fully accorded with Lenin's well-known tenet concerning the task facing the revolutionary parties in applying "the fundamental principles of communism" in a way "which will correctly modify these principles in certain particulars, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92).

To give a scientifically correct assessment of the nature of the connection between the national and the international, it was noted at the conference, is to make a substantial contribution to the theoretical principles by which the parties are guided in their relations with each other within the communist movement. In this connection, Erkki Kauppila recalled the precise definition of the correlation between the national and the international struggle in the revolutionary process given five years ago by the Berlin conference of communist and workers' parties in their joint document. And he quoted: "Struggle for socialism in their own country and responsibility of each party before its working class and people are linked with mutual solidarity of the working people of all countries, and all progressive movements and peoples in the struggle for freedom and strengthening of independence, for democracy, socialism and world peace."

Dimitris Kasiouras, a functionary of the CP Greece CC, described the Greek communists' contribution to the cause of their country's national independence. He said that the fulfillment of this important patriotic task is closely linked with international solidarity, which, for its part, acquires ever more flesh and blood with growing success in ridding the country of imperialist domination.

Our party believes, he said, that in the present critical international situation it is more necessary than ever before to develop and strengthen further the ideological and political unity of the world communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Joint struggle by the revolutionary forces against imperialism calls for a combination of national interests and the international tasks of our movement. It is not right to oppose them to each other in the name of misconceived notions of independence and equality of parties. Such an antithesis effectively negates internationalism, which is precisely what the revisionists in our country are doing.

Hiroyuki Okamoto, member of the Standing Bureau of the CC Presidium, Communist Party of Japan, said that the blending of international-

ism and patriotism is a fundamental principle of the party's program. Since the seventh congress of the CPJ in 1958, we as a party independently bearing full responsibility before the Japanese revolutionary movement, and not blindly following any other foreign party, have assumed a position of independence. Only those who are responsible to their country's revolutionary movement and carry on a selfless fight for its victory can consistently support the revolutionary movement in all countries and advocate militant solidarity with it. That is precisely what constitutes genuine proletarian internationalism; that is the root basis for blending internationalism and patriotism.

We resolutely oppose the use of the existing rules of inter-party relations as a pretext for weakening our common movement and consigning to oblivion the principles of proletarian internationalism, said Jaime Barrios, member of the CC, Communist Party of El Salvador. There is no doubt about the sovereignty of each party. But how are we to understand it? We favor the view which lends a revolutionary instead of a diplomatic character to the cooperation of the parties within the communist movement. The speaker then went on to describe his party's experience in developing revolutionary solidarity with the fraternal parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, stressing that proletarian internationalism, which figures prominently in the Salvadoran people's struggle, would surely have been less effective, if each of its manifestations were assessed with the yardstick of a formally viewed "party sovereignty."

Editor-in-Chief of WMR, Konstantin Zarodov said that many new features are introduced by life into the forms and character of the interaction and correlation of the national and the international factors in the revolutionary movement. There arise many problems which we have probably not yet adequately sorted out in theoretical terms. But this makes it all the more important — as everyone, I think, will agree — not to be sidetracked away from the scientific solutions to these problems. Yet this is precisely the drift, I think, of the attempts to reduce the whole multifaceted dynamic of the changes in the correlation of the national and the international to the statement that whereas the elements of international class organization once used to prevail in the revolutionary movement, today concern for the national interests and rights of the peoples and the independence of the communist parties comes to the fore.

I suggest that it is not worthwhile to waste

our time trying to convince each other of the need to respect the national sovereignty of the peoples, to reckon with the specific conditions in which every party acts, and to value its independent creative efforts in the struggle for socialism and in its actual construction. For us all of these are home truths. And of course, they can be backed up with numerous quotations from Marx, Engels and Lenin. But if we must quote the founders and classics of our theory, I think this should be done with an eye to the whole wealth of their scientific thought.

It is not enough, for instance, to quote Lenin's pronouncements about the importance of the revolutionaries and communists to respect the right of nations to self-determination and to fight to implement that right. Here it is not right to forget another thing, namely, that the petty bourgeoisie alone stops at the proclamation of the right of nations to self-determination, and that, consequently, such a stand is an inadequate one for the working class and the communists to take. The revolutionary party of the proletariat always links up the national interests of its people with the international interests of its class. Now, if we approach the problem of the correlation of the national and the international today in a Leninist, i.e. a scientific way, we shall find that its solution does not call for a repetition of the unquestionable propositions concerning each party's independence. It is far more important to understand how this independence could help to realize the common international interests of the revolutionary forces.

Some speakers drew attention to the fact that bourgeois and reformist ideology has been trying hard to foist on the revolutionary and communist movement a criterion of party independence which is of its own invention. This is the much-touted "critical distance" which every communist party must, it is said, keep between itself and the other parties within the communist movement, especially those in power. This stand was ridiculed by Ib Norlund, who said that the Danes have a proverb (some might say that it reflects a typically Danish trait but I think that it is universally true) and it goes as follows: if you love your wife you don't necessarily have to berate other women. In the context of our conversation, one could say: if you love your party and are concerned about its independence, that does not at all require you to attack other parties.

It was clearly articulated at the conference that the true and main criterion of a party's independence could be assumed to be its ability to consistently pursue a policy which meets the working people's interests and which is not

prone to vacillation under constant pressure from hostile class forces. Among other speakers, *Alvaro Mateus* said that his party's independence was manifested in two main ways: on the one hand, in its independent determination of our political line and action without outside interference, and on the other (and for us that is the main thing), in its class independence, in our ability to withstand any pressure from our adversaries: economic, ideological and even physical pressure.

As the discussion proceeded, many party representatives stressed that they were attending a conference which itself was convincing proof of the importance of close international cooperation among the world's communists. It was noted that the scope and acuteness of the problems confronting the revolutionary movement make a joint search for solutions at international meetings imperative.

Anti-imperialist forces and socialism

The conferees devoted special attention to the problems of developing solidarity and cooperation of the international working-class and national liberation movements with the peoples, parties and states of the socialist community. Many speakers stressed that it is impossible to have a correct understanding of the contemporary dialectic of the national and the international without an analysis of the role the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries now have to play in all world affairs.

The successes of the socialist community states have a crucial effect on the balance of world forces, said *Farook Ahmed*. That is why the peoples battling against imperialism have a great stake in the growing economic might of the socialist countries and in the strengthening of their political positions in the world. We in Yemen, try to develop among the working people an understanding of the fact that our own struggle is aimed not only at ensuring freedom and prosperity for our country, but also at multiplying the common forces of socialism in its historical contest with reaction and imperialism.

Solidarity and cooperation with the socialist countries alone enable the peoples throwing off the yoke of colonialism to create an independent economy, so bolstering the political independence they have won, said *Hong Chuong*, Deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Cong San*, organ of the CC, Communist Party of Vietnam. An important thing to remember is that in accordance with the Leninist teaching, the countries that got rid of colonial oppression can only go on to socialism and bypass the capitalist stage of development if they rely on the

assistance of the socialist countries, that is, the proletariat organized in a state. In keeping with Lenin's behests, Vietnam immediately upon gaining independence and reunification of the country signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union, joined the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and embarked on all-round cooperation with the USSR and with other genuinely socialist states. We see that as a condition and a guarantee of successful development of our national economy and a key factor in our further advance in the building of socialism.

Roland Bauer said that his party considers the fostering of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism among the masses to be among its main political and ideological tasks. We proceed from the need to see to it that the citizens of the GDR should simultaneously become imbued with a sense of responsibility to their socialist fatherland and with an internationalist awareness that our republic's further progress is inseparable from the progress and strengthening of the community of socialist states and the whole world revolutionary movement.

The unity of the national and international aspects of the SUPG's policy is expressed above all in the following clearly formulated goals:

- struggle together with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, the international communist movement and all the other peace forces for the preservation and safeguarding of peace, for the creation of favorable international conditions for building a developed socialist society and for transition to communism, and for the further development of the revolutionary movement;

- further construction of a developed socialist society in the GDR through creative application of the general uniformities of the socialist revolution and socialist construction in the concrete historical conditions and national context of our country;

- improvement of the socialist national state in the GDR and its firm anchoring in the community of socialist states, the prime task there being the strengthening of the fraternal union with the USSR and the CPSU, the most experienced, seasoned and powerful revolutionary party;

- development of a socialist German nation, which at the same time is gradually drawing closer to other socialist nations thanks to all-round cooperation and socialist economic integration;

- education of GDR citizens, especially of the young, in the spirit of socialist national consciousness, which blends socialist patriot-

ism and proletarian internationalism and which resolutely dissociates itself from bourgeois nationalism of every stripe, and especially from anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, its main form.

Socialism translated into life is the chief gain of the international working class and the greatest achievement of the world revolutionary struggle. That is what determines our attitude to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries above all, said *Franz Parteder*. The Austrian communists are bending every effort to make the working people in our country aware of the tremendous positive impact exerted by the socialist community on the international situation, on the processes affecting the interests of the Austrian economy, etc. We stress, for instance, that the growing Soviet-Austrian economic cooperation yields tangible fruit for our working class by providing jobs for large sections of it.

Austria neighbors on three socialist states, and this accounts for some specific features of our work. To some extent, that makes it easier for us to report on the achievements of socialism and its advantages. Hundreds of thousands of Austrians, many of them workers and salaried employees, spend their holidays in these countries and see their life and their successes at first hand. This makes even the bourgeois information media in Austria keep closer to the truth. When it comes to Hungary, for example, any gross distortion of the facts is avoided because that would be too obviously at odds with the people's own impressions.

There is, however, another side to the matter. Vienna has become the venue of many Western propaganda agencies. Our country's geographical position offers many opportunities for them to pursue run-of-the-mill ideological activities of anti-communism, i.e. both for interference in the internal affairs of socialist countries, and for brainwashing the Austrian working people. The propaganda intensely carried on by these organizations makes great play of the shortcomings and difficulties that occur in a socialist society. Our party believes that one of its most important and meaningful tasks is to combat such propaganda.

Armando Lopez Salinas, member of the CC Executive Committee, Communist Party of Spain, noted that his party, proceeding from the well-known Eurocommunist stand, had declared its independence from other parties and states, including the socialist ones. We highly value the socialist countries' role in the preservation of peace and international security, their contribution to the struggle of the working class and the liberation movements of the

peoples. But Marxism requires a critical attitude, including criticism of oneself. Such criticism does not question socialism's superiority as a social system, it is aimed against phenomena which distort its image — socialist reality.

The CP Spain representative also expressed the opinion that the emergence of the socialist community of states eliminates the conditions that formerly made solidarity with the Soviet Union a necessary expression of internationalism.

Daniel Debatisse stressed that the work of the communists in rallying the peoples in the struggle for peace and disarmament implies concern for strengthening internationalist solidarity with the socialist countries. In the ideological war, the bourgeois propaganda media constantly distort not only the fundamental positive role in the world, but also the very idea of socialism and its concrete realities. The French Communist Party believes, therefore, that a sober analysis of life in socialist society, bringing to the masses the truth when our enemies try to pervert it, stressing, as we say, the on-the-whole positive results of socialism's development, without concealing some shortcomings which, we feel, have been in evidence in some socialist countries for a long time — all this is not only a task for theoretical research but the communists' duty to their common ideal, a duty that is simultaneously national and international, because socialism for which we are fighting is the hope of our working class and of our people.

I cannot understand, *Ib Norlund* said, the notions expounded here about solidarity with the socialist countries now acquiring some kind of secondary character on the plea that the working people in these countries hold power in their hands and so, for that reason, no longer need anyone's support. And this is being said at a time when anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are the main instruments in the preparation of a nuclear war. Today it is especially important to cement the unity of the revolutionary forces, and that is the only basis on which their historical potentialities can be used in ensuring peace and security of the peoples.

Girgin Girginov, CC member, Bulgarian Communist Party, recalled that back in the 1930s *Georgi Dimitrov* formulated the proposition that the main criterion of proletarian internationalism was attitude to the Soviet Union, the country where the first socialist revolution triumphed and where a socialist society was first built. It is the BCP's categorical opinion that this fundamental idea remains fully meaningful in the present-day conditions as well,

despite all the changes in the world socio-political situation marked by the strengthening of the socialist community and great achievements by other revolutionary forces. The Soviet Union is the bulwark of the fraternal countries and parties of the socialist community. Lenin's party has been giving crucial and indispensable help to all the revolutionary and democratic forces and has been making the greatest contribution to the development of the theory of the working class and the ideas of social progress. It is the Soviet Union's might that stays the hand of those who want to start a thermonuclear war. For all these reasons, attitude to the Soviet Union remains the chief criterion of internationalism.

As I see it, the Soviet Union and the CPSU are a kind of integral factor for all the three main revolutionary streams of our time. This is borne out, among other things, by the following incontestable fact: those who turn away from the Soviet Union willingly or unwillingly betray the idea of socialism and abandon consistent struggle for national freedom. I don't think there is any reason why in our educational work we should keep silent about this hard-won piece of wisdom.

I cannot help asking myself: can a stand which refers *Dimitrov's* idea only to the past, promote the internationalist education of the masses? I ponder this, for instance, when reading the following statement in the paper prepared for this conference by the Spanish comrade *Lopez Salinas*: "For a certain period — and that was justified — defense of the Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, was the supreme expression of internationalism." I think it is very wrong to speak about it in the past tense. That was so not only "for a certain period," it is so even today.

I think the relevance of *Dimitrov's* principle is vividly confirmed by the practical results of the all-round cooperation and integration between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union carried on under the leadership of our two fraternal parties. It fully accords with the objective trend in the development of qualitatively new relations between the countries of the world socialist community. There is good reason why comrade *Brezhnev* has described these relations of all-round integration as internationalism in action. Incidentally, while considering Bulgaria, I should like to stress that they have provided the basis for the unassailable guarantees of its national sovereignty and independence. We take pride in the fact that never before in its 13 centuries of history has our country been so independent. And on the other hand, never before has it had so many opportunities for

concrete and fully sovereign fulfillment of its international duty as it has today.

What determines our attitude toward the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, asked *Ahmed Azad*, representative of the South African Communist Party. Why do we show consistent solidarity with them and support their policy? Surely, it is not because we are "Moscow puppets," as the imperialists like to claim. On the contrary. Our position on this issue expresses our independent conclusions from our independent analysis of world realities. It is an expression of our awareness that the policy of the USSR and the socialist community meets our own interests and the goals of the worldwide struggle.

Of course, equality of rights is an established norm within the communist movement. I can argue as an equal with a comrade from the USSR, discuss theoretical or any other questions with a comrade from the GDR, and so on. But I cannot, even in the wildest flight of fancy, conclude that the South African Communist Party and the CPSU bear equal responsibility for the development of the world revolutionary process, that we have the same potentialities and resources as the Soviet communists, etc. We must be realists. And since we want to be realists we believe, like many other parties, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union plays the leading role in our movement, and the socialist community of states, the leading role in the world revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle. We say this with a sense of pride, without any sneaking feelings of dismay that under such a set-up our independence is in any way limited or impinged upon.

Hiroyuki Okamoto expressed this objection: since the dissolution of the Comintern it has repeatedly been reaffirmed that all the parties are equal and independent and do not need any general governing center. That has also been affirmed at the international level, beginning with the Statement of the 1960 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

In contemporary conditions, it is important for the advance of the anti-imperialist struggle in the international arena that the three main revolutionary forces of the world — the socialist countries, the national liberation movement, and the working class and masses of the capitalist countries — should fight for the attainment of their political, national and class goals, supporting each other and merging in their common international stream, and so advance the world revolutionary process. What is important is that a socialist country, however big it may be and whatever role it may play in international politics, can never substitute for

the struggle of other revolutionary forces nor determine world development alone. Neither the struggles of the peoples in capitalist countries, nor the national liberation struggles can, of course, lead the world development alone. In such a situation there clearly must be no "leading party" or "center."

Helmut Steinbach came in on that, remarking that he agreed with comrade *Okamoto* about the communist parties' not needing a general governing or organizational center. I share his arguments in favor of that view, he said. At the recent 10th congress of the SUPG it was noted that the communist parties and all the other revolutionary forces of the world had to act in a growing diversity of conditions. What I cannot understand, he said, is with whom the comrade from Japan is arguing. Who in our movement has raised the question of a center?

When the Comintern is mentioned nowadays, *Yaakoub Garro*, member of the Syrian Communist Party CC said, some do it in such a way that it sounds almost like a grim page in the history of the working-class movement. In the present situation, the communist parties do not, of course, need an international organizational center. But one should not forget that in its day the Comintern played a major positive role in training party cadre and rendered substantial help in the formation and strengthening of communist parties in many countries. This goes to show that the actual forms assumed by the correlation of the national and the international should be judged in the concrete historical context.

Imperialism acts internationally and it is wrong for socialism to be confined to the framework of individual countries, said *Hong Chuong*. Close cooperation must be developed among the communist parties and socialist countries. Of course, it is necessary to respect the equality of all the communist parties, big and small. But there must also be inter-party cooperation pursued in the concrete forms which are determined by the nature of their tasks and the specific conditions in which they work.

I take this opportunity to note the assistance we have received from the Communist Party of Japan in combating the expansionism and hegemonism of the Peking Maoist clique and in our actions to support the communists of Kampuchea in overthrowing the Pol Pot regime. That is very valuable assistance, and we are grateful for it.

I take note of the dissimilarity of views held by the representative of the Communist Party of Japan and other comrades. With due respect for

the independence of the Communist Party of Japan, for its point of view, I request the Japanese comrade to take into account what the other participants in the conference are saying and to think about it.

Bert Ramelson, member of WMR's Editorial Board, said: No one here has challenged, at least I haven't heard anyone challenge, the absolute fact that the Soviet Union is a bastion of socialism, and that the October Revolution has transformed the world, that the USSR is the most powerful socialist state in the world, and the CPSU is the most powerful communist party in the world. And therefore, in a sense, they play a special role on the political scene of the world. Now, whether you want to call it the leading role or otherwise, I am not very much worried. If we are to be objective, he went on, we must recognize that this role is tremendously important. But that is precisely because whatever the Soviet Union does has a tremendous impact on the world as a whole, that every communist party should have the right to express its opinion about its actions, including critical opinion.

José Lava, member of the CC Political Bureau, Communist Party of the Philippines, said that he had some questions prompted by the views of those who believe that it is useful for the communist movement to subject the socialist community countries to indiscriminate criticism. To begin with let me put to you the starting premises that make me ask these questions, he said. First, we all agree that imperialism is our common enemy. Second, the community of socialist states, notably the Soviet Union, spearhead the struggle against imperialism. Third, the prime task of that struggle is to strengthen peace, deepen détente and avert a devastating war. Finally, there is an urgent need for broad anti-imperialist unity worldwide. These, then, are the underlying premises on which I base my questions.

Question one: can we successfully and correctly wage our struggle in our countries, while upholding our revolutionary cause, without taking great care that public discussion of our differences of views and criticism should not, wittingly or unwittingly, benefit imperialism and reaction?

Question two: there is no evidence to prove that the Soviet Union is trying to impose a certain "model of development" on anyone or claims leadership of the world revolutionary process; why, then, is this theme being brought up in our movement?

Question three: all of us recognize the right of the peoples carrying on an anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle to receive assistance from

victorious socialism in repulsing imperialist-supported counter-revolution. We also all agree that, accordingly assisting this struggle is a duty of the socialist community. Why is it then, that each time such internationalist help is rendered, there is room for doubts and objections obviously not prompted by a class analysis of the real situations taking shape and reminiscent of the bourgeois propaganda clichés?

Question four: when we talk about our attitude to existing socialism with a view to revealing the essence and tasks of internationalism, should we focus on the right to criticism, which no one has denied?

As I see it, solidarity with the socialist community does not imply *a priori* support and approval of everything that is being done, is taking place or happening in the socialist community countries. Their ruling communist and workers' parties themselves take a critical and self-critical attitude to drawbacks in socialist society. The problem, then, is not whether one can or cannot criticize, but from which class position and with what aim criticism is conducted, what forms and methods it uses, and how, in so doing, are our supreme interests in the common struggle against imperialism to be observed.

The words addressed by the comrade from South Africa to the socialist countries may have been inspired but it seems to me, however, that the formulation concerning their leading role lacks precision, said Janos Berecz, member of the HSWP CC, head of the CC's International Affairs Department. Of course, as a representative of a communist party from a socialist country I am pleased to hear such kind and lofty words addressed to us. And yet I think it is my duty to stress that our movement has already worked out more precise formulas reflecting the fully equal rights of all the three main revolutionary forces of our day — socialism, the international working class, and the national liberation movement. We are working for their unity and cohesion precisely on the strength of their mutual equality. Of course, there are differences in the real political weight and the concrete historical role of each of these three forces. This is due, among other things, to the fact that the communist parties of the socialist countries have experience that other fraternal parties have yet to gain. We know not only how to take power but also what to do in order to retain it. And we know how important and at the same time difficult that second revolutionary task is. For us, the question of what it means for the communists to be the leading political force in a society, to bear the responsibility for

its destiny and to lay down the guidelines for its development has also ceased to be a theoretical abstraction.

That is one aspect of the matter. Another aspect that distinguishes the socialist countries' role and status in the revolutionary process stems, to my mind, from the fact that after the October Revolution and then also since the formation of the world socialist system, the international working class for the first time came to possess the means of struggle that only the bourgeoisie formerly had. Let me mention only the armed forces, and the state and foreign policy apparatus.

The work of the communists in the socialist countries is naturally judged by what we actually do at home and in the international arena. And I must frankly say that I personally felt a surge of pride when, attending the 26th congress of the CPSU, I heard the CC report which noted, among other things, that during the past decade the USSR had increased its gross social product by over 50 per cent. That is an impressive figure. Our party's 12th congress, which was held in 1980, also heard about our successes, which give grounds for legitimate pride. The same applies to the results of socialist construction of which we recently heard from the congresses of the fraternal parties of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the GDR. In all these cases there was also a good deal of justified self-criticism. But if we look at the main thing, at what has been done and is being done in the socialist countries to solve the basic problems of social progress, I think it provides inspiring and convincing arguments for all the participants in the revolutionary struggle who favor the development of deep-going and all-round internationalist ties with the states, peoples and parties of the socialist community.

Similarly, the activity of the socialist countries in the international arena is simultaneously a consistent manifestation of internationalism and a source of telling arguments in favor of the need to strengthen the alliance and unity of the working-class and national liberation movements with the socialist community. Everyone knows of the role played by the USSR and its allies in the struggle to preserve universal peace and of their constant and multiform solidarity with the revolutionary forces of the world.

We resolutely reject the thesis that in our movement "distance from the Soviet Union" can provide the measure of independence. That is a bourgeois, imperialist yardstick. I should like, in this context, to recall and emphasize an idea expressed by comrade Kadar. Here is what he said: *there has never been any anti-Soviet*

communism, and nothing like that will ever exist. I think that is a very precise formulation. It deals with the aspect of proletarian internationalism which bears on the attitude of the international revolutionary forces toward the Soviet Union and the socialist countries.

The working people exploited by Portuguese capitalism have come to regard the triumphs and achievements of the socialist countries as *their own* not only because they see these countries as an organic part of the revolutionary force of the whole international proletariat, but also because in these achievements they see their own future, said *Alvaro Mateus*. We Portuguese communists feel that it is our duty to foster that feeling among the masses. If we had succumbed to the pressure of imperialist ideology or made concessions to the demands of our present or potential allies, demands prompted by considerations of expediency, if the Portuguese communists had begun to claim that existing socialism "does not suit" the Portuguese working people, if we had begun to generalize on the difficulties or errors in this or that socialist country — we would have undermined our own influence. And regardless of what we later did, however fine our Portuguese model of socialism, mass confidence in the very idea of socialism would have been undermined.

The world socialist system, *Yaakoub Garro* stressed, is the bulwark of all the peoples fighting for peace, national liberation and social emancipation. That is why to protect it, to strengthen it, to rebuff any attempts by imperialism and world reaction to smear it and slander it, is not only an internationalist duty but also a national task of primary importance. The imperialists, terrified by the upsurge of the international revolutionary movement, are also well aware that its successes are underpinned by the unity of all the forces within the world revolutionary process, above all their cohesion around the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries. No wonder U.S. imperialism has continued to direct its main efforts to undermine and weaken the friendship and cooperation of peoples with the Soviet Union — and that is epitomized in our region.

There is no contradiction between the national interests of the working masses and their international interests. The peoples are learning from their own experience that if they are to achieve and consolidate national independence, and solve all the economic and social problems confronting them, they must constantly strengthen their combat ties with all the anti-imperialist forces of the world, and, in the first place, cement their relations with the

socialist system and the Soviet Union, its vanguard. Thus, ever greater numbers of patriots of non-proletarian origin, moved by love of their country and their people, are coming to embrace the ideas of internationalism, although in different ways and to a different extent.

In the Arab countries, the slogan of friendship with the Soviet Union has been adopted not only by the communists. The strategic nature of that slogan was reaffirmed by the conferences of the member-countries of the Front for Steadfastness and Confrontation and the Arab Peoples' Congress, which brought together dozens of Arab patriotic parties and organizations. In Syria, it is the slogan of all the parties forming the National Progressive Front. A progressive Arab national leader has rightly said: "Can the destiny of the world be imagined without the Soviet Union!"

Time of alarm, time of cohesion

The concluding plenary session heard the chairmen of the two sections reporting on the discussions in each of them. The conference was wound up in a speech by the Editor-in-Chief of WMR.

Our exchange of opinions, stressed J. Berecs, chairman of the first section, proceeded in a lively and democratic atmosphere marked by frank exposition of views, respect for each other's arguments and viewpoints. The discussions reflected the rich, multi-faceted and multi-layered experience accumulated by the international revolutionary movement. We saw that experience as our common international heritage. At the same time, many of the features it revealed had a specific national flavor.

Numerous examples showed convincingly that the parties working in different conditions are now capable of successfully solving the complicated problems that arise in the development of the objectively existing dialectical interconnection between the national and the international. It was noted that on a global scale the character and content of these questions were influenced by three main factors. The first is socialism, both as an actually existing society, and as the ideal and goal directing the political movement of the international working class. The second is the advance of the national liberation struggle. The third is the policy of imperialism, the changes taking place within the capitalist system and bourgeois society. Many interesting and profound considerations were voiced in this connection. It seems to us, however, that the impact of each of these three factors on the dialectics of the national and the international today can and must be further analyzed.

Divergent assessments and opinions came to light on a number of problems discussed at the conference. But that did not detract from the good, comradely atmosphere of the meeting. Nor did it prevent us from expressing our unity on some fundamental conclusions. Thus, it was invariably stressed that mutual solidarity of the three main revolutionary forces of our day is the key condition of the successful development of the struggle against imperialism, against capitalist oppression and exploitation. It was the common view — and it was clearly voiced and well argued — that the internationalist cohesion of the communists, the revolutionary, liberation and anti-imperialist movements takes on exceptional importance in the present-day situation when the key task now is to preserve and consolidate peace in the world, and avert the recently increased threat of a world thermonuclear war which comes from imperialism.

James West, who chaired the proceedings in the second section, noted that one of the salient features of the discussion was the desire of its participants to tie in the discussion of theoretical problems with the analysis of concrete socio-political realities in the contemporary world. A much stressed point in the course of the conference was the need for a class approach to the solution of the questions arising from the dialectics of the national and the international.

The exchanges helped to clarify the social content of concepts like "nationalism," "chauvinism" and "patriotism." Much convincing and relevant evidence was cited to confirm the truth that proletarian internationalism is an exceptionally important factor in current world development; it exerts a great impact on the whole system of international relations and serves as a potent instrument of struggle against the imperialist policy of exporting counter-revolution.

The participants in the discussion gave a multi-faceted characteristic of the contemporary economic and socio-political situation in the world. It was stressed that the deep crisis which has gripped capitalism, and the growing militaristic, chauvinistic and reactionary trends in bourgeois society complicate the international situation and pose a grave threat to peace and international security. The obvious conclusion this analysis suggests is that the importance of internationalist solidarity of the communists, revolutionaries and national freedom-fighters has now increased many times over.

Special attention should be given to the view expressed during the discussion that the time

in which we live makes it imperative that we should actively translate our internationalist views and positions into practical action and concrete programs designed to solve the most meaningful problems of the working class and masses of people.

I think that all the participants in the conference are satisfied with how it was organized and the forms in which it has run. I gladly join comrade Berecs in assessing the atmosphere in which our exchange of views has taken place. Our section, with some differences of views, was also dominated by the common wish to sort out the complex new problems or differently highlighted old problems in a creative scientific way; we were united in our desire to help clarify the theoretical bearings by which the fraternal parties chart their way to their cardinal goals: peace and socialism.

Once the conference ends, said Konstantin Zarodov, we shall leave hospitable Hungary and return home or to other countries where we now live and work at the behest of our parties, and we shall cross by land or air one, two or perhaps even dozens of national borders. Each of us will then find himself in a specific national environment, in a situation full of unique national features. But I think I can safely say that in spite of all that, we will share a sense of satisfaction with the work we have carried out jointly, work that gave expression to the community of vital class and political interests that objectively makes for the internationalist unity of all the communists and revolutionaries.

So we need not go far in search of examples to illustrate the dialectics of the national and the international. The whole of our life is literally permeated with it. On the one hand as conscious members of the movement realizing the general uniformity of our epoch — the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism — and on the other hand, as patriots of our countries, as the flesh and blood of our peoples, we are ourselves vehicles of this dialectic, its living embodiment.

Allow me in my capacity as chairman, in the act of closing this theoretical conference, to express some of the considerations which arose in the course of the discussion, without, of course, claiming to summarize or evaluate what has been said by others.

As I see it, the participants in the conference have in the course of our exchanges here put forward some new and fresh problems that have yet to be adequately elaborated in theory. Differing views were expressed on some questions; however, we are all united in recognizing the fact that international solidarity is our great common strength, and that it is our constant

task to educate the masses in the spirit of internationalism. There has been reaffirmation of our undoubted unity in comprehending that:

— without the international cohesion of our ranks, it would have been inconceivable to create an adequate political counterweight to the forces of imperialism, which pose a disastrous war threat to the world, a counterweight to the right-wing, aggressive and neofascist forces;

— international unity has always been and will be an effective barrier in the way of the imperialist attempts to impose their will on and dictate to the peoples, countries and whole continents;

— for the working class and the working masses, renunciation of international solidarity would be tantamount to unilateral disarmament in the face of internationally organized monopoly capital;

— without the support of internationalism, the peoples of the socialist community countries would face more difficulties in their struggle and work, while the working class of the industrialized capitalist countries and the peoples of the erstwhile colonies and semi-colonies would have been unable to successfully build on the gains secured in fierce battles; moreover, they might have been doomed to losing these gains.

For the communists, the internationalist stand is a natural and logical one. Why? Because it has deep historical roots, for the communist movement emerged and has now been developing for almost a century and a half as an international movement. Because this stand rests on a solid scientific basis. For our theory is scientific precisely inasmuch as it brings out the uniformities of worldwide social development, uniformities that make headway regardless of how nationally specific their form. Finally, because this stand has a firm class basis, for it is an expression of the truth, discovered by Marx, that "the emancipation of labor is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries . . ."

We spoke of the internationalist education of the masses, and it was justly noted that the ideas of internationalism are best learned by the working people through their own experience of revolutionary class battles. That is natural because, as Lenin said, "practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge, for it has not only the dignity of universality but also of immediate actuality" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 213).

I should like to stress, however, that for revolutionary fighters the concept of experience

*K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 19.

cannot be reduced to their own experience. To limit oneself to that which one has personally experienced and to shut one's eyes to everything outside one's home — isn't that a stand that would be described as suicidal by any politician with the least experience? That is why, while saying that experience is the most effective means of internationalist education, we are also entitled to assert the opposite, namely, that internationalism is an effective means and an invaluable source for the enrichment of revolutionaries with practical experience of struggle.

There is good reason why here, at our section meetings too, the speeches of the comrades who told of their parties' concrete achievements and problems and the class and liberation struggles in their countries attracted keen interest. I do not think that anyone listened to these speakers in the hope of finding ready-to-use recipes. I am convinced that among the speakers, too, there is no one who sought to impose their conceptions as an obligatory model to be blindly copied. That is not the point. None of us imagines the development of internationalism as making everyone fit the same pattern. On the contrary, like their great teachers, Marx, Engels and Lenin, the communists see internationalism as a way and a means for the mutual enrichment of the working class, the working people of all countries with the knowledge and the skills without which the revolutionary cause cannot succeed and which no limited national experience can provide in adequate volume.

Our conference helps to understand better, why with time the problems in the interconnection of the national and the international, far from becoming more simple, in fact tend to grow more complex and why our interest in these problems tends to grow instead of waning.

Many of the considerations expressed here gave me the impression that the comrades justly warned against simplistic anti-dialectical notions about the growing internationalization of life on our planet being tantamount to the ousting and suppression of national aspects in the life of contemporary societies. One of the dialectical complexities of world development in our epoch is that while acquiring an ever more tangible international content, it simultaneously puts in bolder relief some specific national features. In other words, the importance of the international factors in social practice does not grow by way of the muting of national factors, but in parallel and intertwining, and even in a kind of race with the latter.

Indeed, can it be otherwise? Let us look at the problem from the angle of the law of growing uneven economic and political development under imperialism, a law discovered by Lenin. This at once makes it clear that in the context of world capitalism internationalization is confronted, and inevitably so, with a powerful counter-tendency which consists in the intensification and not obliteration or elimination of differences among nations. That alone is enough to prevent one from being confused, as many bourgeois sociologists are, over what they call the explosion of nationalism.

From the standpoint of our revolutionary science that is a perfectly natural phenomenon. It has its objective roots. And we would depart from the scientific stand if we suddenly began to deny the importance of the national element in world development, in the building of socialism and communism, and in the revolutionary struggle. Conversely, the importance of this principle tends to grow just like that of the international principle. That is why the interconnection of the two principles tends to become ever more complex, and the forms of their mutual influence and the mechanisms of their interaction more diverse. Here much that is new appears.

To comprehend that new element theoretically, to draw scientific conclusions of interest to the fraternal parties, and to all the revolutionary organizations — this is the task which, I think, all the participants in the conference set themselves to fulfil.

The people of my generation still remember the world-famous poster showing a worker in the act of breaking the chains of oppression and exploitation. That image was inspired by the victory of the October Revolution. But I sometimes wonder how the same idea could be expressed in visual imagery today? The globe is no longer girdled by a single imperialist chain. The Russian, Soviet worker, who was the first to find a weak link in the chain and break it, is no longer alone. But on the other hand, the working masses and peoples in dozens of countries are still not free from the shackles of monopoly domination, from the yoke of imperialism. Is there anyone who can break these shackles? Yes, there is. It is the great international alliance of socialism, the international working class and the fighters for national independence.

Our conference has well shown the tremendous potentialities for increasing and even multiplying the strength of that alliance latent in the communists' work of the internationalist education of the masses. And education is known to be most effective if it relies not only

on words but also on deeds, when the educators themselves set an inspiring and convincing example. Such an example is set by the fraternal parties by their international solidarity and their close cooperation.

They set this example by acting together for the common interests of the workers of the whole world in the complicated, contradictory and tense atmosphere that took shape in the world at the beginning of the 1980s, and not allowing local prejudice or national emotions to divert them from the internationalist course, from the fulfillment of the class tasks which each party has to tackle in the specific conditions of its country.

We live in highly troubled times. The stakes in the struggle we are waging are enormous. We do not and cannot have any illusions about what a new world war would mean for mankind. Nor do we entertain any illusions, and cannot afford to entertain any illusions, about the readiness and ability of imperialism to resort to any efforts, to any cruelty, to any crime so as to stem the tide of progressive change. And when the smell of gunpowder is in the air, it is no time for arguing about the fragrance of roses and carnations. I think the comrades will agree with me that the significant and valuable thing about our discussions on the national and the international is that they promote our unity now when that unity is especially necessary. Of course, it is not unity for unity's sake, but unity in the struggle against imperialism and for stable peace. That is why I fully share the idea, so clearly formulated here, that the question of sovereignty of states, of the attitude to take to the aid to socialist and to non-socialist countries taking the road of progressive development must always be decided from a class stand: does it strengthen world socialism and world peace, or does it weaken socialism and peace to suit imperialism. The communists and revolutionaries in the non-socialist part of the world have no friends that are more loyal and dedicated than the peoples of the socialist community, just as the peoples in the countries where socialism has triumphed or which are building socialism do not and cannot have stauncher allies than the revolutionary parties of the working class in the industrialized capitalist countries and the revolutionary liberation movements fighting against imperialism in the national liberation zone.

The history of the working-class movement offers some examples when the internationalism of some of its participants failed to stand up to the test of the first major international crisis. Let me express confidence that the communists

of the late 20th century are in no such danger. Their internationalism is being severely tested in the present critical situation in the world. The fraternal parties are rising to the challenge thanks to their political maturity and theoretical competence. Let us end our work, therefore, with the awareness that all of us who met for this conference had the honorary and responsible task of making the best contribution to the further strengthening of the internationalist foundations of our movement. And one of these foundations is our shared determination to prevent our common enemy — imperialism — from ever finding an ally in our own theoretical, ideological or political discord.

Let us always be together in our loyalty to the principles of class-oriented, revolutionary internationalism.

A MILESTONE IN MARXIST PUBLISHING

**The International
Working-Class
Movement:
Problems of History
and Theory**

Chief Editor:

B. Ponomarev

The first Marxist world history of the working class; to consist of seven volumes.

Volume one now available: analyzes the development of the proletariat; the shaping of class consciousness; emergence of Marxism and events up to the Paris Commune.

Name index
cloth 675 pp \$8.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6



Down with imperialism's military plans

FOUR LIES OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Anyone with a vivid memory of past history is certain to have taken special notice of a diabolically significant fact, namely, that it was on the 36th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy that the White House ordered the production of the neutron bomb. The news reached the world at a time when humanity was thinking again of the devastating atomic blast over Nagasaki. Many people believe that the timing of the decision was anything but accidental. Washington was telling the world that it was prepared to drag humanity into a nuclear holocaust if the Pentagon decided that "the zero hour has come."

Times have changed, however. It is not only the atomic disaster which hit the two Japanese cities, or the memory of the two world wars and the Vietnam debacle that raises obstacles to war adventurism. There is also the collective experience gained in bringing about and consolidating détente, an experience which proves that countries can exist peacefully side by side.

This is why the White House encounters difficulties in trying to throw mankind back to the cold war. Every day the news reports tell how deeply the very vision of a new war outrages the peoples. And so the hawks, who think their day has come again, heap lie upon lie to mask their insane plans.

What are the main would-be arguments trotted out by Washington in order to reconcile the world to a new escalation of the U.S. nuclear arms build-up?

Lie one. The White House claims that the decision to produce the N-Bomb is the internal affair of the United States, that is the prerogative of the U.S. president and nobody else.

It is obviously, not a decision of the people of the USA, the large majority of whom want the continuation and consolidation of the détente and SALT processes, a search for a way to deliver the world from the arms burden. It is the decision of a small ruling élite representing the most bellicose section of U.S. state monopoly capitalism.

Further, it is indisputable that weapons which menace the very existence of humanity can never be the exclusive internal affair of any one country politically, morally, or otherwise. The N-Bomb is designed for use outside the United States. In fact, it is blandly announced in Washington that the new bomb is for Europe. U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger put it plainly, declaring that it would certainly have to be used in Central Europe in the event of a "catastrophe."

In the light of this frank admission by one of the President's closest aides, the assertion that the N-Bomb will be stored in the USA is a transparent effort to deflect the people's anger. In view of today's means of transportation, it is immaterial where neutron warheads are stored in the morning. Jet planes can deliver them by midday to U.S. missile sites and howitzers in Europe. After that it would only take a few minutes to make that densely populated continent the epicenter of a nuclear war.

But is hard to believe that the N-Bomb is meant exclusively for the European theater. A weapon which destroys life but not property is, from the viewpoint of the war-minded imperialists, ideal against liberation movements in regions rich in raw materials coveted by the U.S. transnationals.

Lie two. Casper Weinberger and people like him claim that the N-Bomb lessens the risk of war and strengthens peace. He asserts that the existence of neutron warheads would help ease international tensions.

Was ever an argument more base or more dangerous? "Given the unique blast characteristics of neutron weapons," U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield commented, "there will be intense military pressure to unleash them early in a conventional battle. The ultimate deployment of these weapons to Europe and elsewhere throughout the world will blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear battle, increasing the risk of triggering an all-out nuclear war."

Many authoritative political and military

experts testify that production of the N-Bomb is an integral part of the U.S. plans for a first strike, or a war of aggression to put it plainly. President Reagan's decision is aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

Whether the Washington militarists can achieve this aim is a different matter. The people in the White House will sooner or later have to heed the warning from Moscow that the Soviet Union will take whatever steps may be needed to safeguard its security and that of its friends and allies. Politically, however, the inclusion of a new weapon of mass destruction in the U.S. arsenal may even now upset the military parity which made possible a decade of détente and important steps in the first half of the 1970s toward limiting a dangerous strategic arms race that puts a heavy burden on the people. It throws up enormous obstacles in the path of disarmament talks. The political aim of the White House is rightly seen therefore as being designed to aggravate international tensions in order to offset the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union advanced at the 26th congress of the CPSU.

Lie three. Advocates of nuclear armaments not only make the N-Bomb out to be the "lesser evil" but call it a "humane" weapon.

The very idea of a humane weapon is inhuman enough to make all serious discussion unnecessary. Admiral Eugene R. LaRocque, U.S. Navy (ret.), denounced Weinberger's claim that the neutron bomb is a humane weapon. Millions of Europeans, he said, will be killed outright or face a ghastly, lingering death if neutron weapons are used. "We are going to destroy Europe in our attempt to 'save' it," he said.

There is also a revealing social aspect to this line of reasoning. Indeed, the very essence of the neutron weapon is an expression of bellicose imperialism's contempt for human life and its worship of private property with profit as its highest ideal.

Lie four. Washington alleges that all of the USA's allies in and outside NATO support its decision to add the N-Bomb to its nuclear arsenal.

This allegation is refuted by, among others, the governments of Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands, that is, NATO countries, for they censure Reagan's decision. The Social Democratic Party in the FRG, which heads the government coalition, declared that the new weapon would impede progress in East-West arms talks and demanded assurances that it would not be deployed in Europe. Michael Foot, leader of the British Labour Party, said

that Reagan's decision meant "the West might be the first to use nuclear weapons." The Spanish government has announced its firm intention not to allow neutron weapons on Spanish soil. Thus support from "all the allies" boils down to "understanding" from a few discredited government leaders, notably the Thatcherites in Great Britain, the racist apartheid leaders of South Africa, Peking and the Zionists.

Furthermore, protest against the reckless strategy of the White House is surging high even in official quarters in the USA itself. "Production of neutron weapons," Congressman Ted Weiss said, "takes us beyond a senseless level of destruction to a nightmare world bristling with offensive nuclear weapons where we run a real risk of provoking all-out nuclear war."

All peace movements in the USA have come out against the White House decision. Numerous peace supporters are beginning to realize more than ever the falsity of the claim that the behavior of both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization is prompted by a common "bloc" logic. (This, regrettably, is the argument of some anti-imperialists.) It is false primarily because it ignores the class essence of the two alliances, their foreign policy objectives, and hence the class trend of their military strategic concepts and decisions.

To be sure, there is an inner logic predating the attitude of NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries. In NATO this logic results in the chief motive power of the alliance, U.S. imperialism, operating as the generator and escalator of the arms race. It explains NATO's efforts to draw more countries into its system and extend the alliance's sphere of "responsibility" to other regions.

As for the logic predating the behavior of the Warsaw Treaty countries, it stems from the foreign policy of peace consistently pursued by these countries. It prompts them to press for an agreement to renounce an expansion of either alliance, to dismantle the military structures of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, and then to dissolve both organizations. This logic serves the interests of peoples, their struggle for liberation and social progress. It contributes to détente and helps thwart imperialist war plans.

The will to live, and hence for lasting peace, is an elementary, basic human desire. No amount of lies can conceal the threat to life and peace embodied in the N-Bomb. In Western Europe, Japan, the United States, and other countries the movement against siting U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe has now been reinforced by the worldwide movement of

outrage against the White House decision to begin the assembly of neutron warheads. As CPUSA General Secretary Gus Hall said in a speech in Chicago, "the Reagan administration can be compelled to reverse its decision just as world pressure compelled the Carter administration to reverse his decision" (three years ago — J.W.).

The peoples of the world want to return to the road of peace, of negotiations. The communists of all countries are united in this most crucial struggle. They stand united on the side of the people, of life. They are against war and lies. In common with their allies they are doing everything they can to make the 1980s a decade of peace, the edifice of which the peace forces began to build in the 1970s.

James West
Member, CC Political Bureau,
CPUSA

A MOCKERY OF COMMON SENSE

"Don't Ban the Bomb" screams the British journal *The Economist* in a leading article championing the views of adversaries of nuclear disarmament.¹ In the dimension of international politics this stand boils down to a "nuclear peace" making it unnecessary "to be either red or dead." On the moral-philosophical plane it spells out the preaching that humankind cannot avoid coexistence with evil, meaning nuclear weapons.

True, the journal speaks of turning "bad things to good ends," of preventing "their consequences being worse than necessary" and, somewhat more specifically, of "the need to go on trying to bring more discipline to the production and deployment of these (nuclear — E.J.) weapons". But the whole point is that it is preoccupied not with how to extirpate evil but with how to perpetuate it.

"The central question," it says, "is whether the West should have nuclear weapons at all." Its worry is that the answer to this is negative by the anti-nuclear movement, the most massive in postwar history, a movement that is gathering momentum in Western Europe. For those who recognize this, it writes, the "time has come . . . to argue their side of the debate with as much passion as the other side commands. It should, however, be the passion of lucidity rather than of emotion."

The journal sees the mainspring of the anti-nuclear protest in fear-generated emotions, in a lack of "everyday reasonableness which goes by the name of common sense." It says that the nuclear protesters are deluding themselves and tries to prove that common sense is on the side

of the nuclear weapon. Here is how this is done.

The journal starts this off with the philosophy of history. It questions the possibility of "re-creating" a world free of nuclear arms, arguing that the atomic bomb has been invented and therefore "cannot be disinvented," and hence the "evil that came into the world in 1945 has to be lived with." An invention cannot, of course, be disinvented — this is plain common sense. But this is not what *The Economist* has in mind. It has recourse to sophism, glossing over the cardinal point that nuclear inventions can be directed *exclusively* into peaceful channels. There is only one way and it is to ban the atom bomb, to destroy the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and prevent them from being ever manufactured again. Is this realistic? Of course it is.

The Economist is of a different mind. It says that "there will always be governments ready to make use of the nuclear invention, just as there have always been men ready to pick up the most terrible weapon available in their time." This is not a commonsense argument, either. It is borrowed from the pseudo-philosophies preaching that war cannot be eliminated, that man will always seek to use means of destruction against other men. Common sense derives from day-to-day practice and it rejects ideological speculation. Its message is that *there should be no nuclear war*, for it would snuff out all life. The natural desire to preserve life — one's own life and the life of one's family and friends, of all people — leads to the conclusion that neither should there be governments prepared to rise against life. This also is a feasible aim.

Another area is national security. The proponents of nuclear disarmament justifiably assume that a non-nuclear state that refuses to deploy nuclear weapons on its territory is relatively more secure. *The Economist* seems to argue in favor of this self-evident truth, speaking of a temptation to draw the sting (meaning the nuclear armory) before it can be used. In the next breath, however, it makes the reservation that this temptation arises when the nuclear armory can be destroyed. But, the journal writes, building castles in the air, what if nuclear weapons were to be deconcentrated in seas and oceans (on submarines), on land (on mobile launchers), and in the air (in aircraft) — "will that make it more likely, or less likely, to press the button?" And, on a note of triumph, adds: "Less likely, of course."

Shying away from the question of whether it is safer to *live without nuclear weapons*, the journal reduces the debate with a "passion of lucidity" to how these weapons can be *deployed* more safely. The absurdity of its argu-

ments on this score is quite manifest: the creation of an invulnerable nuclear arsenal is a utopia, a mad dream of the militarists. De-concentration of nuclear weapons only exposes a larger territory to a possible strike and increases the dimension of the danger to the population.² In addition, the security of adjacent countries is jeopardized more than ever. As for the likelihood of the button being pressed, under a strategic parity this is a constant quantity.

Carried away by its own arguments *The Economist* undertakes to "prove" that nuclear weapons may be used against non-nuclear targets as well. However, by the most elementary standards of morality the very idea is criminal, as criminal as is any intention to launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike. In addition to its mischief-making and man-hating assertions that nuclear weapons allow achieving the aims of a war "as quickly and cheaply (!) as possible," the journal tries to reinforce its arguments with the example of the "solitary nuclear war that has been fought — the attack on Japan in 1945." Instead of condemning, it justifies this act, writing that "ending it (the war — E.J.) by other methods would quite possibly have killed as many (!) people." As far as *The Economist* is concerned the incineration of hundreds of thousands of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the flames of American atomic bombs in August 1945 is not a cautioning lesson of history but the grounds for making a crime against humankind permissible, an argument to sell the idea that a nuclear strike is permissible against peoples who will not tolerate nuclear weapons in their country — their own or somebody else's.

The third group of arguments, presented as the fruit of common sense, boils down to anti-Soviet insinuations.

The people joining in the anti-nuclear protest in Western Europe, demanding the prohibition of nuclear weapons and of their deployment in their countries, give different motivations for their stand. Some, for instance, say that Europeans should worry about their own security and not about the security of the USA; consequently, Western Europe needs no nuclear weapons, neither its own nor American. Others likewise believe that there would be more peace of mind in their countries without nuclear weapons, although they regard the strategic missiles deployed in the USA as a factor of European security.³

However that may be, in the clashes between the most diverse motivations for prohibiting nuclear weapons one discerns a process involving the surmounting of many difficulties and

contradictions but releasing the public mind from the fetters of anti-Sovietism. Concerned about the strength of these fetters that are letting militarist circles drag Western Europe to the very brink of a precipice, *The Economist* endeavors to shake a way of thinking to which many proponents of nuclear disarmament are inclining, namely, "the Russians are not going to attack anyway." This way of thinking, which harmonizes with the realities of world politics, is knocking the ground from under the refined system of military-strategic arguments of the adversaries of nuclear disarmament. Indeed, since the "threat" is far-fetched, the debates about "vulnerability" are pointless. The substance of *The Economist's* propaganda gimmick is to impose such pointless debates and to force through either directly or in a round-about way the "Soviet threat" myth by piling up as many lies as possible.

As a matter of fact, the journal not only repeats an old lie but manufactures a new one. It concerns yet another belief of the proponents of nuclear disarmament, who foresee that renunciation of nuclear weapons by individual West European nations could serve as the beginning of general nuclear disarmament. To discredit this belief, *The Economist* alleges that such renunciation would lead to a Soviet "nuclear monopoly in Europe" and uses the most horrifying paints of anti-Sovietism for a chilling picture of Western Europe's future under such a "monopoly." But what "monopoly" can one talk about if the official and program foreign policy aim of the Soviet Union and its ruling party is to secure the total destruction of nuclear weapons. To find reassurance that this is so one has only to read the resolutions of the latest congress of the Soviet communists.

The bulwark of the proponents of nuclear weapons is thus not common sense but mockery of common sense. This is not accidental: one cannot judge soberly and, at the same time, champion weapons for the incineration of humankind. *The Economist's* cynical exhortation that the nuclear evil should be "lived with" is a warning that the adversaries of disarmament have not the least intention of ceding to the demands of the peoples. They are going over to a counter-offensive, adamantly pushing the world towards a critical threshold. I am quite certain that the peace forces will draw their conclusions.

E. Jorgen

P.S. In its very next issue *The Economist* (August 15-21, 1981) amplifies on its arguments that nuclear armaments are an evil that must be

lived with, this time in the context of an attempt to justify the neutron bomb.

Its content is that modern technology ought to perfect armaments along what it calls a descending "horror scale." It lists the following stages: (1) "improving the accuracy of the bombs and rockets that carry the nuclear warheads" under the pious pretext that they would "cause less destruction;" (2) "altering the design of nuclear devices so that they have only the destructive effects that are absolutely necessary;" (3) "trying to invent non-nuclear weapons that can replace nuclear ones." Then, superimposing the neutron bomb on this "horror scale," the journal offers two conclusions. The first is that "on the horror scale, it is less horrible than the existing alternative." The second — that neutron warheads are needed "for a specified time" until a further advance is made down the "horror scale."

Does one really need to show that despite *The Economist's* contentions, the actual logic of changes in military technology is that weapons are becoming not "less horrible" but increasingly more sophisticated and lethal. One of the most terrible consequences of the appearance of qualitatively new weapons, including the neutron bomb, is that they are destabilizing. The reason for this is that on account of their military-technical specifications these weapons give aggressive circles the illusion that a nuclear war can be "limited" or "won" and thereby increase the actual danger of such a war breaking out.

The Economist's efforts to justify the neutron bomb and the improvement of nuclear and "conventional" weapons generally encourage the dangerous madness of the proponents of nuclear war. Humankind can be delivered from the threat of such a war only if the arms race is curbed, only if there is disarmament.

E.J.

UNITY IN AN HOUR OF TRIAL

The grave crisis situation in the Middle East generated by the actions of imperialism, Zionism, and local reaction remains a serious threat to international peace. An extremely dangerous eruption of tension occurred in this region in July when for several days running Israel kept up barbarous acts of total aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinians, using the most destructive and lethal means of warfare. In addition to transport communications and towns and villages in southern Lebanon, the targets of massive and brutal bombing raids were Palestinian refugee camps, and the most densely populated neighborhoods in the west-

ern part of Beirut. Lebanese and Arab media have estimated that nearly 2,000 people died in the two weeks' military operations. Citing incomplete, preliminary estimates, even the British bourgeois media admit that at least 200 people died in Beirut alone during the piratical Israeli air raids. Of these 175 were civilians, including 63 women and 48 children.

In these crimes, which evoke memories of the heinous acts of the Nazis, Israel used the most advanced U.S.-made weaponry. The bombs and missiles that sowed destruction and death bore the stamp "Made in USA" and were dropped from U.S. Phantom aircraft. These aircraft took off from bases built for Israel by Americans in the Negev desert. George Chaoui, CC General Secretary, the Lebanese Communist Party, had every reason for declaring that "Tel Aviv committed these savage actions not only with the USA's unqualified consent but also under its control."

And all this to the accompaniment of the U.S. administration's clamor about fighting "international terrorism." But what lies at the back of this? Terrorism is Washington's name for the struggle of the Palestinian people, who have taken up arms to uphold their national rights. The accusation of terrorism is levelled at most of the Lebanese people, who do not want their country to become a puppet of imperialism, to be split along religious-communal lines, to be turned into a reactionary theocratic state, into Israel No. 2.

Meanwhile, after the raid on Beirut the Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, whose shady past as a terrorist is widely known, declared that the next strikes would be aimed not only at military but also at civilian targets. He demanded that Israel should have the "right" to send its aircraft into Lebanese air space and thereby violate the cease-fire agreement and brazenly transgress elementary norms of international law. In his new cabinet Begin gave the portfolio of Defense Minister to General Ariel Sharon, who had publicly boasted that Israel could within a single week seize a territory extending from Al-Jezair to Khartoum and Baghdad. Nonetheless, in the eyes of the Reagan administration, the Begin-Sharon government merits not condemnation but encouragement in the shape of further financial and economic aid and more supplies of armaments. Israel is being pushed into conducting a policy of genocide relative to Arab peoples.

The acts of aggression by the Israeli military are a result of the Camp David deal and, at the same time, an attempt to save that deal from bankruptcy. Essentially speaking, these acts are a continuation of U.S. policy aimed at

establishing American supremacy in the Middle East through the building of military bases and the concentration of large naval forces. This has been confirmed by the very first visit to the region by U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig — he went to all lengths to brandish the bogey of a "Soviet threat."

The USA's efforts to secure an infamous "strategic consensus" in the Middle East, in other words, to form a military alliance in the region against the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, and against the national liberation movements in the Arab world, Southeast Asia, and Africa are encountering firm opposition from Syria, the Palestine Resistance Movement, and the Lebanese national-patriotic forces. Israel's Zionist rulers and their foreign patrons believe that with these vile military actions they can break the resistance of the Palestinians and the Lebanese patriots fighting side by side with them, and force Syria to its knees and surrender.

There are other motivations for the particularly barbarous character of the Israeli aggression. Shortly before it, the Kata'eb, the party of the Lebanese phalangists, had suffered a serious military and political setback. Following in the wake of the policy of imperialism and Zionism, and acting hand in glove with Israel, this party plans to turn Lebanon into the next victim of the Camp David conspiracy, rub out the Palestine Resistance Movement, crush the Lebanese national-patriotic forces, and undermine Syria's staunchness. The inter-Arab peace-keeping force disrupted the attempt of the phalangists to link the town of Zahle, seized by them, with the separatist ghetto⁴ and the narrow frontier zone in the country's south held by Israeli troops and units commanded by the traitor Saad Haddad. This would have unquestionably been a direct threat to the areas controlled by national-patriotic forces and also to Syria's security.

This success of the inter-Arab force triggered an atmosphere of patriotic enthusiasm in Lebanon. In this situation there were calls for speeding up the creation of the broadest possible national-democratic front and for a political settlement on the basis of a clear-cut and determined stand relative to the Israeli adversary. Here the purpose was to reaffirm Lebanon's Arab character, its territorial integrity, the unity of the Lebanese people and Lebanese state institutions, and the nation's independence, sovereignty and democratic development, and to declare in categorical terms Lebanon's support for the Palestine Resistance Movement and its special links to Syria.

In these conditions the USA and Israel found

they had to go to the rescue of their devoted puppets in order to soften the impact of the stinging military and political defeat inflicted on them and mitigate possible remote consequences of this defeat. Moreover, it was their aim to engineer contradictions and a split in the ranks of the progressive-patriotic forces.

The mass of information accumulated in the course of the now more than six-year-long war in Lebanon bears out that the USA is at the back of both the fascist-isolationist project⁵ and the plan, zealously promoted by Reagan's emissary Philip Habib, to use the Lebanese army while preserving its present confessional⁶ character. While these projects differ in form they coincide in essence, and the majority of our people see no distinction between them. While courageously resisting the designs of the isolationists and Israel's acts of aggression, this majority is with similar determination opposing attempts to put the alternative plan into effect. It is uniting around the principles of defensive policy put forward by the Lebanese national-patriotic movement. These provide for the reorganization of the army, the abolition of manifestations of confessionalism in it, and the institution of universal military conscription without any exceptions on religious-communal or ideological grounds. Until this is achieved, the inter-Arab peace-keeping force, regardless of pressure from within and from without with the aim of gradually replacing it with the present Lebanese army, remains the sole legal instrument ensuring Lebanon's security.

Developments have borne out the assessments made by the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Arab Countries last May. The participants in that conference noted: "Allied solidarity between Syria, the Palestine Resistance Movement, and the Lebanese national-patriotic movement is the basic element at the present stage of counteraction to attacks by imperialism. This solidarity acquires a special significance with the escalation of Israel's aggressiveness, against the background of its threat to strike at the inter-Arab force in Lebanon, to devastate the nation's southern areas, and ignite a dangerous flashpoint of war in the region."

The aggressor was prevented from achieving his main political aims thanks to the staunchness of the Lebanese people and the Palestinian fighters, thanks to the unshakable stand taken by the patriotic regime in Syria, and thanks to their close unity in struggle. A large role has also been played by the support of all the forces of peace, freedom, progress and socialism in the world, especially of the Soviet Union,

which has proved that it is a true and dependable friend at all times.

Rafic Samhoun
CC Political Bureau member,
Lebanese Communist Party

USA-CHINA: A NEW DANGEROUS MOVE

Peking's partnership with U.S. imperialism is increasingly revealing its military context. Early this year *U.S. News and World Report* wrote: "Chinese officials make no secret of their desire to buy advanced American fighter planes, anti-tank missiles and other arms. And the betting in Peking is that the web of relations between the two nations is certain one day to take on another strand: sale of advanced U.S. weaponry ..." to China. That day came amazingly soon: in mid-June the U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig pompously announced that the ban on Chinese purchases of armaments in the USA had been lifted. It has also been announced that a Chinese military delegation led by Liu Huaqing, deputy chief of the Chinese General Staff, will travel across the ocean in the role of a buyer.

True, both in Peking and in Washington they are trying to give the impression that the American armaments sold to China would be used only to "modernize" the Chinese armed forces, whose less than successful performance, as *The New York Times* noted in July 1981, in the short war with Vietnam clearly showed China's weakness in terms of armaments and logistics. In reality, the significance of the step that has been taken is much greater, for it spells out the accelerated build-up of the military potential of a power whose leaders make no secret of their expansionist, aggressive, hegemonistic ambitions. Small wonder that even in countries considered close friends of the USA, there is stark awareness of the danger of the U.S.-Chinese collusion. The Japanese *Mainichi*, for instance, wrote on June 19, 1981: "A militarily strong China is a threat to all the countries of Southeast and Southwest Asia adjacent to it." The Indonesian Foreign Minister Mochtar Kusumaatmaja told newsmen: "We were shocked to learn that the United States will possibly arm China."

One can well appreciate this sentiment. Of the 30 military conflicts in Asia since the Second World War, 19 were provoked by China. In neighboring countries it is to this day laying claim to territories that together are larger than China itself.⁷ Memories are still fresh of the Chinese aggression against socialist Vietnam, and armed provocations still continue against it from the north. During the last four days of

July the Chinese fired more than a thousand artillery shells into the Vietnamese province of Lang Son alone. Peking is arming groups of thugs for subversion in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, and some other Asian countries. There is thus a constant threat to the sovereignty of many nations.

In the hands of the Peking leaders, U.S. armaments will obviously be used above all against those nations at whose expense they want to satisfy their hegemonistic ambitions. Also, there is every reason to assume that with the growth of China's military potential it will pursue its irresponsible and dangerous policy not only toward neighboring countries.

The lifting of all restrictions on arms sales to China by Washington is a major step toward a U.S.-Chinese compact, the essence and aim of which is to heighten international tension. Of course, each of these countries has its own aim and is concerned with its own interests. But these aims and interests coincide on many points.

The deterioration of the political climate in the world plays into the hands of the Peking leaders, for it creates the conditions facilitating the attainment of their aggressive plans. For that reason they are eagerly backing U.S. imperialism in the new spiral of the arms race, the deployment in Europe of U.S. medium-range missiles, and the production of the neutron bomb. They declare their support for the U.S. military presence in the Far East and approve Washington's actions in preventing a Middle East settlement.

For its part, having permitted China to purchase advanced military hardware on favorable terms, the White House counts on an even more active partnership with Peking in implementing its own global strategy. This is a typical example of imperialism's maxim of "buying friends in exchange for weapons."

Thus, the spilling of what is in fact a U.S.-Chinese political alliance over into the military sphere creates a serious threat to world peace and security, to the movement of peoples for national and social liberation, for democracy and progress. In the light of the aforesaid one can see why Washington and Peking are so hostile to the mounting activity of the world's anti-war, peace, and freedom-loving forces. This concerns, in particular, the non-aligned movement, which is pressing for détente and general disarmament and has taken a stand against expansionist and hegemonistic policies. The USA and China are out to split the nonaligned movement, to range its member countries against the Soviet Union, smear the policies of socialist Cuba, and discredit India's

foreign policy of peace. U.S. and Chinese propaganda agencies are retailoring the slander that the nonaligned movement "has no prospects before it," that it "is wallowing in its own difficulties from which it is unable to extricate itself." This is an attempt to weaken the anti-war front.

However, there is growing understanding in the world of the danger of Washington's stake in arming Peking, of the consequences that may spring from this military alliance. Vigilance in the face of the intrigues of imperialist and hegemonistic circles and determined resistance to them are the duty of all who cherish peace and the security of nations.

Satiajaya Sudiman
Member of the leadership of the
Communist Party of Indonesia

1. *The Economist*, August 8-14, 1981, pp. 11-13.

2. According to estimates carried by *The International Herald Tribune* on August 3, 1981, a transfer of part of the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal from land-based launchers to aircraft would staggeringly increase the number of possible casualties in the country: from 5,900,000 to 11,300,000 in the first minutes of a hypothetical nuclear war, and from 6,100,000 to 67,000,000-93,000,000 in a second exchange.

3. Waxing indignant over this attitude, *The Economist* calls it "morally distasteful" and "implausible," saying that "it simply tosses the nuclear decision over to the Americans" and makes the Americans more "liable to hesitate before risking the incineration of their cities for Europe's sake." The journal is thus discouraged by any move that might lead out of the nuclear impasse.

4. Eastern districts of Beirut and an enclave near the port of Juniye controlled by right-Christian forces. — Ed.

5. N. Chaoui. "How to End the Crisis," *WMR*, December 1979. — Ed.

6. Confessionalism — a system of distributing government posts and seats in representative bodies by the religious-communal principle. — Ed.

7. *WMR*, No. 8, 1981.

Society serves its citizens

Thomas O'Flaherty
Executive Committee member, Communist Party of Ireland
Kemal Kervan
WMR Editorial Council member from
the Communist Party of Turkey

SOCIAL SECURITY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Confidence

"My parents had 10 children and could not make ends meet. At 12 I had to go into service in wealthy homes. The very thought of what awaited me in old age, terrified me. Had it not been for the people's power I don't know what would have become of me."

A smallish, wiry lady of 85, Frantiska Rehackova was delightfully sociable. We spoke in a pensioners' home in the car-manufacturing town of Mlada Boleslav, Czechoslovakia. Mrs. Rehackova invited us into her cozy one-room flat.

"A glance will tell you that I'm not exactly destitute," she said. "My pension is enough to pay for this flat, which has every convenience, eat well, and enjoy guardianship services. I can also afford entertainment and gifts for my grandchildren. When people can count on such a pension and accommodation in old age they feel confident."

We met the elderly pensioner, whom we have quoted word for word, when acquainting ourselves with the social security system in

Czechoslovakia. This system is the subject of our story. But first we should like to draw attention to the word "confident" used by Mrs. Rehackova.

As we studied Czechoslovakia's experience detail by detail we wanted, of course, to obtain a generalized impression of how effective the social security system is. The question was how to go about it. Were we to take statistics for different countries and compare them? Can they be compared at all? A ploy often used by bourgeois spokesmen is that they snatch facts out of their context and thereby change them beyond recognition. For instance, one comes across the assertion that in some industrialized capitalist country, wages (or pensions or other allowances) are nominally higher than in a given socialist country. But those who say so, "overlook" things like unemployment, the rising cost of living, high taxes and inflation, or, in other words, attributes of the capitalist system that are non-existent in the socialist world. This is why we decided to proceed from the assessments which people make of their lives in countries known to us from more than hearsay. In Turkey the working people have nothing but

contempt for the social security system. In Ireland the working class has, by comparison, won some major concessions from the bourgeoisie, but its condition, too, is far from satisfactory. The disparity between social security and the immediate needs and hopes of the working people is an immutable and omnipresent vice of capitalist society.

That is why we were impressed when the elderly lady said she felt *confident* in life. Many other people we talked to said as much. The population's increased sense of social security was pointed out at the recent 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as a significant achievement of the past few years.

Needless to say, when noting the Czechoslovak citizen's confidence in the future, we must mention first of all his guaranteed right to work and to pay in accordance with the quantity, quality and social value of his work. However, the social security system, with consumption from social funds as its pivot, plays an appreciable role in this.

The following table gives an idea of what this system is like in Czechoslovakia and of its trend of development:

	'000,000,000 korunas		
	1970	1975	1980
Pensions	24.75	31.39	42.46
Sick benefits	5.78	5.45	6.74
Allowances to families with children	9.37	14.45	18.48
Other social guardianship allowances	0.40	0.45	0.54
Medical care	12.03	17.56	21.50
Total	52.33	69.30	89.72
Share of total expenses in the used national income (at prevailing prices)	in%		
	17.4	16.9	19.0

What strikes one on this table is the absence of expenditures of unemployment relief; there is simply no unemployment in Czechoslovakia, any more than in other socialist countries. This makes it possible to concentrate financial resources on satisfying such priority social requirements as education, medical care, and rest and leisure, or requirements that do not depend on individual incomes or tastes or on fashion.*

By and large, nearly one-third of Czechoslovakia's used national income goes into social funds, which have become a feature of the socialist way of life.

*For more details on how requirements are met under socialism, see WMR, March 1981.

Facts for comparison

Early in 1981 there were 125,060 registered unemployed in Ireland; this is 11 per cent of the able-bodied population. In Northern Ireland the proportion is 17.2 per cent. In the Republic of Ireland 26 per cent of the unemployed are under 25 years of age.

In Turkey five million people, or 20 per cent of the able-bodied population are looking for jobs.

In Czechoslovakia full employment was achieved in the early postwar years. Today there is a relative shortage of labor in the economy.

From childhood

"Our concern for people," we were told at the Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, "begins from birth. But in terms of legislation on protection of maternity, marriage and the family, it begins even earlier."

Let us begin from childhood.

In the town of Kralupy, which has a large chemical factory, we visited a nursery school built last year (it accommodates 120 children). It has bright rooms with miniature furniture. The windows look out onto a lawn with a playground and a small swimming pool, where children can splash about in hot weather. Here as in all other Czechoslovak nursery schools, there are two specially trained mistresses for every group of 30-35 children. Accommodation for one child costs parents from four to five korunas a day, and the state pays additionally nearly 20 korunas. These terms make nursery schools extremely popular: they are attended by 82.9 per cent of the children aged three to six.

In Czechoslovakia there also are creches for tiny tots although the demand for them is not as big. Most young mothers (over 80 per cent, we were told) prefer at the expiry of their paid maternity leaves (whose duration is at least 26 weeks) to look after their children at home until they reach the age of two or three. This time is included in seniority, which is important upon retirement. If this is a second child, the mother is paid a monthly allowance of 500 korunas until the child reaches the age of two. As a matter of fact, every family gets an allowance for children in its pay-package: 140 korunas a month for one child, 530 korunas for two, 1,030 korunas for three, 1,480 korunas for four, 1,770 korunas for five, 2,060 korunas for six, and 290 korunas a month for every succeeding child.

A better picture of how society helps parents and children is given by the following table:

Social assistance to families with children '000,000,000 korunas	1970	1975	1980
Total	19.84	27.27	32.96
Cash allowances	9.62	15.32	19.62
of which:			
Pay additions for children	7.60	10.41	14.08
Maternity payments	1.17	1.82	1.90
Allowances to mothers	0.10	1.48	1.36
Single allowances at the birth of a child	0.23	0.57	0.50
State allowances over and above loans to young couples for the purchase of a home	—	0.24	0.53
Miscellaneous	0.52	0.80	1.25
Share of cash payments in the used national income	3.20	3.75	4.16
Social services	3.57	4.72	6.59
of which:			
Pediatrics institutes and creches	0.52	0.73	0.77
Nursery schools and children's homes	0.82	1.64	2.69
School meals	0.77	0.84	1.34
Miscellaneous	1.41	1.51	1.79
Indirect assistance (tax reductions, lower rent, town transport, and so forth)	6.65	7.23	6.75

The demographic aspect of social policy in Czechoslovakia shows that the state is committed to preventing the population's age composition from deteriorating and ensuring a simple reproduction of the population. We were told, however, that the population is expected to reach 17 million within the next 20 years.*

Now demographic considerations are not the only motivation behind society's concern for the rising generation. We saw this above all in Janske Lazne, one of the loveliest spots in the mountainous part of Bohemia.

A children's spa, named Jaro (Spring), which has won world renown for its successes in curing children from the effects of polio, has been functioning there since the 1930s. A new seven-storey building was recently completed. Dr. Vaclav Jaburek, the director of this health center, told us that children are admitted free of charge, although the project had cost the government 223 million korunas paid to a foreign firm in hard currency, and the upkeep and treatment of one child cost 330 korunas a day.

Polio has been almost wiped out in Czechoslovakia. Children who have had it are enabled to take a repeat course of treatment. Besides, Jaro treats children suffering from pyopathy or

paralysis of various origins. Accommodation is also given to children from other countries where polio is still a problem. Since treatment at Jaro takes a long time, children are given not only medical care but a school education. The health center runs its own nursery school and secondary school.

There are quite a few health centers of this kind in Czechoslovakia. Every child suffering from a chronic ailment and every person with a congenital disability is registered. They receive medical care, are paid an allowance and have the opportunity to study and learn a trade and to take part in public life. It is characteristic that Prague has Europe's only conservatoire for young people with impaired eyesight.

Facts for comparison

— In Turkey the mortality rate among infants of up to 1 year of age is 160 per 1,000; in Czechoslovakia it is 17. In Turkey 10,000 women die annually in childbirth, in Czechoslovakia the rate is 15-17 (96 per cent of the births are in maternity homes, where the services are free, of course).

— Turkey has one doctor per 1,880 inhabitants. In the large towns the ratio is 1:700, and in rural areas, 1:15,000. Medical services have generally to be paid for.

In Czechoslovakia there is one doctor per 315 inhabitants with no difference in the quality of medical services in town and country. Medical care is free. Any medicine by prescription costs a symbolic 1 koruna.

Work and everyday life

At the new Caoutchouc chemical factory — which has already earned a name for itself in many countries — we met with the director, Milan Eisler, and other executives, talked to the workers and toured the everyday services.

None of the 3,100 workers employed at the factory is threatened with dismissal. More, there is a constant demand for workers because the factory is being enlarged and also on account of a natural fluctuation of labor. Wages average 2,925 korunas (the median wage nationwide is 2,643 korunas). Besides, in the vast majority of families, at least two people work — the husband and wife — and so the family income consists of two wages.

And all this with unchanging prices for basic commodities such as meat, fats, milk and bread. It is true that the cost of living is showing a certain rise but real wages are growing too.

At the Caoutchouc factory as anywhere else in Czechoslovakia, social insurance is free and available to everybody. The money for the social consumption funds comes from the state

*As of late 1979, Czechoslovakia had a population of 15,300,000.

and the trade unions. In addition to its output plan, the factory has an annual and a five-year social development program. Last year's program, for instance, envisaged the use of 16 per cent of the total investments for everyday service facilities. But it was found possible to spend 28 per cent on these facilities. Expenses to meet the needs of the personnel totalled 31 million korunas. Of these, over 4 million korunas was spent on training and retraining workers; over 8 million korunas, on improving working conditions; nearly 2,500,000 korunas, on protective garments; and 16 million korunas, on housing construction, meals at the factory's canteens, vacation facilities, and the building of a new and reconstruction of old nursery schools.

We visited the factory's out-patient clinic, which employs seven doctors (including two dentists). It has a surgical department, physiotherapy cabinets, and an audiometry laboratory, which systematically checks the hearing of personnel working in departments with a high noise level. A constant concern of the medical personnel is to prevent disease and health hazardous influences. Up to 4,000 medical check-ups are given to the personnel of the factory every year.

We were told of problems. Here (as, in fact, elsewhere in the republic) the housing problem is quite acute. It is estimated that in the current five-year plan period 350 families whose members work at the factory will require housing. Yet the factory will be able to build only 125 housing units.

This does not mean that some people will be left homeless. Most of the new housing is needed by newlywed couples living with parents but wanting a home of their own, and by people living in old houses lacking conveniences. Many of these families join building co-operatives or build their own houses — for these purposes (and not only for these), newlyweds can get a large credit at a low interest rate for 10 years or even longer terms. But people living in factory-owned or communal houses (i.e., houses built on money from national committees) — these comprise over 40 per cent of the families in Czechoslovakia — have an advantage, for they only pay a small part of the actual cost of their homes, including heating. The rest is paid by the state out of social consumption funds.

At this factory as everywhere else, the working week is five days or 42.5 hours. For personnel engaged in continuous shift work, it is 40 hours (and the pay is 500-700 korunas higher). Paid vacations are from two to four weeks, depending on age and length of service.

People thus have quite a lot of leisure time. Society is not indifferent to whether this time is used on wholesome rest and pursuits enriching the individual or on empty pastimes. Hence the impressive social spending on organizing rest and leisure. The Caoutchouc factory has a swimming pool, a house of culture with a wide-screen cinema, and theatrical and dance halls. Moreover, it has chess, dance and other circles, and a pensioners' club. Its sports section is not famed for setting national records but has 2,300 members.

Last year about 2,500 of the factory's personnel and members of their families spent their vacation at holiday homes, not only in Czechoslovakia itself but also in Bulgaria, the GDR and Yugoslavia. Up to 150 accommodation passes to health centers are available annually to those who require treatment at spas. The factory has its own holiday home in the mountains. It is now building a recreation center in Southern Bohemia.

Going over the scale of the entire country, we find the following picture of organized rest and leisure:

Number of people, 000	1970	1975	1980
At factory-run holiday homes	1,369.5*	1,969.9	2,470.3
At trade-union holiday homes (including holiday homes abroad)	363.7	463.7	583.7
At Young Pioneer holiday camps	275.7	392.6	427.3
At spas	243.8	270.1	305.7

*data for 1972.

We could judge the conditions for organized rest and leisure from our own impressions. The Kablo-Kladno factories amalgamation runs a holiday home in a beautiful part of the picturesque Karkonose Mountains. This is a small hotel equipped on a par with international standards. It has a restaurant, a bar and a cinema. It accommodates 60 adults and 30 children for a two weeks' stay. Vacationers pay 32 korunas per day, and a similar amount is paid by the trade union.

However, the opportunity to spend a vacation at a holiday home is not used by everyone. In the large towns, one out of five or seven families has a house or cottage in the country.

Facts for comparison

— In Turkey the two holiday homes built by the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Trade Unions (DISK) and offering vacation facilities at a discount were confiscated by the government and are now run on capitalist

lines, at prices that only the well-to-do can afford.

In Czechoslovakia there are 9,000 holiday homes run by factories or trade unions. Their services are used annually by up to 45 per cent of the population.

In the evening of life

Retirement on pension is one of the most contradictory situations in one's life. It is awaited impatiently: age takes its own, strength ebbs, and familiar work begins to seem intolerably hard. But it is also dreaded, and people try to keep it off for as long as possible, because retirement may rupture long-standing social ties and relations beyond which loneliness and forced idleness loom large.

In Czechoslovakia, social policy toward the elderly takes these circumstances into account, especially as pensioners comprise 21.4 per cent of the population.

Let us begin from retirement age. For men it is 60 (55 for miners) and for women, between 53 and 57, depending on the number of children. All working people of town and country enjoy the right to a pension. Its size depends on the earnings of the last few years and on the length of service, averaging about 66 per cent of the earned income. If a pensioner so desires he can go on working. If he is engaged in material production or the service industry (barring managerial jobs) he gets his pension and pay full. Nearly 60 per cent of the pensioners avail themselves of this opportunity. The rest may work a few months a year or the whole year, getting, however, only part of their pension.

There is another area of concern for the elderly. This is the system of benefits and the provision of conditions for continued activity and the preservation of ties with relatives and friends. These ties usually fade when people living outside the family circles meet with difficulties that compel them to move to a home for pensioners. The conclusion drawn from this, we were told at the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, was to promote the social guardianship service. Let us see what this service offers.

The national committees of towns and districts have a staff of trained social workers. These workers keep lists of single people of an advanced age who cannot help themselves in their homes. They make the rounds of pensioners, helping them shop, launder their clothes and clean their houses. The state bears 60 per cent of the cost of all services. This makes it unnecessary for pensioners to leave their homes and change their way of life.

Moreover, in towns there are personal

hygiene centers where elderly people can have, for example, a chiropody, a haircut, or a coiffure at a discount. Pensioners have clubs, are given accommodation passes to holiday homes, and have the opportunity to go on organized excursions.

There was the question of how to help persons or couples living alone in old houses that have no elevator, central heating or other conveniences so vital to elderly people. The state began opening homes with guardianship services in specially built houses and in re-equipped mansions and cottages in rural communities. These homes have comfortable, specially laid-out flats and additional sanitation and household appliances. But the main thing is that they are permanently staffed with social workers who provide residents with a wide range of guardianship services at a large discount.

It was in one of these homes that we met Frantiska Rehackova, mentioned at the beginning of this story. In the same home we visited the two-roomed flat of 75-year-old composer Jan Hromec and his wife Zdenka. Like Mrs. Rehackova, they spoke of their new home with deep satisfaction.

The social composition of the residents of these homes varies greatly. Nothing about them reminds one of almshouses, the image of which one usually associates with one's idea of institutions for elderly people.

Pensioners think highly of homes with a guardianship service. But it is felt that there is a bigger future for boarding houses offering a wide range of specialized services, including cultural ones. We visited one of these facilities in Prague 9. It can best be described as a micro-community that has fused with the surrounding neighborhoods. It consists of 13 small double-storeyed houses with two-room and one-room flats, and a social center with a dining room, a club and a library. The residents do not have to keep to a rigid routine. Those who wish to work a few months a year are free to do so, and if anybody wishes to stay with relatives or spend a summer at a cottage there are no obstacles.

As yet the demand for these facilities is far greater than the supply. But their network is rapidly growing. The table on page 64 shows the development of social guardianship for elderly single citizens over the past 10 years.

Facts for comparison

— In Turkey the state social security system covers only about 48 per cent of the working population. In 1980 pensions dropped by half on account of inflation.

Kinds of social help	1970	1975	1980
Local social guardianship services:			
number of persons served ('000)	14.6	30.4	47.4
flats in guardianship service			
homes	329	2,028	7,314
personal hygiene centers	10	117	289
pensioners' clubs	491	614	937
Social guardianship institutions:			
places in pensioners' homes ('000)	35.0	36.7	40.0
places in boarding houses ('000)	0.2	1.2	3.0

In Ireland the working class has won substantial benefits in old-age social security. Pensioners do not pay for heating, gas, electricity, telephones and the use of television sets. They have the right to meals at a discount and the opportunity for a free trip in the country once a year. The other side of the coin is the steadily growing cost of living and hence a declining standard in living and a notable deterioration of the condition of pensioners, which increases their dependence on benefits.

In Czechoslovakia the overall living standard enables elderly people to satisfy their requirements from their pensions (even without the benefits they receive).

This account of the social security system in

Czechoslovakia is based on personal impressions and is anything but exhaustive. We have left out much of what we heard from Jaroslav Havelka, Deputy Federal Minister of Labor and Social Affairs. He told us, for example, that ever since its 14th congress (1971), the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has been making a special effort to develop a scientific approach to the charting of social policy and to analysis of the life and requirements of all groups and sections of the population in need of social help. This has produced comprehensive programs defining the principles and lines of assistance to elderly people and also to young families and children, and solving other problems.

This comprehensive approach to satisfying the basic needs of diverse groups of citizens will continue to be improved and kept abreast of changes in conditions of life. It is one of the tasks set in the resolutions of the recent 16th congress of the CPCz. The welfare of socialist society, Jaroslav Havelka noted, is seen as the welfare of the citizens it is composed of, hence the interests of every person and every family are the interests of society.

This is the policy of the Communist Party, which enjoys the trust of citizens because it gives their confidence in the present and future a solid foundation.

From equal rights to full equality

Ana Muresan

Alternate member of the Political EC, CC RCP,
Chairman, National Council of Women,
Socialist Republic of Romania,
Minister of Home Trade of the SRR

Among the various political and social factors that determine the ways of building a many-sidedly developed socialist society in Romania and its advance to communism; the condition of women, the extent to which they apply their abilities in every sphere of life, plays a big role. Gains in this sphere constitute a major achievement of socialism in our country, an important criterion of development reflecting the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Romania's experience shows that women can become really free, enjoy equal rights, win solid political positions and consciously contribute their share to the shaping of the country's destiny only if exploitation, social and national oppression, economic and political discrimination and inequality are fully eliminated and give way to equitable relations and

ample democracy enabling the people as a whole to participate in the management of society. Thanks to deep-going revolutionary changes effected in the years of socialist construction, Romanian women hold an important place in every socio-economic sphere and in government. "We proudly put it on record," said Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the RCP, speaking to a national conference of women in 1978, "that our socialist system has released women's creative energy and enabled it to prove its worth in greater measure . . . This is conclusive proof that conditions for the real equality of men and women and for women's active participation in the management of society are created only when the division of society into antagonistic classes has been abolished."¹

Women have done much in the great, epic struggle of the Romanian people for social and national emancipation, for democratic rights and freedoms. Ever since it was founded, our party has roused the mass of women to action against exploitation and oppression, for a revolutionary renewal of society. August 23, 1944 saw the triumph of a social and national, anti-fascist and anti-imperialist liberation revolution in Romania. Women took a stand in favor of war against Hitler Germany and joined in all major class struggles to democratize the state apparatus, establish the political rule of the working class, rehabilitate the economy and carry out an agrarian reform. After the defeat of the reactionary bourgeoisie and landed proprietors, they were granted ample political rights. In the autumn of 1946, for the first time ever, women took part in parliamentary elections on an equal footing with men; in those elections the masses supported the RCP policy of effecting revolutionary democratic changes in the country. The 1948 constitution, which proclaimed Romania a republic, legalized the full political equality of men and women as well as their equality in pay and in the family.

However, equal rights established by law were only the first step toward real equality. The bourgeois and landowner society of the past had left us a legacy of millions of illiterates, two-thirds of whom were women. Among workers, women made up a mere six per cent and among intellectuals, two per cent. There was no such thing in Romania as maternity protection; the infant mortality rate was high due to poor health care.

The socialist revolution altered the way of life in the country and made freedom and human dignity values of the first order. Relations between people based on social equality and justice, new views and convictions created real conditions for the formation of women's new social and family status.

The actual equality of men and women develops in the course of building a new, socialist system in Romania. Women have made a big contribution to the industrialization of our country, the formation of the cooperative system in agriculture and progress in science, public education and culture, or, in other words, to a far-reaching transformation of society, by their conscientious, inspired effort, their talent and knowledge, their love of the country and devotion to socialism.

The effort of the RCP to provide conditions for making men and women really equal is neither a temporary, passing campaign, nor an abstract slogan. To ensure that women move into a fitting place in socio-economic activity

means materializing one of the ideals of social justice, an essential component of the communists' effort for the development of the individual, translating socialist principles into reality. The program of building a many-sidedly developed socialist society and the advance of Romania to communism sets great store in women's creative ability and active participation in material production and spiritual endeavor, the advancement of the nation, the consolidation of the family, the education of the younger generation, and socio-economic life generally.

Underlying the measures which our party is carrying out to improve women's condition and which are marked by a militant revolutionary spirit is Nicolae Ceausescu's creative and humane idea that achieving full equality is a complex social process requiring a long time and taking place gradually, in step with the strengthening of the socio-economic foundations of socialism and as a result of the close interaction of numerous political, economic, legal, ideological and cultural factors. After the ninth RCP congress (1965) this problem came to receive greater attention than ever and assumed a permanent character; we began to make better use of past experience and to formulate future tasks more clearly than before.

Women's social status mirrors the evolution of our society, the conditions in which they live and work, contributing to every sphere of activity. The path of further progress in women's condition is analyzed in theoretical terms and shown originally and exhaustively in N. Ceausescu's works in close connection with the comprehensive program of historical development of the country, the transition of socialism to a higher plane, more extensive use of the system's material and manpower resources and the development of every man or woman as a personality.

Women's condition has changed radically, above all as a result of their role in social labor. Thanks to rapid economic progress, the proportion of women among those engaged in the economy has drawn near their percentage of the population and is now close to 40 per cent in industry (about 80 per cent in light industry). With the modernization and diversification of the nation's economic structure in line with the requirements of the socio-economic development of the country, the proportion of women in the chemical, mechanical engineering, electronic, electrotechnical and other industries is growing from year to year.

Women's participation in social production is fostered by improving public education and its close connection with production and re-

search. All our young people can receive an education and learn a profession according to their ability and inclinations. It is indicative that girls account for 46 per cent of those enrolled in lycees,² 67 per cent of post-lycee students and over 44 per cent of higher school students. We also owe our rapid growth of the proportion of women who have received a sound training to the democratization of the education system; they now make up more than half of those who have had a secondary education, over one-third of higher school graduates, roughly one-fifth of engineers and about one-third of higher school teachers. Many women have been elected to the Academy of Sciences, Academy of Socio-Political Sciences, Academy of Medical Sciences and other Romanian and foreign scientific or cultural institutions.

This high degree of participation in the country's material production and spiritual life makes women really equal to men. It is a reflection of the ability of our socio-political system to ascertain their enormous creative potentialities and put them in the service of society.

The new social status of women and qualitative changes in their professional activity are closely linked with the process of formation of their spiritual world. Women are not only gaining economic independence but developing as personalities, becoming real subjects of social creativity. This explains changes in women's social behavior and the disappearance of preconceived notions about their alleged inability to perform certain activities long considered an exclusive sphere of men. The background of this process is our country's advance and qualitative technical and technological changes in production. Stereotypes in the distribution of roles between the sexes are gradually going out of existence and are bound to disappear altogether. They were used in the past for the division of labor and for forming ideas of the hierarchical value of this or that activity. The progress made in this respect is consonant with the main lines of our strategy, that is, its economic and social lines, which are two dimensions of the harmonious character of social progress under socialism.

The Romanian state does much for motherhood to be recognized by society as it merits. This is largely brought about by the very process of solidly integrating women into diverse spheres of public activity as well as by legislation, large and systematic appropriations for the education of the younger generation, maternity and child protection and the consolidation of the family. Every year sees the network of creches and nursery schools grow,

with the state allocating more funds for children, the service sector expanding and household chores being made easier. This enables women to join in public life more and more and contribute all the greater a share to the progress of the country while at the same time developing spiritually. The party and the state take special care of the rising generation, see to its training from an early age for professional activity and concern themselves with providing the most favorable working conditions for women. In Romania, which in the past lacked a developed system of health care, 98 per cent of all children are now born in medical institutions, pre-school education encompasses 75 per cent of children between three and four years of age and over 90 per cent of children between five and six.

Socialism has given women a solid position in the management of society. They perform numerous leading functions and do well as executives. "We must do all in our power to ensure," N. Ceausescu stresses, "that women, who constitute more than half of our nation and play an important role in its development, take an active part not only in production and social activity but in the management of every public sphere, the whole of our society, according to their abilities."³

The promotion of women to leading posts is connected with the general laws governing the progress of the people, with the scope of revolutionary effort toward building a many-sidedly developed socialist society and the advance to communism, and with our political and moral principles, whose purpose is to enable people fully to prove their worth in conscious history-making.

Drawing women into economic and political management is a historical necessity; it is prompted by the principles of socialist democracy, by the great responsibility for the country's advance to communism that must be borne in equal measure by every member of society. Throughout the 15 years that have passed since the ninth RCP congress, the leaders of the party and the state, particularly N. Ceausescu, have consistently advocated the admission of more women to the party and called for the assignment of positions of responsibility to them according to their role in the development of the country, their ability and their professional and political competence.

The conditions of women in Romania and the specific problems posed by life in this respect were deeply and comprehensively analyzed by a plenum of the CC RCP in June 1973, which approved a broad program in-

tended to increase women's social role. Today women account for nearly 30 per cent of the party membership. After the June plenum some of them were promoted to the post of first secretary or secretary of district party committees; women in this category of party members exceed one-third. More and more of them serve as secretaries of municipal, city or village party committees or the party committees of large enterprises, cultural, scientific and other institutions. In the latest elections (1979), over 168,000 women were elected to leading party bodies at all levels, which raised the proportion of women on party bureaus and committees to 32 per cent. Women hold important government posts. Five of them are members of the government, 11 serve as deputy ministers or secretaries of state or equal them in rank. Many women head ministry departments, enterprises or institutions.

The 12th party congress (1979) marked a new and higher stage in assuring women equality in the management of public affairs. Women exceeded 30 per cent of its delegates. One-fourth of the members of the CC and Central Auditing Commission are women and nine of them have been elected full or alternate members of the Political EC of the CC RCP.

Speaking of the fundamental criteria of appointing women to leading posts, I wish to point out the example of Elena Ceausescu, one of the leaders of the Romanian working-class movement, an outstanding scholar and fiery champion of the progress and prosperity of the country. Joining the RCP as early as 1937, she went through the hard years of underground work and showed herself to be a staunch fighter devoted to the revolution, a fighter for the ideals of social and national justice, for our people's dignity and freedom, for the independence and sovereignty of our country. In the years of socialist construction E. Ceausescu has been giving all her ability and energies to the advancement of Romanian science and socio-political thought, and this has moved her into the ranks of noted personalities of socialist Romania. Her abilities as a scholar and politician have earned her recognition both at home and abroad. Evidence of this is the degrees conferred on her by several foreign scientific institutions, her election to the Political EC, CC RCP and her promotion to the posts of First Deputy Prime Minister and Chairman of the National Council for Science and Technology. In performing these important functions, E. Ceausescu sees to the implementation of a party and government policy raising women's role in society.

Women's participation in the work of the

highest bodies of the country helps eliminate ignorance and conservatism and distrust of their ability to lead. It is in the interest of society to end these survivals as speedily as possible. Our party considers that it is anachronistic to prefer men to women in assigning positions of responsibility. The only criterion should be the political, professional and moral qualities of the person in question, his or her ability to cope with the future functions. "We must," N. Ceausescu said at the national conference of women, "combat all underestimation of women with the greatest vigor, fully eliminate every tendency to minimize their ability to lead and organize, to hold the most important posts. In line with CC decisions, it is necessary to do more for the promotion of women to leading positions and for entrusting them with greater responsibilities in every sphere of activity."⁴

The only way to bring about tangible progress in the promotion of women is by steadily enhancing the socialist awareness of every member of society. This is being done by public education agencies and by science and art and is also an object of many forms of educational work. The party concentrates on drawing women into its policy, equipping them with our revolutionary world view — dialectical and historical materialism — expanding their scientific and cultural horizons and advancing them morally and spiritually.

Great importance is attached to sociological investigation of women's free time, of the manner in which it is spent. Women have admittedly fewer opportunities in this respect than men. They have less time to acquire more knowledge, to improve their professional skills or political schooling or simply to rest. This prevents them from fully using the opportunities that the country offers for their development as personalities in the course of creating material and spiritual values and also for performing their primary function as mothers, which is to be the first to educate children. Our society steadfastly takes steps to remove this contradiction by assuming duties which women had to carry out in the past or still have to. The RCP has worked out a specific program whose purpose is to end unfair treatment of women and do away with all prejudice against them. The program is based on the firm conviction that to solve these problems is in the interest of both women and society as a whole.

To promote socialist democracy in Romania connotes enhancing the prestige of mass organizations, including women's organizations that group women workers in various fields in city or countryside irrespective of nationality. Using their own methods, these organizations

encourage women to play an active role in the production sphere, in the country's political economic and other public activities.

Now that imperialism's aggressive intrigues are seriously endangering peace and international security and it is all the more essential to promote solidarity and unity of action at the national and international level, Romania's women work in common with women of other countries to support positive world processes. What I mean is international détente, greater cooperation, a just and humane solution of mankind's problems, the establishment of a new international economic order and the safeguarding of world peace.

Steps to increase women's role in our socialist democratic system and ensure their full par-

ticipation in every public activity help implement the policy of the RCP and draw on the inexhaustible initiative, creativity and tremendous energy of women in the interest of the continued progress of socialist Romania.

1. Nicolae Ceausescu, *Romania pe drumul construirii societatii socialiste multilateral dezvoltate*. Vol. 16 Bucharest, 1979, p. 103.

2. The term of study in a lycee (secondary school) is either nine or ten years, or eleven or twelve years. The former term is compulsory. There are general and specialized lycees. Young people who do not enter a higher school on finishing a lycee take post-lycee training in specialized schools for skilled workers and technologists. — Ed.

3. Nicolae Ceausescu. Op. cit. Vo. 15, 1978, pp. 455-456.

4. Op. cit., Vol. 16, pp. 105-106.

In the shackles of technological dependence

Grigoris Farkos

Political Bureau member, CC,
Communist Party of Greece

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF CAPITALIST RATIONALIZATION

The discussion in *World Marxist Review* of a wide range of problems posed by the social and economic effects of capitalist rationalization is a useful contribution to the theoretical and practical activity of fraternal communist parties and to their fight against monopoly at this stage. I consider it important, therefore, to examine some aspects of the scientific and technological revolution (STR) in Greece, described in our party program as a "capitalist industrial-agrarian country whose productive forces have attained a medium level of development and whose fundamental characteristic is strong dependence on foreign monopoly capital and international imperialism." It is this dependence, pointed out in party documents and studies by Greek Marxist scholars, that largely conditions the methods of applying achievements of the STR and, consequently, its class substance in Greece.

In Greece as in other capitalist countries, the lines of scientific and technological progress are determined by the monopolies, which are

primarily concerned, needless to say, with their own interests. The deforming impact of foreign capital tells painfully on the Greek economy as a whole* and accounts to a considerable extent for the distinctive nature of rationalization in Greek industry. A notable peculiarity of this process is the disproportionately large share of imports of new equipment. This technological dependence, a product of domination by foreign capital, which controls one-third of the economic potential of Greece (and moreover, the most up-to-date industries), helps foreign monopolies strengthen their positions in the country.

Analyzing the effects of this new form of dependence, Charilaos Florakis, General Secretary of the CC, Communist Party of Greece, notes that it "not only burdens the country with expenditures running to thousands of millions of drachmas a year in hard currency but dooms it to a protracted lag in the sphere of science and technology, preventing the formation of a domestic scientific and technological basis needed for the independent dynamic development of the Greek economy." This expresses itself in inadequate attention to information processing (computers), the petro-

Continuing publication of analyses of the effects of capitalist rationalization on the social and economic condition of labor. See *WMR*, January, March and June 1980, and February and August 1981.

*Charilaos Florakis, "Two Factors of the Revolutionary Process," in *WMR*, January 1981. — Ed.

chemical industry and other modern fields encompassed by the STR. The result is that industries intended to become the mainstay of renewal and modernization of the Greek economy as a whole have been unable to achieve a higher growth rate and are still lagging behind.

Due to the situation in the Greek economy, achievements of the STR are used on a limited scale or injudiciously. To give an example, no more than 10 of the approximately 200 small and medium electronic computers owned by the country are used at full capacity. Only 1.5 per cent of the working time of all computers is used for controlling production operations. About one-third of it, or 30.3 per cent, is used for computing operations and 68 per cent, for bookkeeping in enterprises, government agencies and banks.

New techniques are introduced mostly by subsidiaries of transnationals and by firms involving considerable foreign participation. It is important to note that these facilities are intended mainly for traditional industries. Besides, imported equipment is not used in this or that industry as a whole and many enterprises in which foreign companies have no direct stake go on operating by old methods. Independent industrial research is virtually nonexistent in Greece and the trade mark is often the only difference between "new" and old equipment.

It is noteworthy, however, that in spite of the country's considerable lag in science and technology, the STR has a strong impact on the class structure of Greece, and the communists must take account of this in working out their programs and deciding on the main lines of their activity.

The most important social change is quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class and its role. The quickening pace of the STR and the development of state-monopoly capitalist relations in the economy have led, as Greek Marxist scholars had expected, to an absolute and relative increase in the army of wage labor. Wage workers add up to more than half the economically active population. A fact of decisive importance is that 90.3 per cent of wage workers (46.1 per cent of the economically active population) are members of the working class. Improving technology has made it necessary for the workers to raise their standard of education. (True, the monopolies adjust education to their own immediate requirements. We always remember this in framing our educational policy.)

The STR has given rise to a trend toward raising the working conditions of wage and salary earners employed in the service sector,

particularly in trade, to those of industrial workers. Furthermore, the intellectualization of material production is gradually effacing the dividing line between workers by hand and workers by brain. And so there are signs of growing affinity between commercial and industrial workers as well as between some groups of the intellectuals and the working class, and given definite prerequisites, a fusion of the former with the latter.

The share of wage workers in the middle strata is increasing as production organization changes. This is accompanied by a reduction of the numerical strength of the traditional middle strata, which submit more and more to monopoly. Now that Greece is a member of the Common Market, we believe this trend will intensify. To be sure, we do not expect the traditional middle strata to disappear altogether. However, they will undergo a restructuring and have to adapt to work in industries in which big monopolies are unwilling to invest for various reasons.

The continuing concentration and centralization of production and capital have speeded differentiation among the bourgeoisie, with small and even medium employers, who are pressed by tax-free monopolies, becoming potential participants or, at any rate, taking a neutral stand in the struggle against imperialism and the domestic oligarchy, as the CPG program points out. On the other hand, intellectual wage workers who play the leading role in management and appropriate part of the surplus value in the form of salary or other payments link up increasingly with the bourgeoisie. Lastly, the hierarchy of salary-earners is growing as the role of the managerial apparatus increases due to the STR. The class struggle, carried into this apparatus, is going on between its higher echelons, which establish closer relations with the bourgeoisie or join it, and its lower echelons, which join the working class.

Scientific assessment of the short-term and long-term significance of the social changes occurring under the impact of the STR is of both theoretical and practical value to our Communist Party. The main reason for this is that certain theoretical concepts evolved by bourgeois ideologists and social reformists have gained currency in Greece. To take critical stock of these theories is essential as a means of deciding the future lines of carrying on the struggle against monopoly.

There is, for example, the concept of "deproletarianization" of capitalist society under the impact of modernized production and the rise of a "new" middle class. Its authors and pro-

ponents claim that the working class is integrating itself into society, which is alternately called a "consumer," "industrial" or "post-industrial" society but remains capitalist.

Most of these concepts apply the term "working class" solely to persons engaged in manual labor. Lacking the education and political schooling needed for the fulfillment of its historical mission, these theorists say, the working class is socially degraded, becomes one of the diverse "pressure groups" and is therefore in need of "intellectual" guidance. This premise leads to the conclusion that the intellectuals are the chief motive power of revolution.

The most modernized form of this concept is the theory of "ideological mechanisms of the state." It sees the main object of social struggles in seizing these mechanisms, which is expected to bring about a change of ideology and hence a disruption of the repressive machinery of the state.

We communists cannot ignore the dangerous character of views of this nature, especially if we remember that some intellectuals are inclined to adopt them, as experience has shown. Their proponents mechanically extend the rapid and outwardly conflict-free qualitative advance of science and technology during the STR to social evolution and generate utopian hopes for painless changes in the social sphere as well.

Many people are beginning to realize that these views are wrong. Intellectuals and members of the middle strata join in the labor movement as it gains ground. Many strikers belong nowadays to social groups other than industrial workers. This is not to say, however, that the workers are no longer the mainspring of anti-monopoly protest. It is industrial workers and their organizations that form the core of the strike movement and formulate the main economic, social and political demands, which also reflect the interests of other working people.

Our party does much to analyze these processes from the social and political point of view and reveals their class nature. It helps the masses arrive step by step at a Marxist-Leninist conception of the dialectics of social struggle.

We show whom scientific and technological progress serves under capitalism. The facts prove that the lion's share of the benefits of applying achievements of the STR in the production sphere goes to a handful of domestic and foreign monopolies. The gulf between rich and poor is widening.

The STR is also responsible for the steadily increasing exploitation of labor and the growing rate of profit. In the manufacturing indus-

tries, dominated mostly by foreign monopolies which introduce more sophisticated technology, the rate of surplus value is close to 300 per cent and the profit rate, 50 per cent. But in industries in which foreign capital has a small share and old technology is used, these indices are about 180 and 30 per cent respectively. To boost their profits, the monopolies resort to every device: intensified labor, which makes for an uptrend in accidents; the bogey of dismissal, which causes social alienation; recourse to overtime, which puts an excessive physical and psychological strain on the worker.

Increasing exploitation and oppression exacerbate the class struggle. Our party considers, however, that the level of the struggle in Greece still falls short of the acuteness of the problems facing labor. One of the reasons for this is that state monopoly capitalism in our country developed under the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, at a time when the CPG was driven underground and the trade union movement put under brutal pressure. A further negative circumstance to be borne in mind is that the one-time intellectuals as well as members of the urban and rural middle strata who joined the working class under the impact of the STR lacked experience of class struggle.

Proceeding from a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the socio-economic structure of Greece and the nature of the contemporary situation, our party came to the conclusion that "the main economic lever of the new power will be the state sector of the economy, which will expand steadily and become the foundation of future socialist social property." That is when the achievements of science and technology can be made to serve those whose labor creates all material and spiritual wealth.

The CPG, which took account in time of the problems raised by the STR, resists its direct negative effects on the working people, such as intensified labor, massive dismissals or increasing social alienation. Considering that the application of achievements of the STR is not a neutral process from the class point of view, the communists declare for scientific and technological progress helping to meet the requirements of the workers and people of Greece and not to enrich the monopolies.

The goal of the CPG is to bring about an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly front as a means of establishing a real democracy in Greece and then of going over to socialism. The communists are convinced that only under socialism can the STR foster the free development of each in inseparable unity with the free development of all.

Some lessons of the Labour Party split

George Matthews
Executive Committee of the British Communist Party

In March 1981 four former Labour cabinet ministers, Roy Jenkins, David Owen, William Rodgers and Shirley Williams, dubbed by the press "the Gang of Four," announced that they were leaving the Labour Party to form a new political party. It was launched a few weeks later, amid a fanfare of press and television publicity, as the Social Democratic Party, with the support of a dozen MPs.

Its sponsors claim that the new party is going to "break the mold" of British politics, bring something new into the country's political life, and radically change the country's future course. To what extent are these claims justified? What are the SDP's prospects of success? What policies will it actually pursue? What were the fundamental reasons for its establishment? And what are the lessons for the labor and progressive movement?

This is the first major split in the Labour Party since 1931, when a number of Labour ministers, headed by the Premier, Ramsay MacDonald, joined with the Tories to form the National Government. That was in the depths of a profound crisis of capitalism. The present split is also the product of a deep crisis in the capitalist system, which is having major repercussions in British politics.

The British economy has been in serious trouble since the mid-60s. The end of the post-war boom had adverse consequences for all capitalist countries, but Britain was affected particularly severely.

The main reason was the refusal of successive governments, Labour as well as Tory, to abandon imperialist policies in a period in which the advance of socialism, the victories of the national liberation movements and the strength of rival capitalist powers had severely weakened the position of British imperialism.

Instead of recognizing the need for a drastic change of course, in alliance with the new and developing forces in the world, these governments tried to put the clock back. They embarked on colonial wars in Malaya, Cyprus, Kenya and Aden. They entered into a war alliance with the U.S., directed against the Soviet Union, and turned Britain into an American nuclear base. British corporations were en-

couraged to invest abroad, instead of at home. Vast sums were spent on armaments, while the basic industries of Britain were run-down, equipment became outdated and obsolete, and the country was less and less able to compete in world markets.

Thus when the slump in the capitalist world developed, it hit Britain with special force. Unemployment soared, living standards were reduced, and there were major cutbacks in the social services. The political consequences of this were bound to be very great. The two major political parties which had dominated the country's political life for over half-a-century proved incapable of solving its problems. This resulted in a growing disillusionment with them, and a weakening of their hold.¹

The effects of the crisis were also felt within each party. The Tories moved to the right, so that the Thatcher government elected in 1979 has been the most reactionary one for decades, slashing public spending still further, breaking up nationalized industries, dismantling the social services, carrying forward the de-industrialization of Britain, and pursuing a bitterly anti-Soviet and pro-American foreign policy. Many who voted Tory have lived to regret it. As a result, the "Iron Lady" is suffering from metal fatigue.

In the Labour Party, on the other hand, the left has been on the advance. Progressive decisions were taken at the Labour Party conference early this year committing the party to a policy of expanding the economy, reducing unemployment, extending public ownership, withdrawing from the Common Market and cutting the arms bill. The conference also opposed the medium-range missile programs, and called for unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain. However, Labour Party conferences have passed similar progressive resolutions in the past, only to have them completely ignored by the leadership of the parliamentary Labour Party. Thus the decisions taken at recent Labour Party conferences on democracy within the party were equally as important as those on policy.

They were designed, first, to make members of Parliament far more accountable to the local

Labour parties by ending the position in which, once elected as MPs, they often continue indefinitely without having to face a process of re-selection; and second, to end the monopoly of the parliamentary Labour Party in electing the leader and deputy leader of the party, which in future will be carried through by an electoral college in which the affiliated trade unions and the constituency Labour parties are strongly represented.

The right wing in the Labour Party understood the significance of these decisions, which, if carried forward, would greatly strengthen the position of the left inside the party, and could end the domination of the right.

But the right-wing leaders were divided on how to fight against the real possibility of such a transformation, and of a Labour government committed to policies which would challenge capitalism rather than try to prop it up. The main group decided that the best tactic was to stay in the Labour Party, continue to fight the left, and try to reverse the progressive decisions taken, or at any rate prevent their successful operation.

Others concluded that, whatever the immediate ups-and-downs of the struggle might be, the victory of the left is in the long run irreversible, and that therefore the best tactic was to leave the Labour Party and form the Social Democratic Party.

They calculate that such a party will attract the support of many of those disillusioned with the Labour and Tory parties, who are not prepared to vote for a left policy, nor, for one reason or another, to support the existing "center" party, the Liberal Party. But since they also consider that by themselves the Social Democrats would not win a decisive number of seats, they are negotiating with the Liberals to form an electoral alliance.

It is 91 years since Engels wrote of the London May Day demonstration in 1890 that "the English proletariat, which has now been providing the great Liberal Party with its tail and its herd of voting cattle for over 40 years, has at last awakened to new and independent life and action."² Now the Gang of Four are trying to put the clock back and again turn the working class into voting cattle for the Liberals and Social Democrats.

In their most optimistic moments the British Social Democrats speak of this alliance winning a sufficient number of seats to form a government. At the very least, they hope that it could win enough to hold the balance of power between the Tory and Labour Parties, decide

what type of government should be formed, and strongly influence its policies.

The threat to the two main parties which they represent was demonstrated by the Warrington by-election on July 16, 1981. Warrington was considered to be a safe Labour constituency. In the 1979 general election the Labour candidate was returned with a majority of 10,000 over the Tory. The SDP decided to contest with Roy Jenkins as candidate in the by-election, with Liberal support.

The result was a crushing blow to the Tories, a sharp warning to Labour, and a great encouragement to the Social Democrats. From 9,032 in the general election, the Tory vote went down to only 2,102. Labour's vote went down from 19,306 to 14,280. In their first parliamentary contest the Social Democrats polled 12,521 votes — 42.4 per cent of the poll to Labour's 48.4 per cent. The Labour majority declined to a mere 1,759.³

However, the Warrington result, and subsequent SDP and Liberal advances in local government by-elections, have struck heavy blows at the complacency with which many Labour and Tory leaders regarded the SDP's emergence only a few months ago. Then Michael Foot, for example, said that it was an "irrelevancy" and "would not win a single seat" in the next general election. The Communist Party warned at the time that this was an incorrect assessment, and that "the labor movement would be very unwise to dismiss the launching of the Social Democratic Party as of no consequence."⁴

After Warrington, right-wing Labour leaders began to change their tune. They had to recognize the threat to Labour which the SDP represents, but tried to turn it to their own advantage by claiming that the cause of the problem was the fight of the left within the Labour Party, which had allegedly antagonized the electorate. Naturally they ignored completely the disillusionment and frustration caused by the policies of successive Labour governments, in which it was the right, and not the left, which was dominant. The aim of the left fight in the Labour Party is to bring about a break with the policies which led to the Tory victory at the last general election, and give electors an opportunity to vote for a real alternative to the Thatcher government.

What Warrington does show, however, is that it is not enough to win advances for left policies within the Labour Party. As Gordon McLennan said in an article on the by-election: "The great question has been and remains — to make key policies of the labor movement the center of popular debate and action, and to win

majority support for them among the people in the workplaces and communities throughout the country."⁵

Countering the SDP also involves an exposure of the real character of the policies which it puts forward. On a number of questions these are not clear, partly because of divisions among the Social Democrats themselves, and also because of the problem of reaching agreement with the Liberals. There is also an element of deliberate vagueness, expressed in the words of William Rodgers who said that the party would "formulate its policy gradually over the next few years" and that "it would be premature to have detailed policies immediately on all issues."

And in any case, the position of the SDP on a number of crucial questions is already clear. Foremost among them is British membership in the Common Market, of which the Social Democrats are fanatical supporters. This presents them with a problem since a substantial majority of the British people want Britain to withdraw from the Market. Indeed, a public opinion poll showed that 54 per cent of their own supporters wanted such a withdrawal, and a substantial proportion of the electorate thought that this was in fact the policy of the Social Democrats. Realizing the unpopularity of the Common Market, Roy Jenkins tried to play down the question in the by-election. But as SDP policy on this question becomes clearer to people it may well diminish support for the Social Democrats.

They are also wholly committed to the war alliance with the U.S. and NATO, and are bitter critics of the Labour Party conference's commitment to unilateral nuclear disarmament and of its rejection of any defense strategy based on nuclear deterrence.

On domestic policy they are devotees of the "mixed economy" — in other words, the present capitalist economy, with about 20 per cent publicly-owned and 80 per cent privately-owned, the whole dominated by giant international firms to whose needs the publicly-owned sector is made subservient.

Roy Jenkins openly repudiates any idea that his aim is socialism. In a *Sunday Times* interview in February 1981 he said: "Oh, socialism! I haven't used that word for years. If you mean nationalizing the means of production, distribution and exchange, that leads to disaster."⁶ Others, like Shirley Williams, do use the word socialism, but make clear that in reality they are against anything remotely resembling it. She writes in her book *Politics Is for the People*: "A traditional socialism steeped in old industrial attitudes and based on the class war has be-

come obsolete".⁷ Her "socialism" involves no challenge to the big multinational corporations, and no extension of public ownership, but only a call for governments to "encourage small-scale enterprise."⁸

David Owen, in his book *Face the Future*, also makes clear his opposition to an extension of public ownership. Like the Tories, he capitalizes on the weaknesses of the type of nationalization operated in Britain. The nationalized industries have been seen as serving primarily the needs of the big capitalist firms. Their pricing policies have therefore been to the disadvantage of the working class consumers, they have been denied sufficient investment capital at low rates of interest for modernization, they have been run by bureaucrats and representatives of big business without any real participation either of the workforce or the consumers, and they have been constantly attacked in the capitalist-owned media.

Thus Owen refers to the "considerable disillusionment about the practical working of the nationalized industries"⁹ and on this basis argues against further major nationalization. In particular he opposes the overall nationalization of North Sea oil, out of whose exploitation the big oil companies, several of them American-owned, make huge profits. "Socialists must cease to believe that the only way of ensuring economic advance is to reproduce the old patterns of state nationalization,"¹⁰ says Owen. But what he means by that is not that the "old patterns" should be replaced by new, democratic forms, but that nationalization itself should be abandoned as a method of challenging the control of the economy by the big multinational firms.

The Social Democrats are in favor of some form of wage restraint, though it is not yet clear exactly what they will finally propose. Roy Jenkins has advocated the establishment of a "pay commission" which would decide disputes over wages and enforce its findings "through a weakening of a potential striker's financial position in the realm of tax rebates, supplementary benefits, and reduced redundancy payments."¹¹ In other words workers would be subject to financial coercion to compel them to accept low wages. David Owen argues for "a decentralized policy that relies on a mixture of market forces, controls and comparability," which, he revealingly adds, "should be able to be maintained by successive governments of whatever party."¹² This is an invitation to the trade unions to put their heads in a noose which could then be tightened by either Tory or right-wing Labour governments.

It will be seen from the above that the Social

Democrats take up the classical reformist position. They have no intention of changing the existing social order. Their main concern is to prevent the election of a government which might take the first steps in that direction. Since they accept the continuation of the capitalist system, there is no question of them making any attempt to transform the capitalist state machine.

As reformists always have, they try to head off the movement for socialism by proposing minor reforms within the capitalist system. As compared with their predecessors, however, their scope even in this direction is limited by the depth of capitalist crisis, which precludes concessions to the workers. Indeed, their policies are a continuation of those which have reduced the living standards of millions of workers and placed in jeopardy the fruits of decades of struggle by the working people. What changes they do propose are purely cosmetic, designed to reconcile the people to the continuation of capitalism by giving them the illusion of participation, while the real power remains with the capitalist monopolies.

The fact that they have broken away from the Labour Party is itself a reflection of the crisis of reformism, since they have concluded that it is no longer possible to rely on the Labour Party as an instrument of reformist policies. This, and not the immediate policies they advocate, is their difference with the right-wing social democrats who have remained within the Labour Party.

But their break with the Labour Party also means that they have turned decisively against one of the features which have made it unique among social-democratic parties — its base in and intimate connection with the trade unions. Originally the votes of the affiliated trade unions, along with the influence of the parliamentary party, were seen as the counter to the more left-wing tendencies of the constituency Labour parties. But in recent years the influence of the left has grown in the unions, which are no longer a reliable bulwark of the right. Hence the antagonism of the Social Democrats to the unions, and their tendency to line up with the Tories in attacking "excessive trade union power." But this deprives them of an important organized base, and underlines the fact that what they are setting out to create is an almost exclusively electoral machine, even more confined to the electoral field than the Labour Party has been.

Obviously on all the major issues of domestic and foreign policy there is virtually no difference between the right-wing social democrats who remain in the Labour Party and those who

have left to form the SDP. But the leaders of the new party realize that if they are to have any hope of winning support they must at least give the appearance of offering something different from the past. They therefore talk ceaselessly about "decentralization" and "participation," as if these were two magic words which would solve all the problems of Britain. Here again they are capitalizing on the unpopularity of policies pursued by both Tory and Labour governments, which have produced a popular reaction against overcentralization and bureaucratic measures. Many people in Britain rightly feel that they have little or no say in what happens. They are treated as vote-fodder, to be wooed in elections every few years, but forgotten in between time.

Mrs. Thatcher and the Tories also capitalized on this feeling, by claiming that they were against too much "state control" and were in favor of "freedom of the individual." But more than two years of Thatcher government has convinced a good many who were deceived at the last election that Tory policies, far from extending freedom or democracy, have ruthlessly extended the powers of central government over local government, attacked working people's rights, deprived three million of the right to work, and increased racial discrimination and authoritarianism.

The Social Democrats claim that they will, unlike the Tories, bring about genuine participation by the people in the running of the country. On close examination, however, this turns out to be as big a confidence trick as Mrs. Thatcher's.

To begin with, the unqualified support which the Social Democrats give to the Common Market means far more centralization and much less democracy. Literally thousands of EEC regulations, not made in Britain but in Brussels, affect almost every aspect of the lives of the people, who feel that the Brussels bureaucrats are even more remote than those in London.

Then the SDP proposes to leave untouched the power of the giant multinational firms, so that a handful of unelected businessmen and financiers will continue to take decisions in secret without the slightest attempt to consult the millions affected by those decisions.

Social Democrat proposals on industrial democracy, far from representing anything new, amount to a plea for class collaboration. Shirley Williams says that industrial democracy is needed to bring about "greater cooperation in improving the productivity of all factors of production, and a better understanding of the

need for voluntary incomes and prices policies to combat inflation"¹³

David Owen makes his aims even more clear, refusing to accept the principle that worker directors should be elected through the trade union machinery, and arguing that non-trade-unionists should have the right to ballot and "reject the trade union nominee."¹⁴ This would undermine trade unionism and the whole system of collective bargaining in British industry.

The foreign and defense policies advocated by the Social Democrats involve centralized decisions on matters of life and death which will not be taken by the British people, or even by their elected representatives, but by the top brass of NATO and American politicians and generals. David Owen, while professing to be in favor of more "debate" on defense questions, shows his real attitude when, referring to the last Labour government's secret decision to spend £1 billion on hardening the Polaris missile warheads, he justifies his acceptance of it by saying: "As Foreign Secretary in 1977 I did not think the savings justified a political row."¹⁵

Obviously there will be, in the rag-bag of proposals for decentralization and reform made by the Social Democrats, a number that will be useful and worthy of support. This also applies to their demand for electoral reform and a system of proportional representation. The Communist Party has long argued for this, though not for the particular method which the Social Democrats support.

But for the most part the SDP leaders use talk about decentralization as a verbal smokescreen behind which they stand for undemocratic and elitist policies. Nothing shows their real position more clearly than their attitude to the great movements of the British people which are developing at present. Millions of people are refusing to be passive victims of the Tory government and are actively fighting back. There is a powerful campaign for disarmament and peace, led by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and other peace organizations, whose support has snowballed in recent months. But the Social Democrats are opposed to it.

The fight against unemployment is developing apace. The People's March for Jobs in May, from the North of England and Wales to London, received warm support in every town and village through which it passed, and culminated in the biggest post-war rally seen in Trafalgar Square, with 150,000 present. Workers in industries and factories threatened with closure refuse to accept it. But the Social Democrats stand aside from these struggles. Nor have

they been active in support of the fight of Black people against racial discrimination, or of those who are campaigning for an end to oppression in Northern Ireland and a democratic solution to its problems, or of the movement for women's liberation.

To talk interminably about "participation," but run away from the mass activity of the working people as if it was the plague, exposes the fraudulent character of the SDP propaganda. What its leaders want is to dampen down the real struggle, to persuade the workers that the class war is, in Shirley William's words, "obsolete," and to divert the movement into channels which are "safe" from the point of view of the ruling class.

What conclusions should the labor and progressive movement draw from the split in the Labour Party and the establishment of the SDP? First, it would be wrong to dismiss it as a "nine-day wonder," as some Labour leaders have. It is possible that in alliance with the Liberals it could attract sufficient support to prevent the election of a Labour government. Second, the fact that some of the right-wing leaders have left the Labour Party should not obscure the continued presence and influence of the many who still remain in the party. They are, indeed, conducting a bitter counter-attack against the left, resorting in their desperation to a flood of vituperation against supporters of left policies like Tony Benn, and increasingly also attacking the Communist Party. Former Prime Minister James Callaghan, for example, argues that Labour MPs should defy conference decisions on the election of the leader, and continue to elect the leader themselves without reference to the constituency parties or the affiliated trade unions. He has also made clear that he would like to see re-introduced the list of proscribed organizations, designed to prevent the association of Labour and Communist Party members, which was abolished some time ago under pressure from the left.

Third, the left in the labor movement needs itself to come forward as the champion of democracy and participation, and not leave this ground for the Social Democrats to conquer. That means giving support to the demands for devolution of government and the setting up of Scottish and Welsh parliaments, democratizing local government and the National Health Service, encouraging community groups, supporting women's liberation and opposing racism and racial discrimination. It means working for genuine industrial democracy, including workers' representation on boards of nationalized industries, and far greater

powers and rights for trade unions in private industry.

Fourth, the importance of building a broad democratic alliance of all the forces under attack from capitalism, as advocated in the Communist Party's program *The British Road to Socialism*, is greater than ever. The labor movement cannot only be concerned with the industrial workers, vital though they are as the leadership of all the progressive forces. It must also attract to its side broad movements and social forces not directly a part of the organized working class movement. And it cannot do so by treating them simply as adjuncts of the Labour Party, whose function is merely to win Labour votes in elections. This is still the tendency of many of the Labour Party lefts.

Fifth, the Social Democrats, the Liberals and the Tories will not be defeated just by electoral preparations and battles. What is crucial is the development of mass action by the people now, and here again the Communist Party has a particular role. Throughout its history it has combatted the narrow electoral approach which has characterized the Labour Party, and stimulated and participated in the great mass struggles of the British people. The latest example of this was the part it played in initiating, inspiring and organizing the People's March for Jobs, with the *Morning Star* as the only national daily paper supporting and publicizing the march from the outset.

Sixth, the labor movement not only requires an immediate alternative economic and political strategy to that of the Tories, but a strategy for socialism. The need for the socialist transformation of society is emphasized every day by the deepening crisis of capitalism. That is why the immediate struggle must be linked with the revolutionary objective of changing the system itself. The only serious attempt to put forward such a strategy has been that made by the Communist Party in *The British Road to Socialism*.

Nuclear Strategy and Common Sense

Nikolai Luzin

cloth \$4.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

It follows from what has been said above that the strengthening of the Communist Party itself is vital if the left advances are to be extended and consolidated.

Only a party based on Marxism can clarify the way forward, help unite the forces of progress, effectively combat the influence of reformism in the labor movement and relate current struggles to the aim of socialism. Just because the Labour Party is a federal and broadly-based party embracing many trends of opinion, it cannot be a Marxist party. The Communist Party does not seek to replace it as the federal party of the working class, but argues that a Marxist party is also needed, and that strengthening the Communist Party would strengthen the Labour Party itself and the whole of the left and progressive forces.

If developments in the British labor movement take place along these lines, the impact of the Social Democrats will be reduced to a minimum, and the chances of returning to a Labour government committed to left policies will be substantially increased.

1. The votes in general elections were some measure of this. For example, in 1951 the percentage of the total electorate voting either Tory or Labour was 80, whereas by October 1974 it had sunk to 54.7, and recovered only to 61 by 1979. The Liberal share of the vote rose from 2.5 per cent in 1951 to 19.3 per cent in February 1974, declining to 13.8 per cent in 1979. (But under the undemocratic British electoral system they won a far smaller proportion of seats in Parliament — 2.2 per cent at their peak in 1974.)

2. *The Fourth of May in London*, article in Vienna Arbeiterzeitung, May 23, 1891.

3. This result exceeded the expectations of the Social Democrats themselves and the forecasts of the opinion polls and political commentators. Obviously it would be unwise to read too much into the result of a single by-election. If the trend at Warrington were repeated in a general election it would mean that the SDP-Liberal alliance would have a crushing overall majority of MPs. But past experience has shown that people often vote differently in general elections, when the big issue is what government will be elected, than in by-elections, when only a single seat is at stake.

Moreover, the government is not compelled constitutionally to hold a general election before 1984, though mass pressure could, of course, force an earlier election. A great deal could happen in the intervening period.

4. Gordon McLennan, CPGB General Secretary, *Morning Star*, March 27, 1981.

5. *Morning Star*, August 1, 1981.

6. *The Sunday Times*, Feb. 15, 1981.

7. S. Williams, *Politics Is for the People*, London, 1981, p. 16.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

9. D. Owen, *Face the Future*, London, 1981, p. 175.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 216.

11. *Morning Star*, February 24, 1981.

12. D. Owen, *Face the Future*, p. 165.

13. S. Williams, *Politics Is for the People*, p. 140.

14. D. Owen, *Face the Future*, p. 270.

15. D. Owen, *Face the Future*, pp. 484-485.



The law: on whose side?

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE AND THE REAL POTENTIALITIES OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

To the Editors:

Your article on the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries for its rights (May 1981) gives figures testifying to the sweep of the strike movement. I think that these data indicate not only a growing dissatisfaction of the working people, but also the potentialities they enjoy in standing up for their demands. In the FRG, for instance, the right to strike is written into the constitution. But your authors have repeatedly asserted that the bourgeois authorities limit this right. Is there not some contradiction here?

Ahmed Boussalam
Bizerte, Tunisia

The editors asked the Socio-Economic Department of the World Federation of Trade Unions to answer the reader's question.

The right to strike is one of the important social rights of the working people. It is written into many documents of the United Nations and the International Labor Organization. Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Trade Union Rights, approved by the Ninth World Congress of Trade Unions (Prague, April 16-22, 1978) says: "The working people have the right to participate in any action in defense of their interests, whatever form this may assume: be it strike, boycott, picketing, sit-in or any other form of trade-union struggle." Article 6 of the Declaration says that "the working people, regardless of their trade, have the right to resort to strikes, and participation in strikes like demonstrations of solidarity and support can never be a pretext for dismissal, punishment, fine, sanction or harassment of either before, during or after the strike."

In the various capitalist countries, legislation takes a different view of this vital right: in some countries, where authoritarian regimes rule, strikes are simply banned, in others, they are officially permitted. But the reality of this right depends on the balance of class forces, the organization and militancy of the workers'

ranks, the capability of the bourgeoisie to maintain its domination by various methods: by means of direct suppression of the masses or through social demagoguery and deceit.

In any case, monopoly capital seeks in every way to curb and even to nullify the right to strike. This is done in various ways, first of all by economic means.

In a capitalist country the strike is an instrument of struggle that is extremely painful for the working people themselves. In the capitalist world today strikes can be used only, as a rule, by working people who are unionized, who are capable of setting up special strike funds, who rely on the strength of national and international workers' solidarity and so on. For instance, in the FRG a strike by printing workers in 1976 cost the trade union 33 million marks, and a strike by metal workers in Wurtemberg in 1978 — 130 million marks.

But one should bear in mind that in many countries far from a majority of the working population is unionized. Thus, in the United States some 20 per cent of all the workers are unionized. The relations between the employers and the rest, 80 per cent of the workers, are based on the principle of "either you accept my terms or get out."

Considering, in addition, that virtually every working person in a capitalist country is faced with the threat of losing his job, with thousands of people prepared to take his place, one will easily realize that it is no easy thing to take a decision to strike.

Let us also note that apart from collective bargaining and strikes, the means available to trade unions in the capitalist countries for defending the demands of the working people are highly limited. Cardinal problems like investment policy, distribution of incomes, pricing, economic planning, etc., are, as a rule, outside the sphere of trade-union control.

Quite different is the case in the socialist world, where the trade unions have a say in decision-making on such matters at every level, from the management of individual enterprises to the highest organs of state power. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the State Committee

for Labor and Social Matters, which establishes the level of wages, can take no relevant decisions without coordinating them with the trade unions. Implementation of plans for socio-economic development, establishment of norms for the remuneration of labor and job rates, the elaboration, approval and realization of labor laws, and the use of social funds—all these and many other key problems fall within the competence of trade unions in the socialist countries.

In capitalist society, trade unions are forced to resort to strikes because there is virtually no other way for the working people to back up their demands.

But does that mean that there is a freeway for the strike struggle? Not at all. The bourgeois state, its legislation and judicial system erect numerous barriers to the exercise of the right to strike. First of all, in many countries whole categories of working people are altogether prohibited from striking, like the workers of government enterprises and institutions. Many types of strikes are banned. In the FRG, for instance, there is a ban on wild-cat strikes which are not directed by the trade union. There is a direct prohibition of strikes designed to put pressure on government agencies, for these are classified as "political" strikes. But today the key problems on which the working people's living conditions depend have to be decided precisely by these institutions. This means matters like social security, medical services, education and professional training, access to culture, athletic facilities, housing conditions, transport service.

However, even the strikes which are recognized as legitimate are hedged with diverse conditions and limitations. Legislation in the FRG, which the author of the letter mentions, is not confined to the constitution alone. It requires, for instance, that strikes should meet the criterion of "honest struggle," "commensurability" and even "the preservation of peace at the enterprise." If these principles, which are subject to highly arbitrary interpretation, are not observed, in the opinion of the authorities, various sanctions are applied against strikers, ranging from compensation of losses to the owners to police repression.

Among the grounds for police intervention in the strike struggles may also be laws on criminal responsibility for "a breach of internal tranquillity," on "coercion," on "material damage," and so on. Police instruction No. 100 requires that FRG citizens should inform the police authorities on "the numbers and make-up of those who support the strike, and those who want to continue to work, on the previous

and expected behavior of the participants in the strike, on radical groupings." The instruction provides for measures in defense of strike-breakers and punishment of persons guilty of "illegal behavior," which may apply, for instance, to the participants in strike pickets.

Lockouts, the mass dismissals of workers and employees by their employers, is one of the severe means of struggle used by the monopolies in their fight against strikes. Lockouts are a harsh measure of economic coercion applied to the working people who are deprived of the means of subsistence when they lose their jobs: wages, the right to receive sick benefits, unemployment benefits, etc. In the FRG, lockouts have been repeatedly used by employers against trade unions, notably against the printing workers from 1976 to 1978, and against the steel workers in 1978.

And when the role of employer is assumed by the bourgeois state, a lockout may have even worse consequences. A case in point was the suppression of the U.S. air controllers' strike last August. The White House answered the trade union's demand for higher pay and better working conditions by firing 12,217 employees without the right to return to the job. An exorbitant fine was imposed on the union. Five union leaders found themselves behind bars, and another 30 are awaiting trial. To thwart the strike, the administration used its military machinery. The controllers' jobs were assigned to Air Force specialists.

Needless to say, this pressure tactic is favored by bourgeois justice. Thus, the FRG's highest court authority on labor relations, in a recent ruling handed down on a trade-union complaint, admitted, even if with some reservations, the "legality" of lockouts. The court argued that both parties had to have "equal rights."

In this way the authorities seek to create the impression that the parties involved are not exploiters and exploited, but some kind of "social partners" who have temporarily fallen out with each other.

By equating the lockout and the strike, the bourgeois court ignores the fact that in these conflicts the monopoly bourgeoisie has tremendous advantages over the workers. Wielding tremendous economic might, it can absorb even long interruptions of production with relative ease. For workers and employees, dismissal means the loss of their very subsistence.

In justifying curbs and bans on strikes, bourgeois sociologists and propagandists paint pictures of a "transformed" capitalist society in which strikes have allegedly outlived themselves. One paper says: "The erstwhile great

antithesis: workers on the one hand, and employers on the other, no longer exists in the old acute form." That is why "strikes and lock-outs need to be banned. They are unworthy of the modern industrial state based on social responsibility and lead to unnecessary explosions of emotions and a kindling of hatred instead of an awareness of community."¹

This is being said about a country where the monopolies receive fabulous profits through the ever more intense exploitation of the working class, and where — as in other imperialist countries — a privileged élite holds the lion's share of the social wealth created by the working people. That is why there is apparently, in fact, no "common destiny" of which *Frankfurter Allgemeine* wrote and which is allegedly undermined by strikes.

Under capitalism, the means of production, do not, after all, belong to the people as a whole, but to private individuals; they do not serve the common but private interests, the interests of their owners, who are not concerned with the public good, but with making the maximum profit and getting rich. In their drive for profit they display little concern for the requirements of broad masses of people, for society as a whole. Take the current restructuring of the economy in the leading imperialist countries, where the transnational monopolies in quest of more profitable investments are folding up whole industries, closing down enterprises and transferring them elsewhere. They are not at all worried by the fact that thousands upon thousands of working people are left jobless to live in poverty and privation. The owners of the monopolies do not have the public good on their mind when they hike the prices of their goods, so generating inflation which erodes the wage increases won by the workers in stubborn struggle, and which depresses the living standards of the masses. The monopolies have no concern for the needs of the working people, rationalizing production in such a way that more and more thousands of jobless go to swell the army of unemployed.

Of course, things would have been quite different if the means of production were owned by the whole people and serving the society as a whole, that is, if the relations of production were not capitalist but socialist. In that case, an interruption of production, whose purpose is to raise the well-being of broad masses of people and satisfy the requirements of the whole people, would indeed harm the working people's interests. No wonder then that the workers of engineering works in Novosibirsk gave this answer to the question: "Why are there no strikes in the USSR?": "We cannot

benefit from a strike. A strike is tantamount to robbing oneself and throwing one's own money to the winds."

Let us emphasize that while socialism does not abolish the right to strike (there is no such ban in the legislation of the socialist countries) it does create the objective prerequisites for regulating labor relations in another way: not by strikes, which have a destructive effect on the production basis, but within the framework of a socio-political mechanism which helps to take into account, coordinate and safeguard the interests of all the sections of the working people, and to secure their balanced and purposeful satisfaction.

In socialist society, the trade unions have rights which enable them to solve — at the highest state level — problems which are of vital importance to industrial and office workers, and to regulate labor relations in such a way as to reckon most fully with the requirements of their members. It is characteristic, for instance, that in the USSR the Labor Code, which has the force of state-wide law, has been drawn up by the trade unions themselves and only then approved by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

In accordance with the Statute of the Trade Unions of the USSR, they have the right of legislative initiative in the higher organs of state power, and are involved in the preparation and examination by the government of draft decrees on wages, social insurance, labor protection, and cultural and everyday services for the working people. They control the observance of the laws and the government's decrees on these matters. The Soviet trade unions periodically hear relevant reports from central planning and economic agencies, and also ministries and state committees. In the event of a breach by managerial personnel of the legislated rights of industrial and office workers, trade-union organizations exercise their protective functions and are entitled to resort to fines and other sanctions. Such managerial personnel can be and are, in fact, relieved of their posts at the demand of the trade unions.

Trade unions in other socialist countries also enjoy extensive rights and powers in various spheres of social and production life.

Consequently, socialism provides all the objective conditions for regulating relations in production without strikes, which have a damaging effect on the socialist economy. Only mistakes and neglect in the use of these opportunities, in socio-economic policy can result in a sharpening of labor conflicts and the emergence of a crisis situation, as has happened in Poland. It was said at the sixth

plenary meeting of the PUWP CC that the situation in the country was affected by "grave errors" and "neglect of the economic laws of socialism..." In the fraternal socialist countries, trade unions have more important positions than they do in Poland and have broader opportunities at their disposal.²

That is the atmosphere in which ground is created for strikes, from which an overwhelming majority of the working people cannot benefit in any way, and which only play into the hands of the enemies of socialism. Speakers at the February session of the Sejm said that as a result of the decline in production and the disorganization of the normal working rhythm "there is a reduction in the material factors of the country's viability,

ty, and a narrowing down of the basis for implementing social tasks and improving living and working conditions."³

From this it follows that only a class analysis of the concrete character of strike action and the concrete socio-economic conditions can show the orientation of strikes and their role and place in the struggle of the working class for its rights, and for its immediate and long-term goals. That is the thrust of the answer to the question raised in the reader's letter.

Mario Ramos

WFTU Socio-Economic Department

1. *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, March 6, 1979.
2. *Trybuna Ludu*, October 5, 1980.
3. *Ibid.*, February 13, 1981.

In memory of S.A. Wickremasinghe

The death occurred recently of Sugeeshwara Abeywardena Wickremasinghe, noted leader of the Sri Lankan and international communist and working-class movement, Chairman of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka. The heart of a fiery patriot, staunch internationalist and tested champion of the working people's interests is beating no more.

S.A. Wickremasinghe was born into the family of a village headman in southern Sri Lanka on April 13, 1901. He was educated in Colombo and London and began his adult life as a physician. When still a student he was deeply influenced by the ideas of the victorious socialist revolution in Russia under whose impact the peoples of numerous colonial and dependent countries rose to fight their foreign enslavers. On his return to Sri Lanka, Wickremasinghe devoted himself to the task of organizing a movement for national independence and the radical social transformation of this country.

In 1931 he was elected to the State Council of Ceylon and came out as a member of it for radical reforms.

Wickremasinghe played an active part in the formation of the Suriya Mal anti-imperialist movement on whose basis the Socialist Party of Sri Lanka — the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) was founded in 1935 with a view to winning national independence and building a socialist society. When Trotskyists gained control of the party he began an uncompromising struggle against them and in defense of the position of the Communist International. Expelled from the LSSP for his ideological convictions,

he gave all his energies to the founding of a real vanguard organization of the working class. He was one of the founders of the United Socialist Party, predecessor of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka (CPSL).

From 1943, when the CPSL was founded, to his death S.A. Wickremasinghe was a member of its Central Committee and CC Political Bureau. He was alternately elected Chairman and General Secretary of the CC. His work at these leading posts was a fine example of dedication to communist ideals, of devoted service in the cause of the working class. Incarceration and other repressive measures by the authorities did not deter him from his chosen course.

Wickremasinghe made a lasting contribution to the development of a militant trade union movement in Sri Lanka. He was Chairman of the Ceylon Trade Union Federation, later called Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions, until 1950 and a member of the Executive Committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions from 1949 to 1953.

His numerous writings and speeches at party congresses, in parliament and at other forums helped for more than half a century to evolve the policy of the Sri Lankan revolutionary movement and publicize it among the masses. He contributed many rousing articles to *World Marxist Review* and did much to promote creative cooperation between the CPSL and WMR.

Communists and democrats the world over will always remember Sugeeshwara Abeywardena Wickremasinghe.

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

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS

320 West Ohio Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

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'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

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 Kobenhavn 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 Hirlap, 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,
Khâu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

