

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

September 1983, Volume 26, Number 9 \$1.00



Vietnam / 15

**USA —
Hall / 3**

**Greece:
party work / 27**

**Crucial year
for Europe / 38**

Monetarism / 19

**South
Africa / 20**



WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

September 1983, Vol. 26, No. 9

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

1 To our readers

Features

- 3 USA: against the currents of time
Gus Hall
- 8 Traditions serve contemporaneity
D. Urbany (Luxembourg)
- 15 Vietnam: strategy of building socialism and defending its gains
Hoang Tung
- 20 South Africa: stepping up the fight against the racist enemy
A. Nzo

The Party

- 27 Party work: criteria of effectiveness
C. Tsolakis (Greece)
- 33 New experience

Exchange of views

- 38 A crucial year for Europe
Scientists and military experts on the aims and consequences of deploying U.S. medium-range missiles
- 45 Monetarism: economic and class content
L. Harris (Great Britain)

Viewpoints

- 51 Peaceful atom: a stable orbit
M.J. Grabivker, B. Kholopov
- 58 Bangladesh: people's will — restore democracy
M. Rahman
- 62 Congo: from African realities to the socialist ideal
J.P. Thystere-Tchicaya
- 66 A mighty instrument of peace
J. Aldridge
- 70 Popular protest in Chile
C. Zuniga
- 71 Big lie brings big sting
J. West

Facts and figures

- 73 Crisis exported to developing countries

Book reviews

- 78 Trip across the USSR
S. Mark
- 79 Bitter fruit: who is it for this time?
M. Delgado

To our readers

Dear comrades,

This is an anniversary issue of *World Marxist Review* (Problems of Peace and Socialism): our journal was first put out exactly a quarter-century ago, in September 1958. It was founded by the communist and workers' parties as a theoretical and information periodical, a rostrum for the exchange of experience, and an instrument for the joint analysis and comprehension of the new problems arising before our movement. The name of the journal itself determined its main thematic line: the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation and social progress. The founding and development of *World Marxist Review* embodied the communists' international solidarity and their urge for cohesion and unity, which permeates the whole work of its international editorial collective. We see this urge as expressing the fiery call of the founders of scientific communism: "Workers of All Lands, Unite!"

What has the journal to its credit on its 25th anniversary?

On the thousands of its pages are presented the most important events of the latter half of the 20th century, the growth of the contemporary revolutionary process, and the communists' views of the changing world. That should above all be credited to the fraternal parties jointly publishing the journal and to the unique, truly global team of contributors that has taken shape through their efforts. Our authors from 124 countries — and more than 3,000 of them have already written for the journal — are themselves active makers of history. To their lot have fallen the struggle for peace, the building of socialism, participation in new revolutions and the struggle against imperialism.

Over the past quarter-century, the journal has effectively been a chronicle of the period in the development of the international communist movement abounding in major accomplishments, in which its positions have been markedly consolidated and its authority as the most influential political force of our day enhanced.

It is a chronicle of the profound changes in the world, which confirm that the general line of the social transformations in our epoch is determined by the transition from capitalism to socialism, a transition inaugurated by the Great October Socialist Revolution and continued

with the growing interaction of the three revolutionary streams: world socialism, the international working class and the national liberation movement.

It is a chronicle of the creative development of revolutionary theory by the communist and workers' parties; relying on the great ideas of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Vladimir Lenin, they have kept enriching the theory with new propositions and conclusions formulated on the basis of a scientific analysis of their experience and the practical struggle of the main revolutionary forces of our day. The indissoluble unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice is the source which steadily feeds the journal's ideological vitality.

World Marxist Review's line is worked out by periodically convened meetings of representatives of communist and workers' parties to consider the results of its activity and its main lines for the period ahead.

From the outset, action in defense of peace, against the danger of war has keynoted the material on the pages of our international publication. Every issue of the journal contains material helping to understand the social roots of the contest between the forces of peace and war, the reactionary nature and goals of the militaristic policy of imperialism and the significance of the peace initiatives of the socialist community countries. The journal has shown the steady development of the peace movement throughout the world and the communists' active participation in it, their struggle for the unity of all those who come out against the imperialist threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The ways of the socialist society's development are among the central topics of our publication. Perfection of the new system is a complicated process involving efforts to overcome difficulties and contradictions. The experience of existing socialism provides reference points for present and future revolutions. Items in the journal reflect and analyze the multifaceted practice of socialist construction, and the all-round cooperation of the fraternal parties and countries, closely tying in the analysis of these processes with the progress of the class contest in the world.

The journal devotes constant attention to the activity of the communists and the working

class of the industrialized capitalist countries and the developing countries, with special emphasis on the problems facing the communist and workers' parties, and a study of the new social phenomena against the background of the sharpening general crisis of capitalism. This approach is primarily reflected in the material on the strengthening of the anti-imperialist forces, the experience of the communists' struggle, and the impact of the ideas of scientific socialism on the working-class and the national liberation movement.

The journal helps to strengthen and enrich the fraternal parties' international ties, both through its items on the problems of proletarian internationalism and the working people's international solidarity, and on the interconnection of the broad struggle for peace, national liberation and social progress; this is also promoted by the practical work of the journal's international collective. Creative contacts between the communists of various countries are facilitated by the international theoretical conferences, symposiums, round tables and seminars which it arranges. In its quarter-century, more than 160 collective functions have been held.

In the face of the anti-communist "crusade" now being most forcibly carried on by imperialist reaction, we seek to give a more militant and vigorous tenor to WMR articles exposing bourgeois ideology and propaganda and the ugly capitalist realities. These items show the lying nature of the anti-communist campaigns and the diverse "psychological warfare" concepts against the forces of peace and social progress. The journal seeks to provide its readers with ideological weapons in the struggle against militarism and fascism, neocolonialism and racism, hegemonism and national chauvinism.

Such are the main features determining the face of our periodical, which has been shaped by the fraternal parties' efforts throughout the

whole of its quarter-century. *World Marxist Review* was set up by 20 parties. Today, the number of parties directly represented on the journal has gone up to 65. A quarter-century ago, it was published in 19 languages, and now in 40. In its early years, it was circulated in 80 countries, and now in 145, with roughly one-half of the printing distributed in the non-socialist world.

Does all of that mean that the journal's way has been free from difficulties and complications, that there has been complete unanimity on all issues, and that the way traversed has been an easy one? No, of course not. Life keeps putting before the journal ever more multifaceted tasks, calling for a theoretical comprehension of the ongoing global changes, of the whole vast diversity of forms and methods of struggle which are determined by the concrete conditions in each country and which all together add up to the worldwide experience of class battles. As fraternal parties and readers point out, the journal is still far from always capable of swiftly providing answers to the newly arising questions of revolutionary practice on the appropriate level or reflecting the changes in the contemporary conditions and the character of the class struggle with adequate fullness. The journal's international collective takes such remarks and proposals into account and seeks to raise its ideological and theoretical level, to provide more information and to make it more telling, to improve every aspect of its work so as to enable it to play more effectively the role assigned to it by the fraternal parties, and to meet the requirements of our international readership to an ever greater extent.

On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of *World Marxist Review* (Problems of Peace and Socialism), we congratulate its veterans in the various countries, our contributors and all our readers.

WMR Editorial Council



Against the currents of time

Gus Hall
General Secretary,
Communist Party, USA

USA: LAND OF CRISES AND CONTRADICTIONS

The United States of 1983 is a land of many crises, contradictions and cross currents. There is instability and change from quantity to new quality. But like the currents of a turbulent river, some are more dominant than others. And the overall flow has a clear direction. In all this, the leaky, dilapidated, corporate-Reagan river-raft labors to sail upstream against the main current.

There are cross currents in the economic arena. These are developments pressing in the opposite direction. The U.S. economy continues to be ravaged by both short-range cyclical, as well as the longer-range general crisis. And there is a continuing deterioration of the structural framework.

Factors such as the increased military orders without precedent, some decrease in stock inventories, the decline in the rate of inflation and a spurt of activity in the auto and construction industries support estimates that the economy is moving in the direction of an economic upturn.

However, on the other hand, there are factors such as the effects of the structural crisis, resulting in sick and dying industries, the continuing high chronic unemployment, continuing cuts in the government's social and economic programs, setbacks and reversals in civil rights and struggles for equality, school integration, housing, voting rights, affirmative action, cuts in social security programs, decline in real take-home wages, the continuing lack of capital investment in domestic industries, the deterioration in the U.S. share of world markets, the continuing economic crisis of world capitalism — all act as serious obstacles to any long-term, stable economic upturn.

Reaganomics continues as a serious roadblock to any economic recovery. The cuts in corporate taxes while increasing military expenditures are escalating the Federal Government debt and the ensuing interest payments on loans, thus creating a new threat on the economic front. The huge and escalating na-

tional debt constitutes a new obstacle to any long-range economic recovery.

War production contracts are breaking all records. As military goods production increases it has the short-term effect of stimulating the economy. On the other hand, however, the new war production industries are not labor intensive. And as the non-military production stagnates it tends to unbalance the economy.

Thus, war production is not a basis for a stable economic recovery. On this, Lenin observed: "When capitalists work for defense — for the state — it is obviously no longer 'pure' capitalism, but a special form of national economy. Pure capitalism means commodity production and commodity production means work for an unknown and free market. But the capitalist working for defense does not work for the market at all. He works on government orders, often with money loaned by the state."¹

The Reagan administration's drive for nuclear superiority over the socialist community by way of the MX missile, Trident submarine, laser beam weapons, Stealth bombers and the Star Wars nuclearization of outer space, continues without let-up.

Undeclared wars — the so-called covert operations — have become a major component of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. The operational policy is to overthrow the governments of Cuba, Nicaragua, Angola and Mozambique. Increasing numbers who participate and conduct these operations are U.S. military personnel out of uniform. These operations are in complete disregard of all human rights, in total violation of international law and the special laws passed by the U.S. Congress. U.S. foreign policy is fast becoming nothing more than criminal banditry.

The support for reactionary, fascist and militaristic regimes and counter-revolutionary forces around the world has also reached unprecedented levels. The United States has become the main supply source of increasingly modern offensive weapons for all counter-revolutionary bands, such as in Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola and many other areas.

The military and economic support to fascist, racist, militaristic regimes such as South Africa, El Salvador, Chile and Guatemala is also now on a massive scale.

In the Middle East, Israel continues its role as an imperialist expansionist power itself, as well as a heightened role as a surrogate for U.S. imperialism. Israel continues its genocidal warfare against the Palestinian people. In the process, U.S. imperialism is establishing new military bases in Egypt, Lebanon, and the Sinai.

The active engineering and conducting of world counter-revolutions — of a counter-revolutionary network — is a major component in the Reagan administration's foreign policy, which has reached unprecedented levels. Besides the CIA and four military intelligence departments, the Pentagon has set up a secret headquarters to carry out covert and overt military operations and counter-revolutions worldwide.

In all parts of the world U.S. imperialism continues to be the main support base for all the forces of reaction who are fighting to turn back and stop the clock of the world revolutionary process. More than ever, the Reagan administration's policies, based on the big lie of anti-Sovietism, are on a collision course with the main currents and trends, both at home and abroad.

At this critical moment everyone has to see clearly who really promotes peace and who advocates war. It takes two to tango, but to unleash a military conflict one side is enough. Facts are stubborn, a look at the record speaks for itself.

— The Soviet Union has pledged no first use of nuclear weapons; the United States has refused to join in this pledge.

— The Soviet Union has signed and adhered to the SALT-II Treaty; the United States accuses the Soviet Union of violating the treaty, a treaty the U.S. Senate refused to even vote on.

— The Soviet Union has unilaterally reduced its nuclear stockpile and missiles, in addition to its conventional armed forces, in a gesture of its peaceful intentions; the U.S. responds with new, more destructive weapons production and warlike moves.

— The Soviet Union has reduced its military budget, while the United States plans to spend 1.6 trillion dollars in five years.

— While the Soviet Union has proposed a treaty declaring outer space a nuclear-free zone, the Reaganites project a nuclear-mania "Star Wars" scenario to nuclearize outer space as new territory for U.S. military bases.

U.S. imperialism still harbors designs to accomplish with nuclear war what it has been

unable to do with conventional war and anti-communist propaganda big lie wars — to destroy the Soviet Union and with it world socialism. It is a nuclear superiority, limited nuclear war policy that is doomed to failure. But it carries with it the deadly danger of nuclear disaster.

The recent proposals of the Soviet Union for marked reductions of nuclear warheads and delivery systems based on equal levels sets the only just and workable basis for the disarmament negotiations. But the Reagan administration continues its disastrous course of seeking nuclear superiority and first strike capability, while demagogically talking about peace and nuclear arms reductions. The phoney talk of peace is a cover under which the build-up for nuclear superiority continues without let-up.

But there are opposite developments. There is growing an all-people's front against Reaganism and Reaganomics. The support base for the Reagan policies of confrontation and aggression continues to erode and narrow down, even in the ranks of monopoly corporations. The popular movement to freeze all production and deployment of nuclear weapons is supported by 75 per cent of the American people. The trade unions are increasingly becoming involved in movements for "Peace with Jobs."

The broad and growing resistance to the Reagan administration's policies is reflected in the electoral arena. In the November 1982 elections² many Reagan-supported candidates went down in defeat. The anti-Reagan coalitions of the racially and nationally oppressed, the working class and the progressive movements in the mayoralty elections in Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston were successful against the old reactionary entrenched two-party political machines.

The new factors giving accelerated impetus to the peace movement are:

— The growing realization that the United States is not a safe sanctuary from the destruction of nuclear war.

— The growing knowledge that there is a direct linkage between the increase in military expenditures and the economic problems adds a new dimension and urgency to the struggle for peace and for cutting the military budget.

— The growing realization and understanding that the source of the arms race and the danger of nuclear war is the Reagan administration's policy of nuclear superiority and limited nuclear war.

— A growing awareness that the Soviet Union is a force for peace and is ready for serious disarmament negotiations.

Within the broad peace sentiment there is a rising, conscious, anti-imperialist sentiment and movement. This is more militant and more directly focused against U.S. policies of open and direct aggression, against the policies of attempting to overthrow governments, especially in countries that have suffered from colonialism.

These movements have especially become active against the brazen U.S. policy of aggression against Nicaragua, El Salvador, Angola, Grenada and Mozambique. They are active in support of anti-imperialist and national liberation forces in countries like South Africa, Chile and Puerto Rico. There is strong support for these movements by religious organizations, members of the Congressional Black Caucus and in the movements of the people who are ethnically related to the countries of Central America and the Caribbean region.

The broad sections of the anti-imperialist sentiment are an expression of protest against the injustice and criminality of foreign interference. In their ranks there is a growing understanding that the U.S. government policies of aggression are in support of profits and exploitation by the U.S.-based transnational corporations.

One of the new forces for peace are religious organizations. The anti-war, anti-imperialist and to some extent anti-monopoly and anti-racist positions strongly expressed by most of the major religious organizations have created new centers of struggle in the overall mass people's upsurge in the United States. Their outspoken positions and statements are a significant factor in creating a moral climate that gives support to the struggles for peace, equality and justice. They are an important factor in the grass roots of the nuclear freeze movement. They have become an effective opposition to the ultra-right fascist groups that operate behind the cloak of religion. They are an important voice in the struggle for democracy. They play an important anti-imperialist role, especially in relation to the struggles against the Reagan policies of aggression in Central and Latin America.

The religious leaders of some 50 million Americans of the Catholic faith last May adopted a resolute stand in the battle for peace and to stop the war drive. In their Pastoral Letter, "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," adopted with 233 for and 9 against, the Catholic bishops declare:

"We must refuse to legitimate the idea of nuclear war. . . . We judge resort to nuclear weapons to counter a conventional attack to be morally unjustifiable. Our support of a 'No First

Use' policy must be seen in this light . . . Our government has sometimes supported repressive governments in the name of preserving freedom, has carried out repugnant operations of its own, and remains imperfect in its domestic record of insuring equal rights to all . . . We believe it is necessary, for the sake of prevention, to build a barrier against the concept of nuclear war as a viable strategy for defense. There should be a clear public resistance to the rhetoric of 'winnable' nuclear wars, or unrealistic expectations of 'surviving' nuclear exchanges, and strategies of 'protracted nuclear wars.'"

Announcing that he was "joining other religious leaders of this nation in opposing the nuclear arms race," T.J. Jemison, the leader of six million members of the National Baptist Convention, advanced a program to put his members "into the front ranks of activists for peace and to secure the social needs of the poor and racially oppressed and humiliated."

Among the major Protestant denominations, a new impetus has been given to further the peace crusade. And the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, representing Reform rabbis in 760 synagogues in the U.S. and Canada, has called for a national drive to win new support for "a verifiable nuclear arms freeze by the U.S. and the Soviet Union."

Thus, the most influential religious bodies in the U.S. have joined the old and new peace organizations, the growing numbers of trade unions and other mass organizations in giving strong voice to the peace majority in opposing the militarist policies of the Reagan administration. There is every reason to affirm that the concept, "peace is the main task of our epoch" is becoming the common sense of the overwhelming majority.

The more than 170-member-strong U.S. delegation to the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, representing a broad spectrum of the peace majority, gives a tremendous stimulus to the most varied peace and solidarity actions which take place virtually every day. A new characteristic feature developing among the defenders of peace is the unflagging, unrelenting nature of their activities. This reflects the fact that some basic propositions for peace have become solidified in the thinking of millions. The results of the latest opinion poll, conducted by the Foreign Policy Association, show 82 per cent urging negotiations on arms control with the Soviet Union and 74 per cent favoring an immediate mutual freeze on nuclear weapons.

Speaking for the more sober-minded sections of monopoly capital, Gerard C. Smith, a former

director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, criticized the Reagan "interim option" arms control proposal and asked, "Have we not learned by past experience that one-sided proposals cannot work and will only kill time?"

The main ideological drive of the Reagan administration, the mass media, the book and magazine publishers is the violent strain of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. This must be seen in the context that the most important issue before the world today is U.S.-Soviet relations. This issue contains all the main questions and contradictions of our times. In a basic sense it determines the nature of the world we live in. And even more basically, these relationships and the nature of the solutions will determine whether humanity will survive on this planet. The peace policies of the Soviet Union and the policies of war and aggression of the United States are the two opposing sides. The main question faced by nations, peoples and parties is: Which side of these opposite sides are you on?

For the United States, the contradictions and cross currents will all come into sharp focus in the 1984 Presidential elections. The outcome will be determined by how united and well organized the broad anti-Reagan forces will be. In addition to the factors giving new impetus to the peace movement, already cited, other factors are firing the people's mass upsurge and the process of radicalization. These include:

- The many-sided economic offensive resulting in a declining quality of life.

- The increased use of racism by the ruling class and the open, blatant advocacy and support for it by the Reagan administration.

- The growing realization that the structural crisis is a long-range, possibly permanent condition of life — with high unemployment and industrial stagnation.

- The high unemployment and high cost of living.

- The overall lack of security on the job and in the home.

- The growing awareness that the country cannot support both the huge military expenditures and the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

- The crumbling of the infrastructure in our urban centers and the increased homelessness and destitution of our people.

- The deterioration of public education and the increase in illiteracy.

- The deterioration of public health care, and the rising problem of mental health illness without treatment.

- The growing helplessness of the majority

of the young generation about school, jobs and a decent life.

- The mounting disillusionment with the parties of big business and the depth of corruption at all levels of government.

Like the Mississippi, the mass upsurge is fed by numerous streams and currents. The main streams that feed the river are the present and future components of the anti-monopoly all-people's front.

It is on the unity of these many components, on how well they are organized that the outcome of the 1984 elections depends.

Central to the rise of an all-people's anti-Reagan front is the unity of the multiracial, multinational working class. In the struggle for equality the main source of power comes from concepts of unity and coalitions, unity of the racially and nationally oppressed peoples, Black-white unity, coalitions of the working class with the Afro-American, Chicano and Puerto Rican communities.

A critical part of this struggle is the struggle against racism in the ranks of the white workers. Racism is the central ideological current that diverts white workers from the path of anti-imperialist consciousness. For the United States, racism is the most formidable obstacle to the development of socialist consciousness. Because we have confidence in the working class we have confidence in being able to win the struggle against racism.

Recent developments show that despite official and legal racist actions, the racist poison is losing some of its potency. This is seen in the victory of Harold Washington in Chicago who has become the first Afro-American Mayor of this second largest city after New York, the Wilson Goode primary success in the Philadelphia Mayoral race, the campaign of Tom Bradley in California, the Robert Clark Congressional race in Mississippi, the Kathy Hall campaign in Indiana and the Richard Hatcher re-election in Gary.³ The main lesson is that in a new way it is now possible to build coalitions and win, even under the most difficult circumstances and virulent racist attacks.

The mass upsurge has a militant component in the farmers. Their creative protests, demonstrations, marches and tactics continue to develop in scope and depth. With the exception of corporate managers of agribusiness, the movements and struggles involved all sectors of the farm community.

The National Conference of U.S. Farmers called by the U.S. Farmers Association was held this spring in Des Moines, Iowa, and attracted farmers from 23 states and 2 Canadian provinces. They represented more than 30 farm

organizations and coalitions. They founded the North American Farmers Alliance. The reports and resolutions passed by this conference reflected a high level of understanding, such as: ending all U.S. intervention in Central America, support for the nuclear freeze, cut the military budget, and support for a massive jobs bill. The conference placed great stress on the need to develop farmer-labor unity. It took concrete measures to achieve such unity.

The North American Farmers Alliance is an all-farmer united front formation. They have been extremely militant as separate groups. In this united association they will become an even more powerful sector. These developments can make a significant change in the political landscape. The farmers and farm communities will add an important sector to the all-people's front.

The July National Conference of unemployed, held in Chicago and attended by 500 delegates from 22 states, resulted in the formation of a national congress of unemployed for a determined struggle for the immediate needs of more than 20 million jobless. Significantly, one of the chief slogans of this new movement is, "Jobs, Not Bombs!"

The broadest expression of the peace sentiment is the movement for a nuclear freeze. This was reflected in the overwhelming vote for the freeze resolution in the U.S. Congress. In the front ranks in Congress in the fight against the Reagan administration's nuclear-militarist policies stands the Congressional Black Caucus. They express the will of the peace majority in the U.S., of which virtually the entire Afro-American community is a vital part.

This broad peace sentiment is seen in the growth of the Peace With Jobs Movement.

The peace issue is increasingly becoming the main source of the widening credibility gap between the people and the Reagan administration.

The new, higher level of women's movements brings with it an understanding that equality for women depends upon the strength and unity of the fightback against the economic gridlock, the peace front and the struggle for the unity between Black, white and all racially and nationally oppressed people. There is a growing understanding that cuts in housing, welfare, child care, health care, social security and education are all directly linked to the war policies of the Reaganites.

Our young generation is the first generation that faces permanent militarization as well as the clear and present danger of life on earth coming to a horrible end in a nuclear flash. This places an ever-present ominous pall

over our young people's lives. It leaves a terrifying imprint on how the young view the present and especially the future.

This is a generation that faces the continuous and deadly flow and penetration of racism, pushed by monopoly capital and the Reagan administration, whose influence the young generation cannot escape. This generation faces the problem of radical deterioration of the public education system, the rising wall of escalating tuition fees and the problem of growing illiteracy. This is the first generation to face the army of robots who replace human hands.

The process of radicalization of the young generation is fed by this unique set of objective circumstances. The birth of the Young Communist League on May Day weekend 1983 is a direct response to the unique problems and character of today's young people. It is a most important step forward.

The 1984 elections can be turn-around elections for our country. The overall challenge will be the reactionary policies of the Reagan administration. The Democratic Party leadership would like to steer the 1984 campaign into one of empty words, without really challenging the underpinnings of Reaganomics or the foreign policy of nuclear confrontation. The Mondales⁴ are competing with Reagan in cold war rhetoric. Such tactics will bring only defeat for anti-Reagan Congressional and Senatorial candidates.

As the campaign gets under way there could be some shifts in the position of top Democratic candidates, but only if the mass upsurge builds enough pressure and if the divisions in the ranks of the ruling class become sharper.

An indication of this potential is seen in the opinion poll conducted at the recent Democratic Party conference in the state of Wisconsin. In the vote on the preferred candidate for the Democratic Party, Mondale lost decisively to Senator Cranston of California. Cranston is generally given little chance of winning the Democratic nomination. But he is an outspoken champion of a nuclear freeze, for disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. His victory in the popularity poll shocked the Mondale camp and the political pundits. The Cranston vote shows how the peace issue has gripped the minds of millions. In its own way it points up a growing readiness among the voters to find ways of independent political expression and not to blindly follow the lines laid down by the Democratic and Republican machines.

The overall electoral developments give a new and wider meaning to the concept of political independence. This includes many of the forces who are against the Reagan policies, as

well as those who do not see the rhetoric of some of the leading Democratic candidates as the basis for a winning alternative to Reagan.

Support for the new politics of political independence ranges from those who still see this becoming a reality within the Democratic Party to those who are convinced that a new, mass anti-monopoly party is necessary now. There is a growing sentiment that the new forms must be independent of the old two-party machines, while not necessarily rejecting the possible need to use the old two-party electoral system.

The new politics of political independence that will generate mass enthusiasm must be related to the struggle for butter and against guns. They must adopt a foreign policy stance of reversing the present policies of aggression.

Within this context, the Communist Party election campaign will be a test of our ability to influence the different sectors of the all-people's front, to advance their unity in the struggle for peace, democracy and economic security. At the present stage of political development it is necessary to examine the possibilities of communists running for public office on independent lines and/or coalition tickets. Where possible, communists should

consider running as part of anti-monopoly peace and democracy slates.

Running communist candidates is the most effective form of public presence, mass propaganda and agitation. Our party campaigns are a vital and unique part of the electoral struggle, and masses now expect and welcome communist candidates.

In preparation for the 1984 elections, U.S. communists bend every effort to unite the various components of the anti-Reagan all-people's front in mass action against the siting of Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles in Western Europe, for a nuclear freeze, for serious negotiations in the disarmament talks and against the social and economic consequences of the Reagan administration's militarist-nuclear policies. They know that what is at stake is the right to life of every human being in the United States and in the world.

1. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 68-69.
2. The mid-term elections, in the course of which all members of the House of Representatives, one-third of the Senators, several state governors, and local authorities were elected. — Ed.
3. Afro-American candidates in the November 1982 local elections — Ed.
4. Walter Mondale, former Vice-President in the Carter administration, is seen as the most preferred Democratic candidate for the 1984 presidential elections. — Ed.

Traditions serve contemporaneity

Dominique Urbany
Honorary Chairman,
Communist Party of Luxembourg

Dominique Urbany, Honorary Chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, lives in a small, modest house in the quiet town of Bridel near the nation's capital. He turned 80 recently. Utterly devoted to the cause of the working class, he has been one of the founders and then leaders of the Communist Party of Luxembourg. He has been a witness and participant in major events of the century in his country and Europe and of innumerable battles and actions of the proletariat. In the 1930s he fought to unite the people against the Nazi threat; during the Second World War he was in the anti-fascist Resistance; and after the war he directed the struggle of Luxembourg's communists for the interests of the working people. Dominique Urbany is one of the long-standing contributors to *WMR*. His articles appeared in the journal shortly after it

was founded, or slightly less than a quarter of a century ago.

Following are Dominique Urbany's answers to questions put by the journal.

What do you feel is the significance of the party's traditions in its present-day activity?

For the communists of West European capitalist countries it is highly important to address the rich history of the working-class movement in order to have a better understanding of present-day problems and get a better perspective of the ongoing struggle. What I want to say is that this experience not only helps to rely on the achievements and successes of the past but also to avoid any repetition of errors. It gives a comprehensive insight into current events and allows understanding their inter-relationship and main trends of so-

cial development amidst other processes and phenomena. Sometimes, the most important problems are pushed to some extent into the background because everyday matters prevent looking properly into them.

This has always been a problem. Ever since 1918, when I entered politics (I was first a member of a young socialists organization and then became a communist), we have constantly come up against this difficulty, the difficulty of current concerns shutting out the horizon and preventing us from stopping to think. We joined battle and put forward demands in keeping with the times, but sometimes we overlooked general issues.

This had a particularly adverse effect in Luxembourg, a small country with a small population and, consequently, a small Communist Party. We had only a few people able to conduct theoretical work. Often this prevented us from examining major problems. Day-to-day affairs prevailed. We realized this and tried to remedy the situation. We managed to ensure the party's development and enjoyed successes, acting firmly with confidence in the future. The history of the Communist Party of Luxembourg is permeated with optimism.

When I speak of theory I mean the fundamentals and general principles of Marxism. I believe that we have to address the sources of our world view again and again. Otherwise, we shall be marking time and swamped by routine current business. The Marx anniversaries this year prompted us to deepen our theoretical work and study various aspects of scientific communism, to master the ideological heritage of Marx and Engels. A result of the party's efforts in this direction is our first-ever publication of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party in Letzeburgesch*.

While stressing the importance of general, fundamental aspects of our work, I should like to emphasize the significance of problems related to the class struggle and the role of the working class. There is much talk today about the situation having changed radically compared with the past, about the social structures having become different, about changes in the condition of the working people. Indeed, there now are considerably more white-collar workers, a larger stratum of skilled workers, and new professions.

Because of these changes some people assert that it is no longer the working class but other segments of society or, to put it loosely, the "people" generally that play the principal role in the historical process. Hence the party is no longer obliged to articulate the interests of the working class. Of course, in the case, say, of the

Soviet Union, the party expresses the interests of the whole people while retaining its working-class character. In the USSR there are no capitalists and landowners, no exploiters. But our people are divided. We have a big bourgeoisie and, as before, at the other pole there are the working masses and their core, the working class. The working class is still society's main productive force. It is still being oppressed. For that reason it is precisely the working class that continues to be the leading revolutionary force.

Ever since our party was founded we have been doing all in our power to develop and strengthen the class consciousness of the workers. We relied on the working class and did our best to bring socialist ideas to them, to show them the actual prospects of their struggle. The workers became aware of their strength because large-scale industry dominates the national economy and the workforce of the big enterprises — the miners and steelworkers — played the decisive role in the country's development.

True, nobody can ignore the fact that today, because of the crisis and unemployment, there is pessimism among a section of the working people. In Luxembourg the numerical strength of industrial workers has diminished dramatically on account of the decline and closures in the steel and mining industries. In the steel industry, for example, the number of jobs was cut by one-third in the latter half of the 1970s.

Never before have the communists faced so acutely as now the task of fighting the mood of despair, of sustaining the workers' confidence in their strength, and countering the pressure from the bourgeoisie. Recently I spoke to a young member of the CPL's leadership who works at a steel mill. He is a member of the local trade union committee. I asked him what the workers were talking about at the mill. "As you know," he said, "we urge them to resist, to stand up for their rights. But many reply that there is nothing they can do, that if they went on strike the enterprise would go bankrupt and they would land in the streets."

Our party is putting forward recommendations, of course: nationalization of the steel industry, the transfer of steel mills run by the ARBED transnational to the hands of the state. The party has made these recommendations in parliament and is working to win public support for them. But apart from this it is also important to show the workers a realistic way out that would end the crisis and guarantee the future. How is this to be achieved? Socialism is the only answer. Without that clear prospect we shall always be in a fog.

In this connection I should like to say a few words about the so-called "models of socialism." I do not think the working people can be inspired with a socialist prospect if, say, the "Soviet model" is denigrated. It is not accidental that the bourgeoisie and its mass media are so furiously attacking everything that is taking place in the USSR and other socialist countries. The bourgeoisie would like to destroy the faith of "their" working people in the socialist ideal, and prove that existing socialism "does not work." This can be understood when it is done by the bourgeoisie. It is not understandable when it is done by some communists.

Of course, there is no "universal model" of socialism. There are no uniforms that all must wear. Each selects a suit according to his taste. But under that suit all of us have a heart. Socialism likewise has a heart, and it is the power of the working people, which spells out the removal of the capitalists from power, the abolition of private property in the means of production, and the extirpation of exploitation. And this does not depend on what country is involved. When Marx wrote *Capital* he did not write it specifically for the German people, and historical materialism is a truth not only in the Soviet Union but also in Luxembourg. The class struggle is international.

Thus, one should constantly address the sources of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, of dialectical and historical materialism, in order to have a better understanding of present-day developments. Of course, we will get no ready-made answers fit for all occasions, but we will have the key to a correct assessment of social phenomena. As regards our party, we have been trying to learn all the time, to widen our knowledge and approach current problems from the Marxist angle.

How did you come to Marxism? What was its attraction for you?

That is easy to answer. My father was a miner and he became a socialist long before the First World War. Miners had a robust class consciousness, a keen sense of belonging to their class. They were the most revolutionary section of our workers. And my father was one of them. He worked in a mine all his life, and I often visited him there and sometimes even slept in the canteen. I was 14 at the time and I have a clear recollection of the atmosphere of those days. The vicar was the principal personage in our community. Half of the community supported him, and the other half was opposed to him. The clericals' supporters were called "black" and the liberals' and socialists' followers were called "lefts" or "Reds." I began by joining the "Reds" against the vicar.

My father used to get a socialist paper that was printed in several hundred copies. It explained the meaning of surplus value and profit, in short, what Marx wrote about. The newspaper was printed by a group of workers and it was called *Le Pauvre Diable* in the same way as factory workers were called *pauvres diables*. My father did not let me read it for he thought I was too small and would not understand what it was all about. But I read it without his knowledge, and some of what I read sank into my memory. Later, at a teacher training college, I got a book on the history of the working-class movement. I swallowed it in a single gulp. I was interested in the history of the French revolution and liked to read Victor Hugo and other progressive French writers of the 19th century. Sometimes I had to skip a meal to save the money for books.

However I noticed even then a discrepancy between literary rhetoric and reality. Rhetoric serves to hide the truth. I had to part with some illusions. I began to take an interest in sociophilosophical doctrines. For the first time I came across Marxist writings that were published at the time as separate pamphlets. I was tremendously impressed.

All this happened, I must say, in the period of the October Revolution in Russia. Movements in support of it were springing up everywhere in Western Europe. But it took long months for the ideas of the October Revolution to penetrate deeply into our society and for the significance of the Bolshevik victory to be appreciated. A leaflet disseminated at the time by a group of Luxembourg workers and socialists said: "The destiny of the working people of the whole world is at present being decided in Russia. Yours too, and you should not forget this. Were the Russian revolution defeated, this would open in other countries a period of the most brutal suppression of the working class and its demands. Therefore the future of the Russian revolution is largely your own future as well." There was a wide response to those leaflets.

The socialist party, founded at that time, supported the Great October Socialist Revolution. I joined that party.

January 1921 was a decisive time for me. Although I was still very young, the socialist section of the Kopstal commune where I lived, sent me as a delegate to the party congress in Differdange at which the question of joining the Communist International was on the agenda. Clara Zetkin, speaking on behalf of the Comintern Executive, stated the well-known 21 points.* But most of the delegates voted against

*The terms of admission adopted at the second congress of the Comintern in August 1920. — Ed.

them. The other delegates moved to another hall and founded the Communist Party of Luxembourg on January 2.

I was among the delegates who voted for membership in the Third International and this caused a small sensation at the congress because the socialist section in the Kopstal commune was not distinguished as revolutionary. But for me the choice was obvious. It sprang from my Marxist convictions. I was active in the work of the Young Socialists organization that belonged to the left wing of the Socialist Party and then was a member of the Young Communist organization and helped to bring out the newspaper *Kommunistische Jugend*.

We were inexperienced, of course. Our ideals and views were vague, but we were firmly convinced that the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin expressed the truth, conformed to and explained the facts of life. Some people claimed even then, just as others do today, that Marxism was "outdated." The bourgeoisie always wanted to see Marxism "outdated." But for us it was a living doctrine, the science of the day. We argued, pondered, and took part in the struggles of the working class and came to the conclusion that only Marxist theory opened the sure road to the future, that only a revolutionary struggle for the implementation of the communist ideas, abandoned by the opportunists, was consistent with the interests of the working people.

As a matter of fact, opportunism is the philosophy and policy of cowardice and rejection of struggle, a policy of accommodation to the interests of the powers that be. There was another delegate to the congress from the Kopstal socialist organization. When the voting on membership in the Comintern was to be taken he did not appear in the hall. Do you know why? One of the leaders of the socialist party was a lawyer who was this man's defense counsel in court. And so my fellow delegate feared to vote against him at the congress.

Yes, indeed, opportunism has always meant cowardice, accommodation, and renunciation of principles. For me the only rule has always been to follow and stand up for my convictions. That is why in 1921 I voted for membership in the Third International and the formation of the communist party. Since then my life has been linked to the history of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

Ever since the emergence of the communist movement bourgeois propaganda has been trying to depict the communist parties of various countries as a "foreign force" to which national interests are alien. Would you say a few words

on how your country's national problems have stamped the activities of your party?

The communist parties champion the interests of the working people, of the working class, and thereby undermine the interests of the bourgeoisie. It is quite natural, therefore, that the latter should strive to slander and discredit the communists, to describe them as "foreign agents." However, if we look back we shall see that this is exactly how the social democrats were treated in the days when they were still propounding revolutionary views and acting against the bourgeoisie. Nothing less than class collaboration suits big capital, and it is prepared to recognize as "national" only a party that renounces the principles of class struggle.

As regards the Communist Party of Luxembourg, ever since Zenon Bernard, Jean Kill, and I headed it at the close of the 1920s our program has been based on three principles. First, we are the party of the Luxembourg working class and as such participate in the international struggle of the workers of all countries on the basis of effective solidarity. Second, we are a democratic party and want the working class to come to power in Luxembourg by the will of the people. And, third, we are a national party and stand for the independence and sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Ours is a small country, and it is sometimes hard to find it on a map. In other countries there are people who do not even know where it is situated. On a trip abroad I was once asked: "Where is Luxembourg? In Belgium?" "No," I replied, "Luxembourg is in Luxembourg. And get that through your head."

Our people have time and again had to prove that "Luxembourg is in Luxembourg." For a small country like this, the question of national independence has always been acute. It was often used as small change by the big powers, and subjected to invasion, occupation, and devastation by foreign invaders.

The Communist Party has always championed democratic national traditions and backed everything that helped to safeguard the country's freedom and independence. In the 1930s when the threat of nazi aggression and war loomed large, we spoke of the danger of collusion with fascism.

Precisely those who supported fascism, which was a mortal threat to our country, attacked the Communist Party, organizing the harassment and baiting of communists. In 1934 Jean Kill and I (we were teachers at the time) were fired, while in 1935 the party's Chairman Zenon Bernard was unlawfully deprived of his parliamentary mandate. Following Hitler's

example, the clerical-liberal government tried to liquidate the Communist Party. It drafted the "Law on Public Order," which the people called the "muzzle law." If passed, the new law would have banned the Communist Party. However, in the referendum of June 6, 1937 the majority of the people of Luxembourg rejected the pro-fascist bill. This strikingly demonstrated the people's determination to be independent and their opposition to subordinating their country to the nazi Reich. Moreover, this was a blow at the slander directed against the Communist Party, which the rightists wanted to portray as an "enemy of the people of Luxembourg."

In 1935 I took part in the work of the seventh Comintern congress in Moscow. The call of the congress for unity among all democratic forces against fascism and the threat of war was also well received in Luxembourg. Our party was working hard to form a people's anti-fascist front. A League for the Defense of Democracy was formed. This was a broad alliance of left forces that included communists, socialists and liberals, and it played a big part in organizing resistance to the nazi occupation.

The communists warned that the threat from nazi Germany was mounting, but the ruling classes lulled the vigilance of the people. Luxembourg's ruling circles welcomed, for instance, the Munich deal, which gave Hitler a free hand and was the prologue to the Second World War. While they were lauding Chamberlain, the Communist Party was the only organization that exposed the Munich treachery. Our newspaper, *Volksstimme* wrote at the time: "Czechoslovakia has been sacrificed but peace has not been saved."

Developments bore out these words. In September 1939 Hitler attacked Poland, in April and May 1940 Denmark and Norway fell, and right after that nazi troops crossed the frontiers into the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and France. Within hours they overran our country.

The nazis set about "Germanizing" Luxembourg and "returning" it to the Reich. Luxembourg's state apparatus was destroyed, while the constitution and all attributes of independence were wiped out. They not only banned the French language, which has long been used in the country alongside German, but prohibited the use of our written language. They even changed the country's name to "Lutzelburg."

In spite of their small number and the huge inequality of strength, the people of Luxembourg did not submit. At every step the invaders encountered resistance. The Communist

Party was the active core of this resistance. Of course, in the Resistance there also were socialists, liberals, Catholics, and people from all social strata. But only the Communist Party operated as an organized political force calling upon the people to fight the invaders. The communists proved to be the only people who did not have to learn anew in 1940. Their conduct during the occupation was a continuation of the anti-fascist, patriotic line that we pursued before the war. Small wonder, therefore, that the nazis subjected the Communist Party to savage repression. Many of our comrades, the party Chairman Zenon Bernard among them, died in the Gestapo dungeons, prisons and concentration camps.

In the decisions of the illegal party conferences of 1940 and 1941 and in the program of anti-fascist resistance adopted in May 1942 the communists called upon all patriots to rally in a broad united front regardless of party affiliation and world view. The Communist Party, notably the steelworkers and miners in it, played the major role in organizing the famous general strike of September 1942. Our newspaper, *Die Wahrheit*, was the only illegal publication printed in Luxembourg during the occupation. It was issued until August 1942, when the nazis raided its offices. It was replaced by another publication.

I had to hide and move to Belgium. As a member of the Resistance I edited an underground news sheet that was brought out in more than 20,000 copies. Working underground, our party did its best to instil in the people the confidence that liberation would come, that fascism would inescapably be defeated.

If we survey the post-war years it will be seen that in this period, too, the party has continued the line of safeguarding the nation's vital interests. We were opposed to the abandonment in 1948 of Luxembourg's neutral status proclaimed as long ago as 1867 and enshrined in the constitution. We did not agree to Luxembourg's involvement in the NATO bloc, whose policy runs counter to the nation's interests, and we objected to our country's participation in military preparations against socialist states. We have always been convinced that the nation's interests are best served by a policy promoting peace, détente, disarmament, international cooperation and European security. We are therefore opposed to the use of Western Europe for the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles that are a mortal threat to the peoples of our continent.

There are, of course, differences of opinion about what conforms or runs counter to na-

tional interests. For instance, we do not believe that the nation's interests are served when such vital matters as, say, the future of the steel industry, which is the foundation of Luxembourg's economy, is determined outside the country, in the Common Market agencies, when foreign capital seizes control of the main levers of our economy, or when our country follows in the wake of the aggressive policies of the big imperialist powers, of the USA in the first place.

The communists' approach to national interests is prompted chiefly by the aspirations of the working class and all other working people, i.e., the vast majority of our people. These aspirations are in the focus of our activity, of our policy. And this policy finds a response among the population of Luxembourg. True, today as in the past, the right-wing forces sometimes try to tag the label "agents of Moscow" on the communists. But this no longer has any effect. Our prestige among the public is high and the country's ruling circles have to reckon with this. On my 80th birthday I received congratulations from, among others, the Prime Minister, a noted leader of the Catholic Party. This would have been inconceivable before the war. We are citizens of a small country where many political figures know each other personally and government awards leave us cool. But I must tell you that I have been decorated with some of the highest orders of our country for my participation in the Resistance and for my 30 years' work in parliament. I have also been decorated with orders of socialist countries: the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union — the Order of the October Revolution and the Order of Lenin were awarded to me on my 80th birthday. These decorations, I feel, mirror recognition of the role played by the Communist Party of Luxembourg in the struggle for our country's interests, for stronger friendship and cooperation with the peoples of socialist countries, and for greater internationalist solidarity among working people.

How would you define the significance of this solidarity today?

I have already said that as young workers and students we were vastly impressed by the October Revolution. We welcomed it enthusiastically. We realized that it had opened up the prospect for the revolutionary transformation of the world in the interests of working people. Ever since then the Soviet Union has been for us the bastion of social progress and the bulwark of peace, socialism and freedom. This has been confirmed by history. What would have become, for instance, of Luxembourg had the Soviet Union not played the decisive role in

defeating fascism? Our people were under the threat of extinction. This should never be forgotten. To this day we regard the Soviet Union as a country free of exploiters, where the working people are masters of their lives, and where impressive economic and social advances have been made despite the difficulties caused by the war and its effects and despite imperialist pressures and intrigues. It is not that we give some special preference to the Soviet, notably, the Russian people. We respect them as we do other peoples. But for us the main thing is that the socialist system functions in the Soviet Union. The Soviet people are translating into reality the ideas of Marxism, the most humane, just and decent ideas of our time.

Today it is highly important to disseminate the truth about the USSR and its policy. We do not agree with those who bracket Soviet and U.S. policy under the guise of fighting "bipolarism," the domination of "two superpowers," and so forth. The world's division into a socialist and a capitalist part is neither "propaganda" nor an invention. It is an objective fact. And each has to choose in social terms which to prefer: capitalism or socialism. The talk about a "third way" and a "third force" holds no water. The course pursued by U.S. imperialism today and, by and large, followed by the ruling circles of other imperialist states is fraught with the threat of war, of a nuclear catastrophe. At the same time, we can see that the Soviet Union, where nobody is interested in an arms race or external expansion, champions the road of peace. And we prefer to go along this road together with the Soviet Union.

The bourgeoisie is also making its choice. It is no accident that such huge efforts are being made today in the capitalist countries to discredit existing socialism and foment anti-Sovietism. Day after day it is drummed into the heads of our fellow-citizens, of our young people in particular, that a defense is needed against a "communist dictatorship," against the "Soviet threat." That is a lie. There is no such threat.

In the capitalist countries the bourgeoisie now has much more powerful means of indoctrination than ever. It has television, the radio, the press agencies, and the mass press. Is it not now harder to withstand its influence?

The mass media have certainly changed dramatically on account of significant technological breakthroughs. I can judge quite concretely. As students back in 1919 we were among the first in Luxembourg to make ourselves crystal sets and were happy when we could listen to music from Paris or Berlin.

Today television has entered every home

here in Luxembourg as well. There are seven channels: two French, two Belgian, two West German, and one Luxembourg channel, to say nothing of the radio and press, which mostly peddle the views of the bourgeoisie. Even so, I do not think we should consider these media all-powerful. In the days of youth, too, the bourgeoisie had broad possibilities for manipulating public opinion. To this end use was made of the press, the school, and family upbringing — just as today.

As I see it, the main thing is how far our political activities and our explanatory work are consistent with the truth, with the development of reality, how far they meet the requirements of the masses. If the aims are chosen correctly we can count on the support of the people and on success.

Needless to say, we do not ignore the significance of the party press and other media for the dissemination of communist views. Our party has always sought to improve its newspaper and bring out more publications although this is linked to the surmounting of enormous difficulties due to the modesty of our financial resources. There was a time when I had to go personally from door to door of workers' houses to collect donations for the publication of our newspaper. We are also trying to get more access to radio and television, although in capitalist conditions this is not easy.

There are many young people in your party. What are your wishes to young communists?

In the first place, it is important to stress the need for constant study, for assimilating Marxism, its methodology, the fundamentals of

scientific communism. For this, as I see it, it is necessary to look into the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin more often. Their works teach people to think, to analyze facts, to see them in the historical perspective. Marx, Engels and Lenin wrote in a splendid, vivid, figurative language that inspires and convinces, and not in the language of resolutions. Resolutions are necessary too, of course, but Marxism should be studied at its sources. These books retain all their significance to this day. They continue to explain the world and society's development, and give indispensable orientations for a creative quest for concrete ways to socialism in each country.

It goes without saying that young communists should know the history of the working-class movement in their country and the history of their party. Regrettably, we were so absorbed with current work all the time that we gave little thought to setting up archives and doing historical research. Yet these are extremely important. True, something has already been done in this respect. Jean Kill's *1,000-Year-Old Luxembourg* relates, among other things, the work of the communists. In connection with the party's 60th anniversary, which was marked in 1981, a book has been published on the history of the Communist Party of Luxembourg. Other works have also been published, but much more might have been done.

History has to be studied, of course, not for its own sake but in order to understand present-day problems, to get a better view of the present and the prospects of the struggle in the light of past experience. Of immense significance in this context is the work of our young comrades who have set up the Jean Kill Center for research into the problems now confronting the party.

I should like to note, however, that for all the importance of theoretical work and study, practical work must not be forgotten. Erudition should not be wasted. Knowledge must not be allowed to be a deadweight. They have to be applied in real terms. Here clarity and precision of political posture and firmness of conviction are needed. The work of communists requires courage and staunchness, selflessness and honesty, and devotion to the ideals of social justice, to the ideals of the working class.

The 24th congress of the Communist Party of Luxembourg is to be held next January. Many young Communists will be represented. I should like to wish them to honorably carry the baton that we have carried for many years, and to continue and multiply our party's militant traditions.

The World Capitalist Economy

V.V. Rymalov

Scholarly treatment of decisive trends in postwar development of capitalist and developing countries.

cloth 327 pp \$6.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

Strategy of building socialism and defending its gains

Hoang Tung
CC Secretary, Communist Party of Vietnam

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam is observing its national holiday these September days. At a huge rally in Hanoi 38 years ago, Ho Chi Minh, speaking on behalf of the Provisional Revolutionary Government and the Vietnamese people, read out the Declaration of Independence announcing the birth of the first worker-peasant state in Southeast Asia. The less than four decades that have passed since that historic day are a short period for a country which has gone through centuries-long development and which created a distinctive civilization as far back as remote antiquity. However, humanity today is developing so fast that some decades equal centuries in significance. This is true of the years following the proclamation of national independence. The transition to socialist construction thoroughly changed what was a backward colonial and semi-feudal country. Led by their tried vanguard, the Communist Party of Vietnam, our people achieved notable victories in all economic and cultural spheres and in the struggle against foreign aggression.

The imperialists and international reaction refused to accept the fact that our country had cast off the chains of colonialism. First to make war on Vietnam were the French colonizers. That war lasted nearly nine years and ended in the aggressors' ignominious defeat at Dien Bien Phu. Then came the U.S. imperialists; having decided to turn South Vietnam into a new type of colony and a military base, they treacherously violated the 1954 Geneva accords which recognized the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of our country. They went beyond the pursuit of a neocolonialist policy by using the most barbarous military methods. Their aggression against our people exceeded considerably that of the French. The United States spent over 350 billion dollars on that war and its planes dropped about eight million tons of bombs and rockets on Vietnam.

After two decades of heroic struggle, the people of Vietnam, who rallied together around the Communist Party and were aided by fraternal socialist countries and all peace forces, emerged victorious in the war of Resistance; they maintained their independence and free-

dom, liberated the South and reunified the country. After the formation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (1976), the CPV announced the policy of building a new society all over the state. "In this epoch, with national independence and socialism indivisible, the victory of the national people's democratic revolution in our country, where the working class plays the leading role in the revolutionary process, marks the beginning of a socialist revolution, the beginning of the stage of transition to socialism, the beginning of the period of the proletarian dictatorship fulfilling its historic mission."¹ This was said at the party's fourth congress (1976), which adopted a comprehensive strategic program of socialist development.

The program set the following main goals: to accomplish three revolutions — in production relations, in science and technology, and in ideology and culture — leaning on the dictatorship of the proletariat and promoting the working people's right to collective management. The congress described the scientific and technological revolution as one of key importance. Industrialization is the central task during the transition to socialism. It is on its fulfillment as well as on setting up a system of collective management and large-scale production that the working people's efforts must be concentrated. Thus what we have is a set of problems bearing on every aspect of the process of socialist construction, including the education of the new man as an active builder of the new society.²

The tasks in question must be carried out in a backward agrarian country and this means grappling with big difficulties. To this day the country is affected by the dire consequences and severe trials of 30 years of war and the subversive activities of the Chinese authorities.

Vietnam effectively resisted Peking's expansionist claims and did its internationalist duty to the fraternal people of Kampuchea by helping them free themselves from a genocidal regime. The special relations that have come to interlink Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos in the course of their logical revolutionary develop-

ment are vitally important for our peoples' destinies.

By going to war against our country early in 1979, the Peking rulers posed a threat to our national independence and to peace and stability in Indochina and Southeast Asia. Socialist Vietnam resists this subversion and is prepared to defeat all attempts at aggression.

The working people of our republic dependably defended their country by making tremendous efforts and numerous sacrifices. They strengthened the country's defenses, carried out socialist changes in industry and trade, introduced cooperative farming in the southern provinces and reorganized the economy. Thereby they provided new favorable opportunities for progress.

The gains made in socialist construction are reflected in the new constitution of the SRV, adopted by the National Assembly in 1980. It points out that the working people, that is, the working class, the cooperative peasantry, the socialist intelligentsia and other working men and women, are operating as a collective owner in the political, economic, cultural and social spheres, on the basis of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry with the former playing the leading role. "Collective management," Le Duan, General Secretary of the CPV CC, pointed out, "is the main content of the new constitution because the real purpose of national independence and socialism is to form a system of collective management and because collective management is a most important motive power of our revolution."³

The fifth CPV congress (1982) reaffirmed the time-tested policy of building the new society adopted by the previous congress. With due regard to the situation, it stated, all our people and our whole army, led by the party, must unite still more closely at the new stage of the revolution and devote their energies to the fulfillment of two major strategic tasks: building socialism and being prepared to defend the country. Accordingly, the party is continuing steadfastly and firmly to implement the dictatorship of the proletariat, consolidating collective management and creating favorable conditions for socialist industrialization.

Spelling out this policy, the CPV defined the development lines of our economy for the 80s. To radically solve the food problem and raise the living and cultural standards of the population, we must perfect the productive forces, make better use of the potentialities of agriculture and industry and produce more foodstuffs, raw materials and consumer goods. After we have achieved these objectives, we will be able to go over from the present economic

structure dominated by agriculture to a new one, with industry as the basis on which agriculture and light industry will be modernized.

The party realizes that the current stage of building the new society is the most difficult and crucial one, for it is at this stage that we must pave the way for industrialization.

The economic strategy of the CPV is distinctive in that the country is going over to socialism without passing through the phase of capitalist development. The possibility of this transition has been theoretically demonstrated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of building socialism in the north of our country as well as by the experience of other states of the new world.

Understandably, Marx and Engels, who defined the external conditions of the transition of economically backward peoples to socialism, could not reveal the internal objective conditions of this transition. Those peoples were too different, the social and political phases through which they had to go too varied and the pace of history too dissimilar. Engels saw "the stages of transition to a communist society as the most difficult of all existing questions, for conditions are changing continuously."⁴ In the case of backward countries, an "abbreviated way" of development (term first used by Marx and Engels in their writings) does not mean the same as "accelerated advance." What it does mean is fewer stages of social development. In this connection Lenin called special attention to the need for states bypassing the capitalist phase to proceed gradually in carrying out transitional measures.⁵

The founders of scientific communism noted that in economically backward countries where capitalist relations are underdeveloped or almost non-existent, it is necessary, nevertheless, to preserve and use to a degree the capitalist elements that took shape. "We are as yet unable," Lenin wrote, "to pass directly from small production to socialism . . . We must utilize capitalism (particularly by directing it into the channels of state capitalism) as the intermediary link between small production and socialism, as a means, a path, and a method of increasing the productive forces."⁶

Guiding itself by the theory of scientific communism in socialist construction and creatively applying it in the particular conditions of our country, the CPV is confidently carrying on its policy of building a new society without going through the capitalist phase. The country is gradually eliminating the multistructural character of its economy in the South, forming a single social structure of society and overcoming the negative influence of bourgeois

ideology in the South; the masses are closing their ranks on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideas.

Our economy, which is not strong enough yet to effect even simple reproduction, will have to accumulate assets for extended reproduction. This explains why party decisions regard agriculture, forestry, fishing, light and home industry and the traditional handicrafts as the basis for industrial development. These do not require major investments while making possible primary accumulation and the creation of an export base before very long. Agriculture is the chief sector that must help solve all difficult problems.

In the early years of socialist construction, the party failed for various reasons to keep up this line in full measure, with a resulting disproportion in the form of more rapid development of heavy industry, which was not supported by objective possibilities or resources. This largely accounted for agriculture and light industry failing to meet economic needs and ultimately slowing down our progress somewhat.

The party took steps to remove distortions in structural policy. Its fifth congress stressed the need to make the best possible use of actual potentialities, particularly manpower resources, for effective farming and a judicious distribution of investments contribute to the development of priority economic fields. Besides, proper combination of large, medium and small-scale production in terms of both industry and territory and its improved management help solve pressing economic problems.

Important problems requiring a flexible approach, the fifth congress pointed out in its documents, include definition of the forms of labor organization corresponding to the period of transition from small to large-scale socialist production as well as the use of material and moral incentives. It is essential to wisely combine centralism and a plan-based approach with widespread initiative in labor on all levels. In line with congress decisions, we are reorganizing production in all rural districts and redistributing the work force in the process among industry, agriculture and other fields depending on local conditions.

There are over 400 districts in our country. Each of them has arable lands averaging 10,000 hectares and a population of about 100,000 working in cooperatives. The district is our basic territorial-administrative unit in which production and distribution and the people's material and cultural life are organized and assets for socialist industrialization ac-

cumulated. There too, armed forces are formed. Within every district economic relations are established between cooperatives, and industrial plants and trading and transport companies are set up. Important enterprises, major building projects and the distribution of basic consumer goods are directly controlled by the state, which entrusts urban and provincial authorities with the management of smaller economic entities. Experience has shown this system to stimulate economic development, allow scope for local initiative and take into account the production experience of the population of the district concerned and their interests.

The party and the government devote unfailing attention to small and home industry in the districts. By advancing them, we can make better use of manpower, the land, forests and mineral resources. This meets both local and national interests, for the growth of small industry, which produces mostly consumer goods, makes it possible to establish its relations with agriculture at the initial stage and this, in turn, helps shape an agrarian-industrial structure at the district level.

Increased production of consumer goods will necessitate larger deliveries of agricultural raw materials. This is an important incentive for the transition of agriculture from a single-crop system to diversification, from fragmentation to centralization and from small to large-scale socialist production. Light industry not only processes agricultural raw materials but helps hasten the transition of the countryside from self-reliance to commodity production and intensify exchange between town and countryside.

At a time when the possibilities of the socialist mode of production are still limited even though the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat holds key positions in the economy, it is very important to use all the productive forces of the country. This is why a correct class policy plays a particularly significant role in evolving a strategy for the transition period. The party and the state apply this policy in directing the process of socialist change in a multistructural economy; at the same time they will do their best until the end of this process to make maximum use of the possibilities of each class for stabilizing and advancing production and for strengthening the economic positions of socialism. This is the only way to ensure that society develops dynamically.

While transforming industrial enterprises, which in the South were owned by the bourgeoisie, as well as private capitalist trade through various forms of state capitalism, the

party considers it necessary to fully use the potentialities of the diverse economic structures in terms of work force, technology, etc., so as to promote production. There are five sectors in our country: state, collective, mixed (private-and-state), individual, and private capitalist. In every industry, especially in those producing consumer goods, the state, while retaining its leading role, allows some members of the national bourgeoisie to do business under the supervision and control of the authorities concerned.

"After socialist changes have been completed in the main," Le Duan says, "the small-commodity sector will survive in the economy for a long time to come . . . The state must see to the proper management of the small-commodity sector and help it develop in the right direction, so as to provide for the needs of those employed in it and partly meet the requirements of society.

"Economic structures should not be separated from one another; on the contrary, they should combine organically in the production process on the branch principle and within the local economy."

The attitude to the peasantry is a major political matter to which the CPV constantly pays the closest attention. The admission of peasants to cooperatives and associations for joint land cultivation should proceed, as party decisions point out, and generally does proceed in strict accordance with three principles: voluntariness, mutual benefit, and democratic management. In areas where peasants have not yet become organized on the principles of collective production, favorable conditions are provided for this, special attention being given to the training of managerial personnel. A gradual transition is going on from such forms as mutual assistance groups to these associations and cooperatives.

Lately the party has been applying a number of additional incentives for cooperative peasants. Proper regard to social, collective and personal interests, and steps to perfect remuneration are an important factor for raising labor productivity. The fulfillment of the relevant decisions of the CPV CC has yielded positive results in many cooperatives.

Making the land the whole people's property as stipulated by the constitution will play a very important part in promoting socialist forms of farming. It will ensure judicious utilization of the land in accordance with state plans.

In recent years we have also assigned an important role to personal subsidiary holdings. Peasants and employees of state enterprises are

allowed on a temporary basis to grow food crops on uncultivated lands belonging to cooperatives. This is a notable factor since the country is short of foodstuffs.

Agriculture has made obvious progress. In 1982 it produced over 16 million tons of rice and other foodstuffs (in terms of rice) against 15 million tons in the previous year. Output of animal products and the catch of sea fish have increased as compared with 1980. The country now has a real possibility of fully meeting its food requirements on its own. This is no small achievement since formerly, that is, even when our population was half as large as today, there were permanent food shortages. However, the food problem as a whole is still acute.

Some advances have also been scored in industry despite difficulties in supplying raw materials, the insufficiency of energy and the shortage of spare parts. Average annual output in 1981 and 1982 went up by 12.7 per cent (chiefly in small and home industry). Between 1976 and 1980, this index equalled 0.6 per cent. Consumer goods output last year grew by 10 per cent. Nor is this the limit, for there are still considerable untapped resources.

Favorable changes have come about in some other fields. Transport is functioning better, more money is invested in capital construction and exports have grown.

Special mention should be made of our southern areas. There, too, the formation of rural cooperatives, almost completed in Central Vietnam, is going on at a brisk pace. In the main economic fields private capital has virtually lost all its positions. However, we still have many problems to solve in the South, particularly in the sphere of distribution and circulation.

Political and economic advances link up closely with changes in education, science and culture. We have in the main done away with illiteracy, that sad legacy of colonialism, even among the national minorities. Over 14 million children go to school. Upwards of 260,000 people have received a higher education. Our scientists make a growing contribution to the solution of industrial and agricultural problems.

The working class, cooperative peasantry and socialist intelligentsia are taking part with great élan in the construction of a new life under the slogan "Everything for the socialist motherland, everything for the people's happiness."

The party sees constantly to the education of the working people in the spirit of true patriotism and proletarian internationalism, of close solidarity with the Soviet Union and

other socialist countries, which have always extended tremendous all-round assistance to Vietnam. This disinterested, noble support helps us in laying the groundwork for industry and transport, science and technology, culture and education. Creative application of the experience of fraternal countries enables us to fulfil this far from easy task all the more effectively.

Membership in the CMEA (since 1978) has provided our republic with greater opportunities to participate in the international socialist division of labor and develop cooperation with fraternal countries on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis. We have substantially increased our exports within the framework of the CMEA thereby contributing to the progress of the world socialist economy. This also enables us to gain additional sources of accumulation for subsequent industrialization.

The plenary meeting held by the CPV CC late in 1982 was a further important step toward carrying out the decisions of the fifth congress. It specified the social and economic guidelines for 1983 and the five-year period as a whole and concerned itself with pressing matters relating to distribution and steps to perfect the economic mechanism, extend the potentialities of the district echelon of management and develop transport. The plenary meeting noted that "in the past two years, according to the general line and economic policy of the fifth CPV congress, various measures taken by the party and the government to improve economic management have induced the working people to make new gains in production, and brought about considerable changes in the economy and the life of the whole country."⁸ The meeting put on record advances in diverse branches of agriculture and drew the conclusion that already there are real possibilities of solving the food problem, supplying light industry with raw materials and increasing exports.

On the other hand, the meeting pointed out that our achievements are not very considerable as yet and that there are still many difficulties to overcome if the economy is to be stabilized and strengthened. The country can advance toward large-scale socialist production provided it firmly relies on collective labor. This is the chief productive force at the moment. Hence the great importance of molding the new man as a collective master and a worker educated in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and socialist patriotism, and who sees his greatest ideal in building a free and happy life for all.

The ongoing thorough reorganization of the old social relations and the rise and formation

of the new relations typical of socialist production are revolutionizing the thinking of our working people, leading to changes in the social composition of society and the character of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia as well as in their mutual relations. This logical and deep-going process is one of the obvious achievements in the revolutionary transformation of Vietnamese society.

The numerical growth of and qualitative changes in the composition of the working class, the leading force in our country's economic, political and social life, are factors of the first importance in the development and consolidation of the socialist production relations. Whereas the working class in 1960 accounted for a mere 5 per cent of the economically active population, today its proportion exceeds 10 per cent and most of its members are young people. Another indicative fact is that two-thirds of workers have received a secondary or incomplete secondary education. It is fair to say that emerging in our country is a new, socialist type of worker.

Our peasants, too, have been steadily changing. Mechanization and electrification are gradually bringing agricultural labor closer to industrial labor. The work force employed in various economic fields is redistributed noticeably as the economy develops, for the better the technical equipment of the countryside and the higher the peasants' labor productivity, the smaller the relative proportion of people engaged in agriculture.

A problem that is still pressing is the socialist education of the hundreds of thousands of artisans and traders who are only just joining the working class. These sectors are coming to participate in the construction of the new society. But as everyone knows, the abolition of private property in the means of production does not automatically eliminate manifestations of a private proprietor mentality. The experience of our country and other socialist countries has shown that to take non-proletarian sectors on to the socialist road, it is necessary to combat their petty-bourgeois tendencies and prejudices. These can only be overcome through painstaking educational effort, whose success is furthered by the reshaping of the economy and public life.

All this great, historic remolding of social consciousness is being led by the CPV, the vanguard of our revolution. The purpose of the party's political-education work is to heighten national awareness, encourage public activity and foster the working people's sense of civic responsibility for the destiny of the country. The all-round progress which the republic has

achieved by consistently strengthening the alliance of the working class, the cooperative peasantry and the working intelligentsia is a result of both the operation of the objective laws of socialism and the communists' steadfast effort.

Hence the special importance of building the party and raising the efficiency of party leadership. The fifth CPV congress defined the key task as steadily promoting the proletarian character and the vanguard role of the party and strengthening it politically, ideologically and organizationally. This will enable the party to provide highly competent leadership in socialist construction and the defense of the country, and preserve the revolutionary essence and scientific soundness of its policy, the purity of its ranks and its close connection with the masses.

The party's general line, aimed at building a new society and defending its gains, is meeting with furious resistance from internal and external enemies, who persist in attempts to prevent or hamper the implementation of this line. Our enemies want to undermine the unity of the party and the people; they foment discord among ethnic groups and resort to economic blockade. In taking a stand against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Peking hegemonists

try to revive reactionary puppet forces and to involve the ASEAN countries in the struggle against the revolution in the fraternal countries, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The people of Vietnam are closely united around the party founded and steered by Ho Chi Minh, a party thoroughly dedicated to the class and national interests and to the struggle of the international working class and freedom-loving peoples. This unity plus all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including our neighbors, friends and brothers-in-arms, Laos and Kampuchea, are the chief guarantee of our country's advance to socialism, whose successful construction is inseparable from national defense.

1. *Tap chi Hoc tap*, Hanoi, No. 12, 1976, p. 51 (in Vietnamese).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
3. Le Duan, *The Right to Be a Collective Owner*, Hanoi, 1981, p. 153 (in Vietnamese).
4. Frederick Engels, *Letter to Conrad Schmidt in Zurich*, July 1, 1891.
5. See V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 314.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 350.
7. *Tap Chi Cong san*, Hanoi, No. 2, 1980, p. 30 (in Vietnamese).
8. *Third Plenum of the CPV CC*, Hanoi, 1983, pp. 1-2 (in Vietnamese).

Stepping up the fight against the racist enemy

Alfred Nzo
General Secretary,
African National Congress
(ANC) of South Africa

The sharpening of the all-round confrontation between the oppressed masses and the apartheid regime is now the definitive feature of the situation in South Africa. Ever broader social strata, including democratically-minded, courageous members of the white community, are daily becoming more extensively involved in the fight against the racist authorities. To mark the 70th anniversary of its foundation, the African National Congress declared 1982 the "Year of Unity in Action," and unity is effectively becoming an organic component of the people's struggle.

Consider, by way of example, the action by industrial workers for higher wages, better working conditions and against the reformist demagoguery to which the employers frequently

resort in an effort to undermine the militancy of the Black working people. Such action is increasingly merging with civic protests against the growth of prices, rents, transport fares, etc. This is natural, because on his meagre wages the worker has to keep his family — to buy the food and clothes and pay the rent — so he cannot afford to confine himself to action only at the enterprise.

For their part, broad strata of the population express solidarity with the just demands of the Black proletariat and give it effective support. When the owners of the Red Meat Company in Capetown dismissed their workers, a public committee organized a boycott of the firm's products. There was a nation-wide campaign in defense of the victims of a lockout staged by

the owners of the Wilson Rowntree confectionary factory in East London: virtually all the African shopkeepers refused to stock its candy and other products. Women and students have played and are playing an important role in such actions.

More and more religious leaders have openly and boldly condemned the system of apartheid. Among them is the President of the Catholic Bishops' Conference Denis Hurley, the President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches Alan Boesak, and General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches Desmond Tutu. Our organization is proud of its cooperation with the courageous fighter for justice and human dignity Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, whom the ANC honored in 1955 with the well-merited distinction of the title "Isitwalandwe."¹ Let us recall that resolutions passed by the synods of a number of Protestant Churches echoed the common mood of the masses in resolutely rejecting the authorities' "reformist" line, which is aimed at perpetuating the domination of the white minority, even if in a different guise.² On the whole, it could be said that the Christian community, with the exception of a small part of it which backs the terrorist regime of apartheid, has joined with the other democratic forces in working to realize the aspirations of the people, who are striving to break the shackles of slavery and oppression.

The steady growth of democratic attitudes among the white population, notably the young people, is yet another important phenomenon: there is a growing conviction in their ranks that a system which dooms the majority of the inhabitants to oppression and discrimination has no future. More and more young whites accept the Freedom Charter, the program put forward by the national liberation movement, and some of them join in the practical struggle. Not long ago, a young white woman courageously told the fascist court that she was a member of the African National Congress, despite the fact that in our country membership in the ANC is a treasonable offence. Barbara Hogan was duly sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. Such a bold challenge to the racist authorities is a clear manifestation of the strengthening of the spirit of militancy among a section of the white population. Pretoria's rulers are trying hard to break this spirit, for it poses a grave threat by further weakening and narrowing down the social base of apartheid.

There is now no longer any doubt that the overwhelming majority of South Africans do not accept the existing system and support the

program and goals of the liberation movement, with its vanguard, the ANC. Our organization is the embodiment of the hopes of the people of South Africa, because it is of the flesh and blood of the oppressed, who cannot be deprived of it, as they are being deprived of land and freedom, the fruits of their labor and the right of citizenship, as they are being deprived of life itself. In proclaiming that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, Black and white, and that power should be in the hands of the people, the ANC voices the people's most cherished aspirations, for which they have fought and continue to fight, unsparing of their lives. The oppressed people look with hope to the ANC above all because the Congress has not confined itself to rhetorical tirades against apartheid, but taking the front line has fought for freedom, organizing and directing the action by the people's army, Umkhonto we Sizwe, in the relentless fight against the terrorist regime.

The principle of combining mass political struggle with armed action by Umkhonto's combat units is an exceptionally important element in the ANC's strategy and tactics. The participants in political action display greater vigor and boldness in the knowledge that they are backed by a people's army which operates virtually everywhere and is capable of inflicting sensitive blows at the enemy. On the other hand, the general politicization of the masses is the only reliable basis on which armed struggle against the apartheid authorities can be carried on.

We do not in any sense regard military methods as absolutes and do not believe that the rifle is the key to the solution of all problems. There is a need above all to involve the masses in direct political struggle. Confronted with the intransigence of the racists, they will come to realize that in these conditions political confrontation alone cannot bring down the regime of apartheid, and that it needs to be backed up with other, notably armed, forms of struggle. There is, consequently a two-fold task: to develop in every way the political activity of the oppressed, while simultaneously instilling in them a determination and readiness to take up arms.

In the past two or three years, armed actions by Umkhonto we Sizwe have dramatically demonstrated how our fighters have matured and gained in skill and experience. Strikes have been delivered at such high security installations of South Africa's military-industrial complex as the SASOL plant for processing coal into liquid fuel,³ the military base in Pretoria and the Koeberg nuclear power plant. The latter operation deserves to be described in greater

detail. The nuclear power plant at Koeberg is being erected with the aid of French transnational corporations, which have invested billions in this project. It is highly important for South Africa's ruling circles that the imperialist monopolies should have no fear of losing their investments, that they should feel that investing money into apartheid is a sure thing. The act of sabotage caused doubt on that score, thereby helping to deepen the crisis of the racist regime. It also gave a fresh impetus to the activity of the democratic forces outside our country demanding Pretoria's total international isolation. It was also important that the blow was struck a few days after the South African militarists' raid on Maseru, the capital of Lesotho, and so was an impressive reply to the racists' barbarous crime.

Together with such spectacular action attracting universal attention, the picture of the struggle is determined by the much more numerous combat operations which are smaller in scale: attacks on military posts, police stations and other strongholds of the racist authorities, and the paralyzing of communications, oil pipelines and electric power transmission lines. These actions are not always reported in the press or in statements by South African officials. The fact that the South African authorities have tried to keep silent about Umkhonto we Sizwe operations has also been confirmed by the CIA, which is not exactly a friend of the freedom fighters. CIA reports, intended only for senior members of the U.S. military and political leadership but leaked to the press, frankly state that in the recent period, especially from the early 1980s, the combat might of the armed wing of the ANC has grown noticeably, that the number of successful operations has increased, and that Umkhonto units are now capable of operating autonomously for a long period fulfilling diverse tasks and closely coordinating their efforts.

Fresh confirmation of this has come from the boldly conceived and brilliantly executed action in the very heart of the South African capital toward the end of last May. A powerful device was exploded near the headquarters of the South African Air Force. That attack against one of the regime's main military centers demonstrated the growing confidence of the people's fighters in their strength, and their readiness to clash head-on with the racists' military repression machine. Observers were unanimous in reporting that the operation in Pretoria further enhanced the ANC's authority and increased its attraction for the people. The report of the freedom fighters' latest success

was met with jubilation by the overwhelming majority of the Black population.

Regrettably, some sections of world public opinion (and I do not, of course, have in mind the imperialists and their minions, with their malicious slanders on the national liberation movement) have succumbed to the influence of lying propaganda and are still inclined to see Umkhonto we Sizwe's heroic actions as being no more than isolated acts of terrorism. But these claims do not at all square with the facts. As I have said, the ANC is engaged in an armed struggle in close connection with efforts to mobilize the oppressed for political action and with reliance on their growing political activity. It is from the masses that the people's army draws its strength and has its support. Without a broad mass basis, our armed struggle would have been doomed to inevitable failure. In our country, for instance, we have no jungles, and it would seem that those who take part in combat operations have nowhere to hide. But once their task has been fulfilled, they seem to disappear into thin air, leaving the regime's bloodhounds baffled. It is the population itself giving reliable refuge to the fighters that in a sense becomes the "jungle." This is exceptionally important in organizational terms and serves as convincing evidence of the fact that the people regard the armed fight against the apartheid regime as their very own vital effort. Umkhonto we Sizwe units are capable of mounting operations in the most diverse spots in town and country which are frequently very far from each other, only because they can rely on the masses.

The racist authorities declare that the armed wing of our organization has been operating exclusively from the territory of neighboring states, which allegedly give refuge to "terrorists." It is on the pretext of striking at ANC bases and in "retaliation" for the May action in Pretoria that the South African Air Force staged a barbarous air raid on the residential suburbs of Maputo, the capital of Mozambique. But everyone who takes the trouble to think will realize the absurdity of the claims that military operations hitting key installations, the nerve centers of the regime, could be organized and mounted from bases hundreds and even thousands of miles away from the place of the operation.

It is extremely important to emphasize yet another fact. We took up arms in response to the racists' terrorism. For decades the participants in ANC-guided action confined themselves exclusively to non-violent methods. It was only after having experienced the full brunt of the apartheid authorities' brutality and having

been convinced from its own experience that peaceful means alone could not help to realize the people's aspirations, that our organization was forced to take the decision to start an armed struggle. Even the imperialist press now and again has to admit that in the present conditions this is the Black majority's only realistic way to freedom. Here is, for instance, the opinion of the *Washington Post*, which says: "The racist system by which the white minority rules is evil, and the Blacks who are its principal victims have virtually no possibility of changing it peacefully."⁴ Armed action on the part of the ANC, the vanguard movement of the discriminated and dispossessed masses, is a forced response to what Archbishop Denis Hurley has called "structural violence," that is "violence built into the political structures of the country, by which those in authority oppress their subjects and subordinates."⁵

Some say that the forms and means of struggle we use do not allegedly "fit" into the notion of guerrilla warfare in the light of the experience in Angola, Mozambique and other countries. That may well be so, but one must reckon with the specific conditions the ANC fighters have to face. First, most of the terrain in South Africa is not favorable for guerrilla warfare of what could be called the "classical" type. Second, South Africa has a sophisticated network of communications enabling the racist authorities to move their troops to any part of the country at short notice. These circumstances cannot be ignored in the planning and staging of combat operations. Aware of the enemy's strength, we seek, at the present stage, to scatter its forces to the greatest possible extent, making use of the tactics of surprise single strikes in different places.

We decide on the ways and methods of fighting the apartheid regime on the basis of the strategic line worked out in the light of the situation in which South Africa's progressive forces have to act. That this line is correct is evidenced above all by the fact that, in pursuing it, we have been successfully fulfilling the task of building a mass army of political fighters. The true revolutionary has no right to refuse to make use of this or that form of force, if they organically blend with the mass movement to break up the system of national and social oppression and help to bring about an upswing in the people's liberation struggle.

In the face of this upswing, there is growing strife within the ranks of the racist white minority. Dissension is also dividing the ruling National Party. The cohesion of the ruling class, which once appeared to be virtually monolithic, has been undermined. The reason

is that the steadily growing pressure from the national liberation movement strikes fear into the hearts of the racists for the future of the system as a whole. They are forced to cast about for ways to safeguard their positions and to perpetuate their rule over the rightless Black majority. It is the tactical differences on this issue that make for the conflict between the members of the various groups within the ruling circles.

The ultra-conservatives brush aside any idea of departing from the ossified canons of racial segregation. They have not only attacked the project for "reforms" proposed by Prime Minister P.W. Botha, but have also complained that many of the tenets of apartheid have already been consigned to oblivion. It may appear to be a monstrous joke for the Black workers, the countless victims of the terrorism sanctioned and practised by the racist authorities, for all those who are stunned by the ongoing tragedy in South Africa, to hear that the policy of racial discrimination and national oppression is being conducted with some "omissions." But it is still a fact that much of what the National Party initially considered indispensable has been quietly shelved because it turned out to be economically unfeasible. One example is the notorious "color bar" in industry. Despite its existence, Black working people are gradually being allowed to do some of the jobs earlier reserved exclusively for whites. That was required by the needs of the economy and the interests of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. The "constitutional reforms" are, in fact, an attempt to adapt, to "gear" apartheid to the requirements of big capital and the imperialist monopolies to an even greater extent.

The ultra-rightists' attacks on these reforms give the impression to political innocents that the government wears the halo of a fighter against racial discrimination. The same purpose is served by the widely publicized statements by South African officials in the United Nations and other international bodies designed to advertise the mooted "reforms." Actually, the "power-sharing" proposals are aimed above all at undermining the unity of the Black population in its struggle against the racist regime; and this is precisely how they were presented at the provincial congresses of the National Party, where they were met with approval. The establishment of a tri-cameral parliament and a presidential council, and the admission to these and also to the organs of local self-administration of a limited number of Coloureds (persons of mixed race) and Indians (of South Asian origin) are hedged with condi-

tions guaranteeing the predominance of whites at every level of the state system and preservation of the full plenitude of power in their hands.

It is not surprising that South Africa's democratic forces have branded the government's plan as a callous political farce. The oppressed masses are aware that they cannot ultimately benefit from any reforms within the framework of apartheid, a system which cannot be "improved;" it has to be destroyed and a new, democratic system built on its ruins.

Only a handful of puppets, among them the renegades in the leadership of the Coloured Labor Party, have agreed to play their role in the "power-sharing" circus. There was a veritable explosion of indignation among the Coloured people in South Africa at the party's decision to support Botha's "reforms." In some cases, these leaders had to ask for police protection against the people's indignation when they attended the meetings and rallies organized by the party. For its collaborationism, the party has been expelled from the South African Black Alliance.⁶ The democratic forces have taken a number of organizational measures so as to be in a position to respond more vigorously to any possible vacillations on the part of some moderates. One was the emergence of the United Democratic Front, which shows that the people are resolved to resist the regime's line of splitting the ranks of the oppressed.

The total hypocrisy of the "reforms" by South Africa's ruling elite is highlighted by the fact that the racist order is being toughened up even as the racists hold forth on involving Coloured and Indians in "parliamentary life" and the "exercise of power." In Pretoria, a number of parks which were opened to one and all in 1973 have once again been declared out of bounds for Black people. In Johannesburg, there was a tide of protest over the fact that the premiere of the box-office attraction, *Ghandi*, was played in racially segregated cinemas. The restrictions on the movement of Black South Africans and their choice of domicile have been tightened up.

The campaign of repression and terrorism is spreading. More people are being held in detention without trial and due process of law. South Africa holds the world record in the number of death sentences passed: since 1976, more than 1,000 persons have been executed in the country. Last June, despite worldwide public protests, demands by the UN Security Council, the Organization of African Unity and other international and national bodies, and appeals from the governments of many countries, the racists executed three more patriots,

members of the ANC. According to Sheena Duncan, President of the Black Sash, a South African group bringing together white women involved in the struggle for the rights of the Black population, "in very many ways, South Africa today is actually moving faster toward its grand design of apartheid. There is change, but it is not reform."⁷

The main evil is that the racist regime has not shown the slightest inclination to allow civil rights to Africans, the overwhelming majority of the population.⁸ The intention is still to turn them into aliens in their own land by claiming that they are "citizens" of tribal bantustans where many of them have never set foot in their lives. The bantustan policy, as South African patriots have repeatedly said, is not aimed at all to satisfy the aspirations of the Black people. Its main purpose is to split the Africans up into tribal groupings, to incite hostility among them and so weaken and stamp out the liberation struggle.

Pretoria is simultaneously seeking to create the impression that apartheid is being "dismantled," by telling the Africans: "Go back to your tribal enclaves and enjoy freedom over there." Indeed, there is no racial segregation within the pseudo-independent "bantustans," where the rights of citizenship are enjoyed only by the Africans, who as a rule belong to one and the same ethnic group. But the establishment of these artificial entities, which are effectively tribal ghettos, is in itself perhaps the most dramatic manifestation of "separate development of the races."

The forcible imposition of "independence" on the inhabitants of the "Black states" entails only one thing: a sharp worsening of their socio-political and economic condition. With the emergence of a bantustan, the members of the corresponding group are instantly stripped of even the minimal rights they had up to then enjoyed in South Africa and are turned into outcasts, helplessly waiting until there is a demand for their labor in the apartheid economy.

In economic terms, the bantustans themselves are absolutely unviable. They are located on barren wasteland and, in addition, are fragmented into scattered tracts. Thus, Bophuthatswane consists of six pieces, and Transkei, of three. The existence of an industry is virtually out of the question. Subsistence farming is in a state of decline because of the over-population (over the past 20 years, more than 4 million Africans have been driven into the homelands), and the rapid erosion of the topsoil. Even according to official data, which patently fail to reflect the actual hopeless state of the "economies," over the past two years

there has effectively been zero growth in production in the "independent" bantustans. According to the same sources, nearly 80 per cent of the population in these pseudo-states has no source of livelihood, i.e., these people are faced with death from starvation. Every year, almost 30,000 children (or 3-4 children an hour) die from malnutrition in South Africa. Diseases like kwashiorkor⁹ and marasmus¹⁰ are endemic. Citing these facts, a British newspaper correspondent says: "Whether malnutrition and high infant mortality can be eradicated in South Africa before apartheid is itself eradicated seems doubtful."¹¹

This year, South Africa was hit by a severe drought. The situation became downright catastrophic and mass famine spread in the bantustans. According to the *Rand Daily Mail*, the number of kwashiorkor-afflicted children in the hospitals of Northern Transvaal more than doubled. But these were the lucky ones. Specialists from the Institute of Natural Resources at the University of Natal believe that for every hospitalized child at least a hundred others were left uncared for. The Pretoria authorities have ignored the tragedy. The amount allocated in aid for the starving in areas with nearly eight million people was smaller than that which went in the form of subsidies to the drought-hit farms of less than 25,000 whites. The Africans have been left free to enjoy their "right" to die.

The collaborationists from the administrative élite being imposed on the "Black states" are the only ones who have benefited in any way from the bantustan policy. These puppets, who have been installed over and above the masses, are straining to please their masters. Such fly-by-night rulers as the "president" of Ciskei, Lennox Sebe, and his brother Charles, who heads the bantustan's police force, have been hounding the fighters for national liberation, trade union activists and all democrats and patriots. Within less than two years of "independence," the Ciskei police force has already chalked up a record for performing dirty deeds assigned to it by the white racists. The patently fascist methods used by the apartheid authorities are also being borrowed; and this is also characteristic of Transkei and Venda. As everywhere else in South Africa, the main blow is being aimed at the ANC, which is prohibited from carrying on its work on the territory of the bantustans, and its members and supporters are brutally hunted down. Attempts are made to undermine the trust of the masses for our organization by claiming that it is "terrorist" and that it, allegedly, operates "contrary to the people's interests."

But no amount of repression can prevent the Africans from rising to the struggle for their country's freedom, a single homeland not cut up into tribal enclaves. Some democratic forms of organization rejecting the policy of apartheid in all its manifestations have emerged in the bantustans. The growth of their activity is itself convincing evidence that there the African National Congress also continues to have influence and authority. It is to the ANC that the masses look for a solution to their problems, because their bitter experience tells them that the racist white minority has no intention at all of meeting the aspirations of the dispossessed, whatever the reformist tricks it may resort to. Its policy remains unchanged: to suppress by every possible means the urge of the oppressed Black majority for freedom and human dignity.

The line of genocide against the people at home is logically extended in the foreign policy sphere in the form of unceasing aggression against the neighboring independent states.¹² The racists became much more bellicose when the Reagan administration took office. Discarding the old fig-leaf rhetoric censuring the apartheid authorities for their violations of human rights, Washington has openly declared Pretoria to be its ally and got down to a "constructive engagement" with it. The once mainly unpublicized ties between the two countries were raised to an official level. South African delegations, including delegations from the war and intelligence departments, began to pay regular visits to the United States, and there was a string of U.S. visitors to South Africa. The U.S. Department of Commerce lifted its ban on the sale of a number of military-strategic goods to the racists. The United States backed a new loan (more than \$1 billion) to South Africa from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), despite the fact that the plan was opposed by an overwhelming majority in the UN General Assembly. The U.S. representative on the Security Council vetoed the resolution which condemned the large-scale invasion of Angola by Pretoria's troops.

Sensing Washington's diplomatic, moral, political and covert military-material support, the apartheid authorities have really let themselves go. Here is an example: just after one of the first statements by former Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who declared that henceforth the U.S. administration would give "resistance to terrorism" priority over "defense of human rights," and in the same breath attacked the African liberation movements, the South African militarists crossed into the territory of Mozambique. Armed raids on the frontline states and subversive acts against them have

become regular. The talks on the granting of independence to Namibia have been effectively scuttled.

The situation in our region continues to grow more complicated. A crisis, as acute in tension as that in the Middle East, has arisen and unless measures are taken without delay, the whole continent could be shaken by the destabilizing process. International peace is in jeopardy.

In these conditions, the liberated countries in southern Africa have demonstrated their resolve not to succumb to intimidation and not to retreat in the face of the racists' threats. Representatives of the frontline states meet regularly to consider ways and means of resisting South Africa's mounting aggressiveness. A Southern Africa Development Coordinating Conference has been set up for the main purpose of helping these countries to escape from the vice of their economic dependence on the apartheid regime.

Unity of action is the key prerequisite for

victory. There is also a need for unity on the scale of the whole continent. That is why we are most concerned with the condition of the Organization of African Unity, which has faced serious difficulties in the recent period. The imperialists, the Reagan administration in the first place, have naturally rubbed their hands in glee at the sight of the sharpening differences in the OAU ranks. After all, it is they who chiefly seek to inject an atmosphere of mistrust and disarray into relations among the liberated countries. But independent Africa has disappointed its enemies and has proved that it can act with unanimity and strengthen its anti-imperialist cohesion. The 19th session of the Assembly of the OAU heads of state and government showed that this organization continues to be an effective instrument in the fight against imperialism, colonialism, racism, apartheid, and for peace and international security. It continues to have an important say at authoritative international forums — in the United Nations and the non-aligned movement.

The African National Congress, a militant contingent of the revolutionary movement in Africa, resolutely supports these efforts. We must close ranks to realize the key provisions of the OAU Charter, to complete the process of decolonization on the continent, to liquidate the hotbeds of local conflict, to make a contribution to the struggle to stop the imperialist-fuelled race toward a thermonuclear catastrophe, and to assure the peoples of the world a peaceful and happy future in freedom, democracy and progress.

Special Edition

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Karl Marx's death, a deluxe edition of the **Manifesto of the Communist Party** illustrated with the classic woodcuts of the great Belgian artist, Franz Masereel (1889-1972).

In Canada:

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

cloth \$4.25

In the USA:

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Ave. S.

New York, N.Y. 10016

cloth \$3.25

1. Literally from Xhosa "bravest warrior feather," the highest honorary title awarded to outstanding fighters for the freedom of the people of South Africa. — Ed.

2. For details of the South African government's "constitutional reforms" proposals, see the article by Dr. Yusuf Dadoo "Crisis of the Racist System in the South of Africa," WMR, No. 12, 1982. — Ed.

3. The Pretoria authorities attached special importance to the project in the hope that it would help them solve the acute energy problem facing South Africa, which does not have adequate deposits of high-quality energy sources.

4. Quoted in *International Herald Tribune*, May 25, 1983.

5. *Financial Mail*, December 24, 1962.

6. Consisting of the Indian Reform Party and the Inkatha movement headed by the Zulu tribal chief Gatsha Buthelezi. — Ed.

7. *U.S. News & World Report*, May 23, 1983, p. 32.

8. About 70 per cent. — Ed.

9. A special type of grave dystrophy afflicting very young children due to lack of protein in the food.

10. The wasting and emaciation of the body due to long starvation or malnutrition.

11. *The Guardian*, May 29, 1983.

12. See also "Southern Africa: Rebuff the Aggression," WMR, No. 7, 1983. — Ed.



Party work: criteria of effectiveness

Costas Tsolakis
CC Political Bureau member,
Communist Party of Greece

Greece now lives in a new political situation which has taken shape after years of bitter struggle by left and democratic forces, a struggle which led directly to the defeat of the right parties in the October 1981 parliamentary elections and the installation of the PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement) government. It is true that social development is still far from being determined by a democratic trend. It was said at the 11th congress of the CP Greece (December 1982) that the prospect for profound anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist changes, vigorously demanded by broad masses of people, is being complicated by various difficulties produced both by the reactionary counter-offensive and by the PASOK government's inconsistent and contradictory line. The political situation in the country remains fluid and ambiguous.

The new situation demands that the CPG should not only improve and renew the forms of its organization and activity, but also reassess the old criteria by which the effectiveness of party work is judged, which is why we feel that the reflections on this matter which have appeared on the pages of this journal are especially relevant.¹ We are most interested in the following questions: how are we authentically to determine whether we are advancing or marking time? Are our influence among the masses and the party's capacity to influence various aspects of social and political life growing or not?

Here, much does, of course, depend on the objective conditions. After all, the concrete historical environment largely "dictates" the lines and forms of the activity of the social forces, including the communists. But something else is also self-evident. The CPG's experience shows that there are a number of general, fundamental indicators of the effectiveness of party activity whose relevance and significance are not influenced by the political situation. These are, above all, criteria like the *organizational strength and ideological maturity of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, the solidity of its ties with the masses and the*

role of the communist party as a factor in national life.

We are sure that each of these general indicators not only can be applied on its own but also contains some highly important concrete elements whose significance tends either to increase or to decrease according to the requirements of the time and of the objective conditions. That is the context in which we have tried to comprehend a possible range of the most meaningful criteria of the effectiveness of party work in the light of the realities of modern Greece.

Party building is always geared to the political line, to the tasks in hand. Following the overthrow of the "Black Colonels" dictatorship in July 1974, the CPG emerged from the underground and got down to a substantive organizational reconstruction and renewal, consolidation and expansion of its ranks. The Communist Party's responsibility and obligations to the people demanded, as it was said at the 10th congress of the CPG (May 1978), that it should be turned into a strong and massive Marxist-Leninist party broadly relying on the working class and the other working people, closely linked with the trade unions and other mass organizations and capable of successfully fulfilling its mission under any conditions. At the same time, the congress drew the communists' attention to a number of organizational and ideological problems whose solution would help to advance in fulfilling this task.

The powerful influx into the CPG of fresh forces lacking hard-won experience in the underground struggle was not to have any negative impact on the party's theoretical thinking, its organization, discipline and ideological cohesion, or on its steadfast loyalty to the revolutionary doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and internationalist traditions. *All these qualities — an assurance of the CPG's viability and effective activity in the new conditions — had to be cherished, creatively developed and passed on to the new generation.*

The successful solution of many problems in the organization and ideological spheres en-

abled the party markedly to advance in fulfilling the main task set by the 10th congress. In the four and a half years between the 10th and the 11th congresses of the CPG, the party's numerical strength almost doubled. The active recruitment of industrial workers and young people improved its social and age composition,² a reflection of the party's growing authority and influence in the masses, and this is a visual indicator of the effectiveness of the communists' effort.

Our experience testifies that the party's conversion into a mass party and its establishment as a real national force constitute a single and indivisible process. Only a massive party is capable of convincingly manifesting its presence simultaneously in various spheres of social life, taking an active part in the solution of burning national problems, and dispatching its couriers to every stratum of the population to mobilize the masses for the struggle. Such a party alone has the strength and energy to take effective action along the diverse lines of the class struggle, from factory and cooperative to municipal council and parliament. One can also hardly object, I think, that this is the kind of party which finds more favorable conditions for forming political alliances at the grass roots, in the midst of the popular masses, something that in turn helps to achieve understanding at the top. All of this warrants the assertion that *the party's numerical growth is one of the main indicators of its influence in society and the masses, an important criterion of the effectiveness of its everyday work.*

What has been said, of course, applies only to a party acting in the conditions of legality and not subjected to police repression and persecution. It is also true that in certain political conditions even a "small" party conducting an active and vigorous policy is capable of exerting its influence — frequently crucial influence — on the course of developments. In this context, Lenin remarked that "even a small party . . . after it has thoroughly studied the course of political development and become acquainted with the life and customs of the non-party masses, will at a favorable moment evoke a revolutionary movement."³

I want to note yet another aspect. The party's numerical strength and percentage in the country's population are, of course, important in any conditions, but in themselves they merely go to create good opportunities for effective activity, without in any way guaranteeing the party's activeness or its ability to reach every stratum of the society. Consequently, this does not yet give an adequate notion of the magnitude of the party's revolutionary potential or of its capacity

to determine its strategy and tactics correctly, by creatively applying the theory of scientific socialism in accordance with the national peculiarities of the class struggle. In other words, *quantity becomes strength only when it goes hand in hand with the requirements of quality.*

We believe, therefore, that the assertion that the party's numerical growth is an important criterion of the effectiveness of its work is true only if the concern for enlarging the party ranks is filled with a class content, backed up with an attentive and exacting approach to young communists, and reinforced with conscious and creative participation by each party member in the day-to-day struggle for the attainment of the set goals.

The present situation requires that the CPG should be strengthened in every way, and this is equally impossible to do without enlarging the organization and enhancing vigilance and responsibility in the recruitment of new members. The penetration into the communist ranks of some people who do not join out of conviction but on the spur of the moment inevitably tends to erode the party's class face and do it considerable harm. That is why not everyone who wants to call himself a communist is admitted to the CPG, but only those who meet the requirements of the rules. Prospective members go through a six-month probation period and are at once given a concrete assignment. For some time, an experienced communist helps the newcomer to get a feel of the CPG traditions and to learn of its strategy and tactics. We believe that scrupulous observance of this arrangement helps to keep the new membership up to the required standard and provides a guarantee of continuity in the CPG's class, revolutionary and internationalist traditions.

In the complicated and contradictory situation which has taken shape in Greece, the Communist Party is faced with the task of consolidating and building up the mass democratic movement, helping to realize in every way its truly tremendous revolutionary potential. How is this difficult task to be fulfilled? There is only one answer: *there is a need to enhance the party's role in national political life, to strengthen its ties with the masses, to organize and mobilize the masses in the struggle for democracy and socialism.*

We speak about the communists' influence in society and of their "presence" in national life. But for all that, the CPG, a working-class party, seeks above all to promote the working-class movement, which is ever more vigorously manifesting itself as the leading force in the struggle for the satisfaction of the socio-

economic demands of all the working people, for a policy of genuine change. The Greek communists have concentrated their attention on work in the midst of the industrial proletariat, at the large enterprises and in the trade unions. How is the growth and extent of the party's influence in this sphere to be measured?

Let us look at the facts. In the period since the 10th congress of the CPG, proletarian action in the country has continued to gather momentum, increasing in scope and militancy. Work-stoppages, rallies, marches, demonstrations and other forms of struggle have become widespread. Between the 10th and 11th congresses, the number of strikes and strikers nearly tripled over the preceding four-year period.

But how much of this should be credited to the communists? It is hard to provide a simple answer or to "measure" or "weigh" such party influence. However, we have made a thorough study and analysis, for instance, of how the working class has responded to our proposals, how these proposals have helped to radicalize the demands and politicize the slogans of the working-class movement, and the extent to which they have penetrated into the minds of working people who were but recently among the passive sections of the population. The results of this analysis make it clear that the workers' demands now range not only over the economic sphere, but also bear on political problems like protection of the population's constitutional and social rights, defense of peace, Greece's withdrawal from NATO and the EEC, and the liquidation of the military bases located on national territory.

We also believe the following indicators to be important: how many communists have been elected to trade union leadership and as shop stewards at enterprises, the strength of unitary trends in the trade union movement, the extension of the network of party cells at enterprises (the big ones in the first place) and so on. There have been recent signs of marked progress along all these lines.

Thus, in 1978 unionized workers totalled no more than 300,000, and in 1983, 700,000. Here, much of the credit goes to the CPG's lower-echelon organizations, which the 10th congress urged to work hard to involve the bulk of the working people in the trade unions. Here is another indicative fact: in 1978, the CPG enjoyed definitive or considerable influence in 300 lower-echelon trade union organizations, and now the figure is 1,240 (out of a total of 3,500). Furthermore, virtually all large enterprises now have CPG organizations, while the workers of many factories and plants openly read and circulate the party newspaper *Rizospastis*, in defiance of an employer's ban. All of this undoubtedly has a positive effect on the trade union movement as a whole.

In a critical evaluation of what has been done, the CPG is aware that the working-class movement in Greece is still faced with many outstanding problems. At some enterprises, the building of trade union structures is still in an embryonic state. A large part of the working people has yet to be unionized, and the problem of unity in the trade union movement is still far from solution. These difficulties are to some extent determined by objective circumstances which do not depend on the communists' activity. Still, we say that action by party organizations and trade union activists who are CPG members has not been sufficiently effective. That is why the 11th congress called on the communists to bring about a qualitative improvement of their work in the trade unions. This requires an in-depth analysis of the causes of the above-mentioned shortcomings, consideration of the specific problems relating to women and young people, and a correct definition of the lines and forms of struggle in order to unite the broadest working masses.

While giving great attention to the working class, the key source of the communists' influence, the CPG has also sought to play an important role among the peasantry, the urban middle strata, workers in science and the arts, etc. We are fully aware that vigorous activity exclusively among the workers could produce a serious disorder known as "ouvrierism," whose main symptoms are neglect of the allies of the working class and underestimation of their role in the political struggle. This could have grave consequences for a revolutionary party.

The political changes demanded by the broad masses in Greece are inconceivable unless there is close cooperation of all the progressive forces. In the less than two years since the democratic parties won the election and PASOK took office, some positive changes have certainly taken place, but these have neither affected the interests of the monopolies nor produced genuine national independence. That is why it is still perfectly clear (and awareness of this is being driven home to ever broader strata of the population) that many of the urgent economic, national and democratic problems remain outstanding, and that they cannot be solved without the participation of the masses, and without the support of the CP Greece, let alone in defiance of it.

However, the working people's struggle is being substantially hampered by the PASOK leadership's clearly negative attitude to co-

operation among the progressive forces and also by the insufficiently solid unity of the masses, and this has prevented the utmost use of the new situation for advancing along the way of democracy.

We would be misleading the masses if we concentrated our attention on achieving accord "at the top" or if we took a wait-and-see attitude until the differences dividing the democratic forces are surmounted. Our policy of cooperation envisages an uninterrupted process in the course of which the positions and views of the parties are approximated to each other, the existing preconceptions are overcome, and anti-communist prejudices are broken down.

It would be no exaggeration to say that much now depends on active, persevering and skilful action by each of the CPG's grass-roots organizations, on the capacity of the communists in the localities to find and fill with real content diverse forms of joint mass action, even if only on a local scale, on a temporary basis, and on particular issues. After all, any step toward cooperation, however modest it may appear to be at first sight, brings nearer the desired unity and enlarges its framework.

Many party organizations have gained some interesting experience in this context. For instance, at the factories commissions are set up on the communists' initiative to demand reinstatement of unjustly laid off workers, and they frequently force the employer to make such re-instatements. Understandably, these commissions take an equally firm stand for the interests of communists, socialists or the supporters of "New Democracy."⁴ Another popular form of work is the staging of referenda on the scale of a city, a village, a municipal area or an enterprise to deal with burning social and even international issues (like the defense of peace, removal of U.S. military bases from Greek territory, etc.).

The course of the struggle shows a party organization's capacity to lead the broad masses, and whether its influence is great, its slogans convincing, and its proposals intelligible. I think that advance toward grass-roots unity or conversely, the marking of time, could be regarded among the most meaningful criteria of the effectiveness of the communists' work in our conditions.

It was said at the 11th congress that "we frequently confine ourselves to working with only a part of the population on which we have a direct political influence."⁵ What is it then that impedes consistent implementation of the CPG's unity platform? It appears that shortcomings like narrowness of view, mistrust or

apprehensions concerning other advocates of change and also of people traditionally supporting bourgeois parties, and an inability to find a common approach with them on concrete issues are far from being of secondary importance. It is highly important for every communist to comprehend that the success of the policy of alliances depends, not least importantly, on his own willingness to cooperate with members of diverse democratic forces, and that it is determined by his personal efforts, tolerance and respect for the views of his allies. It is also highly important for every communist to understand that unity cannot be promoted by flabbiness or abandonment of principle "for the sake of cooperation" in the face of PASOK's hegemonistic ambitions.

We are prepared to use any opportunities for cooperation "at the top" and seek such opportunities. But we also openly tell the masses: *not everything depends on the communists alone*. Alliance is a voluntary matter so that no cooperation will materialize if one of the parties has no need of it, to say nothing of resisting it in every way. That is just as natural as every party's urge to maintain its independence in an alliance and to expand its own influence in society.

The communists yearn to secure the unity of the forces of democracy and progress on the basis of equality, respect for independence, and repudiation of any discrimination and diktat whatsoever. In order to attain this goal, we are prepared for a long and patient dialogue and for definite compromises. That does not at all mean that in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of its policy, the CPG will act without principle or allow its "definite party stand"⁶ to be effaced. The establishment of an alliance is an objective imperative. That is why the Greek communists have been working hard to make the unity of the progressive forces demanding real change an eventual reality on a principled basis.

The number of votes won in elections is frequently set up as one of the criteria of party success in bourgeois society. This is not as simple a matter as it looks. Let us consider our own experience.

In the past eight years, the CPG took part in six parliamentary and municipal elections. It is noteworthy that the party's popularity with the electorate has been steadily growing from one election to another. Thus, in the 1974 parliamentary elections the United Left Front (of which the CPG was a member) won 9.47 per cent of the votes, whereas in 1977, the CPG alone won 9.36 per cent, and in 1981, almost 11 per cent, which made it the country's third

largest party in terms of parliamentary seats (13).

In that period, there has also been a marked increase in the number of communists with seats on the local organs of power, as the following eloquent data show:

	1975	1978	1982
Elected mayors	22	32	46
Elected members of municipal councils	500	800	1,118
Elected community chairmen	35	230	474
Elected members of community councils	700	1,600	3,080
Total communists elected	1,257	2,662	4,718

The Communist Party scored an especially impressive success in the 1982 municipal elections, in which it won mayoral posts in 46 cities. Add to this the fact that, thanks to the support of those who voted for CPG candidates in the first round of the balloting, socialists were elected in the second round as mayors of Athens, Piraeus and Salonika, that is, the country's major cities, and this will bear out the correctness and effectiveness of the CPG's political line in the preparations for and during the elections.

Is that a reflection of the Communist Party's growing authority and influence? All the well-known reservations about the substance of bourgeois democracy apart, can the election returns be regarded as a criterion of the effectiveness of the party's work?

We believe that parliamentary and municipal elections can provide the communists with a barometer to gauge the rise or fall of their influence with the electorate. A comparison of the various election returns makes it possible to judge, very tentatively of course, about the extent of the working people's support of the party's policy, and the spread of its influence by area, which means the direction in which we need to improve our activity.

The election returns provide a more objective notion of the effectiveness of work among the masses not only by the party as a whole but also by its regional and local organizations. How many members and supporters of the CPG took part in formulating and discussing its electoral program? How many factories, villages and districts are involved in the party's agitation and propaganda measures? How many individual meetings and conversations were held and how many people were involved? How many people attended the party's electoral rallies and meetings in a given town (neighbor-

hood, village)? The answers to these and similar other concrete questions are useful in shedding light on the positive experience and the omissions in the communists' daily work.

At the same time, it would be wrong to forget that the results of elections held under the rule of the bourgeoisie nearly always fail to reflect a communist party's real influence in the masses and are not commensurate with its role in the life of society. The causes are many, and they are manifested in different ways in various conditions. There is, for instance, the impact of the casuistic anti-democratic laws and regulations which erect diverse obstacles on the communists' way to parliament, the impediments to their use of the mass media, whose role in shaping the political sympathies or antipathies of a section of the electorate can hardly be exaggerated, the deep-rooted anti-communist bias, the acute shortage of campaign funds available to communist parties in contrast to the generous funding of the bourgeois parties by the monopolies, and many other things.

The expression of the electorate's will is also frequently influenced by the international situation, historical traditions, ingrained habits and, one could say, the psychological implications of the elections. Thus, the CPG's true influence among the masses was not reflected in the 1981 parliamentary election, the main reason being that on that occasion many voters supporting the Communist Party voted for PASOK in the belief that this would help to solve the main problem, which was getting out the rightists. Under repressive regimes, electoral campaigns are obviously no reflection of the actual pattern of political forces.

Consequently, for all their importance, elections cannot serve as the chief, let alone sole, criterion of the communists' role, place or influence in society. We do not accept the reformist parties' approach in judging their popularity with the population mainly on the strength of a string of electoral triumphs and defeats.

The present situation puts on the CPG a new and more responsible mission in the country's political life, investing it with the role of main advocate of the idea of comprehensive democratic change. The task we set ourselves in this connection is to exert an active influence on the minds of the broadest strata of the Greek people, explaining to them the goals and substance of genuine change and rallying them around these objectives. It is not only a matter of winning an additional number of supporters and voters (although that is also of exceptional importance), but also of driving home to the

whole population — both those who now follow the party, and those who support other political forces — the communists' ideas and proposals for the whole spectrum of the problems moving the nation.

We believe that this most difficult task can be fulfilled only by a party which does not confine itself to criticizing the existing system and government policy, but also *puts forward clear-cut alternatives in every sphere of foreign and domestic policy*, offering the masses concrete ways for solving the problems with which they are then concerned. I think that in the present conditions this capacity of the party — swiftly to formulate convincing proposals on the ways of tackling emerging problems — tends to be the key criterion of the effectiveness of its activity.

Well-argued and constructive criticism, which facilitates dialogue and attainment of unity, will naturally continue to be our reliable weapon in the future as well. But that is not enough. By proving the errors of other policies, it is possible to shake faith in them among a section of the working people, but not to win their trust. So the problem is, at long last, to convert the Communist Party into a force which does not so much deny as make proposals. That is why it is highly important to popularize our revolutionary platform in every way, so as to show the working people not only that the policies of others are wrong, but above all that our own are correct.

Only a party that has a scientifically grounded and realistic program of transformations that is understandable to the masses can expect to be recognized as a national force. The CPG does have such a program for anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly change. The CPG has its own well-argued conception on literally every sharp issue of national life, ranging from state-wide problems (NATO, military bases, curbs on the power of the monopolies, development of the state sector in the economy, relations with the EEC, etc.) to particular problems of local importance.⁷ The documents of the party's 10th and 11th congresses contain well-considered and scientifically verified realistic proposals on virtually all the problems which to any extent agitate the minds of our people today. Here, one has to stress that these are not pious hopes or propaganda slogans. The communists' proposals add up to a concrete program of radical solutions for the urgent problems. That this is more than rhetoric will be confirmed by hundreds of thousands of Greeks who have experienced at first hand the results of the CPG's activity in the local organs of power.

The 11th congress set the task of theoretically elaborating the key problems in the development of society more swiftly and on a higher level. The masses await answers to questions like the fight against inflation and unemployment, the nature of the economic crisis and the ways of getting out of it, the peculiarity of the country's social perspective in the present conditions and many others. All of this calls for the marshalling of the party's scientific and intellectual resources, in particular more creative and effective efforts by our Center for Marxist Studies.

In saying all this, one must add that the party's proposals on the ways of tackling the nation's problems should be heard not only on the floor of the parliament or popularized through the CPG's periodicals, or just in the major administrative and industrial centers. We believe that it is important that they should be carried to every little town and village. But that is not enough either, because the party's governing bodies cannot comprehend the whole diversity of the social reality in the localities, which means taking it into account in formulating the alternatives. Hence the responsibility of the grassroots organizations, whose task is to know the mood of the masses, to study the needs of the population and to work out ways of satisfying these. *The capacity of each grassroots organization to put forward its own proposals for the solution of local problems in the light of the CPG's general political line could well be listed among the criteria of the effectiveness of its work.*

In this article I have, of course, dealt with only some of the aspects of party work, leaving aside many indicators of the effectiveness of efforts by this or that party organization and of the party as a whole, such as the spread of printed matter,⁸ fund-raising drives,⁹ the number of communists with permanent assignments, and also the number of communists regularly paying the established membership dues, and so on.

In view of the limited space available, I have deliberately confined myself to just a few questions which, we believe, are the main ones in Greece's specific conditions today. We emphasize that these conditions are specific, because the conversation started by comrade K. Naumann calls above all for a concrete historical approach to the search and definition of criteria, and not just for abstract reasoning. The distinctions between the social-class realities in which the communist parties now have to operate are obviously great, so that *criteria which are of primary importance in one case may not be essential elsewhere*. But it would evidently also be wrong to deny that there are

some common indicators of work effectiveness which are meaningful for all the parties. We should like to know how these common criteria are manifested in different ways, depending on the national specifics and on the requirements of time and place. I am sure that a comparison of differing experience and standpoints could yield useful matter for all, both in elaborating the theoretical thinking of the communist movement and for our practical activity.

1. See K. Naumann, "Party Work: Questions of Effectiveness," WMR, No. 1, 1983.

2. At the time of the 11th congress, the CPG's social make-up was as follows: workers, 32.77 per cent; peasants, 18.11 per cent; employees, 14.48 per cent; scientists and other workers by brain, 12.32 per cent; artisans, handicraftsmen and petty traders, 9.72 per cent; other social groups, 12.60 per cent; 77 per cent of the party members

were under the age of 40 years, and women made up 22.6 per cent of the membership.

3. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 476.

4. "New Democracy", a right-wing political party. Set up in September 1974; ran the country until the 1981 parliamentary election. — Ed.

5. 11th Congress of the Communist Party of Greece. Documents, Athens, 1983, p. 94 (in Greek).

6. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 210.

7. See C. Florakis, "For a Peaceful Future and Real Change," WMR, No. 5, 1983.

8. In 1978, the daily printing of *Rizospastis*, the organ of the CPG CC, was 30,000 copies, and in 1982 — 42,500. In addition, 51,000 copies are circulated in Athens and Peraeus alone on Sundays. *Rizospastis* is now Greece's largest morning daily.

9. Since 1974, the CPG has held four fund-raising drives, and their results speak for themselves: 1978 — 150 million drachmas, 1979 — 200 million, 1981 — 250 million, and 1982 — 275 million.

New experience

OUR INTERVIEWS

FOR NATIONAL RENEWAL

Aldo Tortorella

Leadership and Secretariat member,
Italian Communist Party

Could you tell us what made the ICP give up the historical compromise policy and switch to the democratic alternative idea, as formulated at the party's 16th congress?¹

The historical compromise policy was frequently taken to be for what it had actually never been. That conception did not at all set itself the goal of achieving an understanding with the Christian Democratic Party (CDP) at any price. But considering that such a vagueness did appear, we stopped using the term. However, the fundamental proposition on which the historical compromise rested — to unite the various social strata and political forces and mobilize them for the solution of Italy's acute problems in the economic, political, moral and institutional spheres — remains fully valid.

Nor has the question of the ICP's attitude to the Catholics lost any of its importance. A sizable section of them supports the CDP, but we have always stressed that it would be a mistake to assume that all the Catholics should be identified with the CDP. Many believers are now already members of the left-wing parties or various Catholic organizations which are not Christian Democratic. Finally, far from all the members of the CDP share the views of that party's leadership. So in putting forward the

democratic alternative policy, we have no intention of forgoing the contribution which Catholics could make to its realization.

The experience of the national solidarity government² showed — especially after Aldo Moro's murder — that the Christian Democrats are incapable of escaping from the fetters of the power system they themselves have created. That is why Italy needs a democratic alternative to that system, which it was impossible to shake by means of the national solidarity policy and which, if it remains, could merely increase the phenomena that are detrimental to the whole of the country's political life, including the main one, which is identification of the ruling party and the state. The democratic alternative is designed to put an end to such a state of things, presenting a program for restructuring the economic administration, the state organs and the whole power system. Consequently, this will be a process of transformations.

Is it right to assume that an alliance of left and democratic parties will act as the vehicle of the democratic alternative?

The left democratic parties will constitute the basis of the alliance. But we believe that it should also involve the other political and social forces, by which I mean the numerous sections of the working people who are now not represented by the left parties but who have a stake in changing the system of state administration and the order existing in the society. The democratic alternative could be supported by numerically small secular parties, which

now vacillate between the left-wing circles and the center. I have in mind the Social Democratic, the Republican and, in a sense, the Liberal parties. The latter now takes a more open stand with respect to the socialist-oriented forces.

We fill the alternative idea with a profound innovative content. The alternative is to be constituted not only by the traditional political circles, but also by the trade unions and major associations representing the middle strata: artisans, petty traders, peasants, etc. In other words, the idea is to establish an alliance of all those who want to implement a jointly worked out project for the transformation of the society.

What is this project?

First of all, it provides for Italy's all-round development, because, with the present lag in some sectors of the economy and some geographical regions, like those in the south, our country could be called relatively underdeveloped. Italy suffers from chronic unemployment, whose level has been further pushed up by the crisis. The economic model which is characteristic for our country and for other capitalist countries, and which is oriented toward a growth of individual consumption at the expense of the social interest creates the danger of dissipating a sizable part of our national resources, and poses a threat to the environment and to cultural and national values that are an asset belonging not only to Italy but to humankind as a whole.

We believe it to be important to work out a model for socio-economic development which, while not scrapping the achievements, and not ruling out any rational growth in the popular masses' level of well-being, still, in our view, unsatisfactory, would make consumption different, more collective and social. The idea is to form an alliance of forces interested both in the country's development and in the establishment of a new system of public administration that would bring to the fore values like the people's cultural and occupational standards, in place of the primacy of fortunes, superiority of the wealthiest strata and financial might.

Such, in the most general outline, is the content of the alternative and the character of its political and social alliances.

As far as we know, the Italian Socialist Party (ISP) is not prepared at the present time to respond positively to the communists' proposal. Couldn't this hamper the ICP's initiative?

The socialists still display indecision and vacillation with respect to our initiative. It would be wrong, however, to assert that they have completely rejected the alternative idea. The fact is that in the past the socialists were in

opposition to the CDP, but subsequently moved away from that policy and resumed cooperation, however conflicting it may now and again be, with the Christian Democrats within the framework of a left-of-center government coalition. But joint membership of the government with the CDP has brought the ISP very serious disappointments.³ The socialists have failed to attain the goals they set themselves, but these goals were, incidentally, formulated by the whole government coalition as well (for instance, the need to overcome the economic and financial crisis, protection of public law and order, the combating of organized crime, and improvement of the society's moral health).

In the recent period, there has been an improvement in relations between the ISP and the ICP. The socialists have come to realize that no effective cooperation with the Christian Democrats in the government is possible. They have felt in practice the latter's aggressiveness with respect to their party. The improvement in the relations between the ISP and the ICP was also promoted by the comprehension of the fact that the existing forms of cooperation between the socialists and the communists meet the interests not only of the two parties but also of the masses of working people and the country as a whole. There is no doubt that a weakening of the alliance of the communists and the socialists in the trade unions or other mass organizations, in the municipal councils of the major cities and the regional councils now run by the left-wing forces would harm the overwhelming majority of the people, and the whole of Italian democracy. That is why we discern within the ISP not only the vacillation, but also some signs of a reappraisal of its political line.

What are the spheres of social life in which the dialogue and mutual understanding between the communists and the socialists could be extended? What is the communists' role in the struggle for realizing the democratic alternative?

The need for dialogue and cooperation between the ICP and the ISP is most pronounced on the level of the local organs of administration. In many places, such cooperation has become a reality and is being consolidated in some respects. Elsewhere, it is just taking shape, but it is already opening up fresh opportunities both for extending ties between the two parties and for developing democratic policies on a national scale. For instance, a left-wing junta was recently formed in Bari, one of the three major cities in the south of the country. On it are socialists, communists, social democrats, and Republicans. A socialist was elected

mayor of the city, and his deputy is a communist.

Cooperation between the ICP and the ISP has also been resumed in the Naples municipal council and is being maintained in Taranto. We are fully aware of the unusual nature of such changes, because in most cases the cities in the south are run by coalitions with the pre-eminent influence of the Christian Democrats in alliance with the socialists. Just now, dialogue and cooperation between the left-wing parties are gradually spreading from the north and the central regions to the south. That does not, of course, rule out contradictions, which are frequently caused by factors of local importance. In Florence, for instance, the joint administration of the city by the communists and the socialists was interrupted by a decision of the local ISP organization, and not of its national leadership.

We believe that dialogue and cooperation between the two parties should also develop in the course of the struggle on the social front for satisfying the economic demands of the working masses, for safeguarding the rights and freedoms they have won, and for putting through democratic changes in the sphere of culture. Here is another area of cooperation: there are places in Italy where legality is virtually non-existent, and where criminal Mafia-type organizations are rampant, having struck deep roots in society in consequence of the permissiveness displayed by some political forces and organs of power. We believe that cooperation between the communists and the socialists is also of crucial importance for solving this problem.

Considering that relations are being established between forces which have a different character, there is a need to reckon with their distinctions and show respect for their independence. Consequently, each party must be free to determine its own political line. By cooperation we also mean efforts aimed to gain a better understanding not only of each other, but also of all of us together gaining a better knowledge of the country's real needs.

The ICP seeks the deepest insight into the Italian society's real problems. The communists attach primary importance to this task in realizing the alternative. It is high time to understand that one's opponents should never be blamed for one's own defeats. The main thing is to bring out one's own shortcomings and difficulties. We say as much to the other left-wing democratic forces, stressing, for example, that some of their political propositions have not yielded the desired results. Say, the ISP's concept of manageability, which was

designed to assure Italy of a stable government, did not justify itself and failed to solve the existing problems. These cannot, of course, be solved within a few months, but a few small intervals apart, the alliance of the Christian Democrats and the ISP and other non-religious parties has, after all, existed for more than 20 years.

Italy is now faced with a number of grave problems. We do not deny that some of the responsibility for this also falls on the opposition, including the ICP. But it is perfectly obvious that the main responsibility for the state of affairs in the country falls on those who are running it.

So, the communists' task in implementing the democratic alternative is to renew their own selves and to induce the other forces to renewal. We must launch a massive struggle and put forward major political initiatives to solve the problems which worry all Italians. Nothing will come of talk about policies in abstract terms alone, i.e., exclusively in terms of relations between the parties.

In this context, Palmiro Togliatti's precepts are increasingly meaningful. He taught us that a party seeking to become a genuine transformative force in the society cannot confine itself to preaching a socialism that will arrive in the future; it must vigorously intervene in the country's current life, indicating concrete ways for the solution of vital problems.

At the present stage, the communists need to make the utmost effort in what we believe to be four main areas. First, to press with initiatives in defense of peace, because it is now imperative above all to avert the greatest danger — the danger of war — impending over Italy and Europe as a whole. Second, to continue the search for ways of getting the country out of the socio-economic crisis. Third, to stand up for the democratic rights which are being trampled in some parts of Italy. And finally — last but not least — to put forward initiatives aimed to overcome the most crying injustice faced by humankind, when some have everything, and others nothing, and when large masses of men and women are doomed to spiritual ignorance.

By invigorating and improving our work in the midst of the people, and putting forward proposals and ideas designed to change the state of things, we shall advance to the democratic alternative.

1. Held in Milan from March 2 to 6, 1983 — Ed.

2. Formed in March 1978 by the CDP with the participation of socialists, social democrats, and Republicans with the Italian Communist Party's parliamentary neutrality. In January 1979, the ICP was once again forced to switch to the opposition. — Ed.

3. In May 1983, the CDP-led government fell. Its resignation and pre-scheduled parliamentary elections were initiated by the ISP, which was nominally dissatisfied with the CDP's diktat. In the elections held on June 26 and 27, the CDP received 32.4 per cent of the poll (38.3 per cent in 1979); the ICP — 30.8 per cent (31.5 per cent); and the ISP — 11.4 per cent (10.4 per cent). After the elections the ISP leadership reaffirmed its negative attitude to the idea of setting up a government with the communists' participation. — Ed.

DOCUMENTS

DECLARATION BY ARAB COUNTRIES' COMMUNISTS

Important international problems, especially the situation in the Middle East, have been discussed by a meeting of communist and workers' parties of Arab countries.¹ Their declaration stressed that the participants in the meeting condemned Washington's aggressive strategy, which is aimed to undermine the policy of détente and peaceful coexistence and to switch to total confrontation with the USSR. U.S. imperialism's adventurist line, the document says, is fraught with the grave danger of a world nuclear war. This makes the efforts to defend peace and save humankind from catastrophe the main problem facing all the peoples.

The declaration regards the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestine Resistance Movement as a part of the hegemonistic U.S. policy on a global scale, as a part of the offensive by U.S. imperialism against the Arab national liberation movement for the purpose of establishing its military-political and economic domination in the region.

The document draws attention to the mounting danger of aggression against Syria, which has rejected the Lebanese-Israeli agreement² and the "Reagan plan." In these conditions, defense of Syria acquires pan-Arab and international significance.

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab countries call on all Palestinian national-patriotic forces to display the utmost concern for the preservation of unity. This is a task, the document stresses, not only for the Palestinian patriots, but also for all the other progressive trends in the Arab world.

The Declaration condemns the violence, terrorism and discriminatory practices with respect to the communist parties of some countries in the region, and the attempts to prevent the communists' active participation in political life, and voices solidarity with the fraternal parties of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Egypt, Bahrain and other progressive forces and national liberation movements.

In order to resist the U.S.-Israeli aggressive

anti-Arab line, the participants in the meeting outlined a program of action envisaging the mobilization of broad popular masses and of all the national patriotic circles in the Arab countries in support of Syria, of the Lebanese National Patriotic Forces, and of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the establishment of its own state under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative. The declaration contains a demand for the release of all political prisoners that have fallen victim to repression by reaction, or those imprisoned in Israel and on the occupied Arab territories; it also expresses solidarity with the People's Party of Iran.

1. It was attended by the representatives of the Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, the National Liberation Front of Bahrain, the Egyptian CP, the Iraqi CP, the Jordanian CP, the Lebanese CP, the Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco, the Palestinian CP, the CP of Saudi Arabia, the Syrian CP, the CP of the Sudan, and the Tunisian CP. — Ed.

2. The so-called "peace agreement" between Israel and Lebanon signed with U.S. participation on May 17 of this year as Israel continued its military occupation of a sizable part of the territory of the sovereign Lebanese state. — Ed.

IN THE MIRROR OF THE PRESS

PRAVDA

Plenary meeting discussions

Pravda, organ of the CPSU Central Committee, daily tells its readers how the communists throughout the country are tackling the tasks set before them by the June 1983 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC. The improvement in ideological and political-education work and efforts to tie it in with the solution of tasks in economic and cultural construction, and tightening up discipline and order are being discussed from every angle by plenary meetings of republican, regional, city and district party organizations and by party committees and work collectives.

Every day brings news of numerous measures aimed to make ideological work more effective in the light of the decisions of the June plenary meeting, says *Pravda*. This includes lecture days, scientific conferences with a practical approach, fixed political-study days, addresses by leading party, government and trade-union functionaries, scientists, propagandists, social-science lecturers in shops, field stations and cattle-breeding units. Special TV and radio programs are being broadcast, and newspapers and journals, including *Pravda*, carry special sections shedding light on advanced experience in ideological work.

Thus, an article published in *Pravda* under

the caption "CPSU CC Plenary Meeting Discussions" reported on the activity of a center set up under the Central Committee of the CP Georgia for the study, shaping and prognostication of public opinion. In the several years of its existence, the center has carried out almost 70 sociological studies, in the course of which it polled 48,000 industrial workers, 32,000 office workers, 18,000 collective farmers, 28,000 students, 5,000 pensioners and 4,000 housewives. This voluminous material was processed and enabled the Central Committee of the CP Georgia to take a number of concrete measures for improving the situation in various spheres of social life in the Republic.

Pravda says that other ways of studying the working people's opinions are being used, including sociological questionnaires, meetings with men and women at their place of work or residence, and the canvassing of opinion on various problems by newspapers, radio and television. In order to answer the questions being asked by the population, extensive use is made of debating clubs. These have recently emerged at many enterprises and on Georgian TV, which has a highly popular Dialogue Studio. In addition, the center systematically issues a special bulletin entitled "What Is on People's Minds in the Republic" and publishes highly popular collections called "Frank Dialogue."

The article emphasizes that the initial experience gained by the center has proved most convincingly that the sceptical attitude which some party workers initially took to it was unjustified, and its help is being requested ever more frequently. Thus, the CC Bureau, CP Georgia, has analyzed the results of public opinion polls on the work of Georgia's civil aviation and railway transport, administrative institutions, marketing establishments and everyday services. The center helps the Central Committee to analyze various aspects of party committees' activity and to see more clearly in the mirror of public opinion every functionary's weak and strong points.

The effectiveness of the center's efforts best of all confirms the importance and necessity for carrying on this line of ideological work today. No wonder, says Pravda, some city committees and large primary party organizations in Georgia are now setting up councils for the study of public opinion.

IN BRIEF

AUSTRIA

The CP Austria Central Committee has decided

to hold the 25th Congress of the CPA from January 13 to 15, 1984.

BRITAIN

On the initiative of the CP Great Britain, a left forces' festival was held in London to mark the 165th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx and the centenary of his death. It featured meetings and debates on various issues, and was also a demonstration of protest against the reactionary policy of the Conservative Thatcher government.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Central Committee of the Dominican CP has decided to hold the DCP's third congress from March 16 to 18, 1984.

GDR

The German Democratic Republic marked the 40th anniversary of the Free Germany National Committee, whose formation during the Second World War was a major landmark in the history of the German anti-fascist resistance movement and its leading force, the Communist Party of Germany. Upon the country's liberation from fascism, the valuable experience gained by the communists in the Free Germany movement was used in setting up the democratic system and subsequently in building the first workers' and peasants' socialist state on German soil.

POLAND

Polish writers who are party activists met in Warsaw to discuss the situation among the country's writers.

PORTUGAL

The PCP Central Committee's Political Commission has announced that the 10th congress of the Portuguese CP is to be held from December 8 to 11, 1983.

SPAIN

The CP Spain held its traditional festival in Madrid's Casa del Campo park, where dozens of colorful pavilions were set up by the party organizations of Asturias, Andalusia, Catalonia, Castile and other regions. The main topic of the posters and displays was the struggle for peace and disarmament, for Spain's withdrawal from NATO.

TUNISIA

A plenary meeting of the Tunisian CP decided to hold its ninth congress in 1984.



A crucial year for Europe

SCIENTISTS AND MILITARY
EXPERTS ON THE AIMS AND
CONSEQUENCES OF DEPLOYING
U.S. MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES

European and world opinion is increasingly alarmed by Washington's stubborn intention to go ahead with the deployment of new U.S. medium-range missile systems on the territory of a number of West European countries in late 1983. There is a growing awareness among wide strata of the population in the West European countries, the United States and Canada that the Reagan administration's adventurist, militaristic policy is making developments extremely dangerous and posing a real threat to the very existence of humankind.

The relevant problems were considered at a meeting of civilian and military experts at the Vienna International Institute for Peace. Among them were: Dr. *Daniel Ellsberg*, public figure, formerly of the U.S. Department of Defense; Professor *Georg Fuchs*, President of the Vienna International Institute for Peace; Brigadier General *Michael Harbottle*, Retired, former Chief-of-Staff of the UN Peace-Keeping Force on Cyprus, associate of the Center for International Peace-Building Studies, Great Britain; Dr. *Carl Jacobsen*, Professor, University of Miami (Florida, USA); Lieut.-Gen. *Michail Kirjan*, Professor, Dr. Sc. (Military Sciences), Deputy Head of the Institute of Military History, Ministry of Defense of the USSR; Dr. *Josef Mrazek*, head of the International Law Department of the Institute of State and Law, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, head of the Disarmament Section of the Academy Presidium's Commission for Research into Peace and Disarmament Problems; Senator *Nino Pasti*, Retired General, Italy; *Nikolai Polyanov*, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), Scientific Director, Vienna International Institute for Peace; Dr. *Walter Schutze*, associate of the Institute for International Relations, France; Brigadier-General *Michalis Tombopoulos*, Retired, Greece; Dr. *Joachim Wernicke*, consultant engineer, Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics, West Berlin. *WMR* was also represented at the meeting.

Below is a main-line summary of the opinions expressed in the discussion.¹

Has the balance of forces been upset?

Nikolai Polyanov. In November 1982, President Reagan tried to justify the unprecedented U.S. arms build-up program by claiming that the Soviet Union had a clear advantage in every area of military strength. That does not square with the facts. Thus, the balance of forces between the USSR and the United States in strategic armaments was painstakingly analyzed during the almost seven years of talks connected with the drafting of SALT-2. As a result of that analysis, it was recognized that there was an equilibrium, and this was confirmed in a document signed by the heads of the two states in 1979. Is it conceivable that within two or three years the Soviet Union has proved capable of gaining a "clear advantage" in strategic armaments, which take a very long time to develop and deploy?

The same applies to Europe, where a rough equilibrium in medium-range nuclear weapons was established many years ago. This is especially evident if, in accordance with elementary logic, it is recognized that here the Soviet weapons of this type (the other Warsaw Treaty countries do not have any) are faced with the following types of nuclear vehicles: first, the various types of U.S. missiles, above all Pershing-1, the U.S. bombers based in a number of West European countries and on aircraft-carriers plying the seas which wash the shores of Europe; second, the British and French ground-to-ground and sea-to-ground ballistic missiles, and also the Air Force aircraft of Britain and France.

In any comparison of medium-range nuclear arsenals in Europe it is not right not to count the latter element, as the United States, Great Britain and France would have it. Whatever name NATO diplomats may give this type of weapon, the point is that the British and French missiles

and bombers have a range which allows them to strike at targets as far away as the Urals.

Carl Jacobsen. The Pentagon has lately issued many documents showing that there is no U.S. inferiority in any of the areas we are considering. The Reagan administration's "Soviet superiority" arguments are merely sleights-of-hand.

Michael Harbottle. The U.S. administration's statements that it is prepared to scrap its plan for deploying Euromissiles only if the Soviet Union gives up all its SS-20s² is like a bargain from the "have-nots" to the "haves." As I see it, the USSR does see itself totally targeted from all sides, and even if the new U.S. missiles were not deployed, it would still have to face the threat not only of the submarine weapons and the air weapons of the United States, but also of the United Kingdom and French deterrents.

We, in Britain will certainly be pressuring our government that they must accept the fact that our weapons cannot be left out of the equation. Otherwise, it is impossible to reach any agreement.

Nino Pasti. I have tried many times to examine official U.S. documents, and I have reached this conclusion: the Reagan administration and its senior members, including the chiefs of the armed forces, are simply not telling the truth when they insist that the strategic equilibrium has been upset. It follows from Pentagon publications for 1983 that in the number of nuclear warheads the United States has always been and continues to be ahead of the Soviet Union. A diagram appended to these documents shows that during the last 10-20 years the number of U.S. nuclear warheads increased by more than 5,000. Former President Carter had admitted that the United States leads in the development of new types of nuclear weapons. So who is to blame for the arms race?

Now and again one hears the argument that in the presence of the SS-20s, we, NATO's West European countries, also need to have weapons capable of striking at targets on Soviet territory. Let us imagine, however, how the West would react to any member of the Warsaw Treaty declaring, in view of the capacity of the United States to deliver a nuclear strike at its territory, that it needs to have its own weapons to hit at targets in the United States, and insisting that such weapons would not upset the equilibrium and so should not be put on the scales weighing the balance of forces.

When on active military service,³ I always opposed the deployment of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The urgent task now is to maintain the equilibrium of strategic forces,

taking into account all the medium-range systems.

Walter Schutze. A few words about the arsenals of France and Great Britain. Concerning French nuclear weapons, I believe that they are completely independent from the NATO standpoint and in purely military terms, because France and the North Atlantic Pact have no common "targeting plan," and because the French President alone has the prerogative of setting in motion both the tactical and the strategic missile forces. Things are different with similar British weapons. Apart from purely national weapons, Great Britain has at its disposal four submarines armed with Polaris missiles. These are a component part of NATO's armed forces in Europe and are operationally subordinate to NATO's Atlantic Command. That is why the British strategic arsenal must be counted together with the NATO arsenal.

Josef Mrazek. May I disagree with Dr. Schutze's appraisal of the role of the French nuclear forces. By way of evidence let me refer to the Ottawa Declaration, which was signed by all the NATO countries, including France, in June 1974. It says, altogether unambiguously, that the armed forces of France and Great Britain help to strengthen the common North Atlantic "potential for deterrence." President Francois Mitterand, Defense Minister Charles Hernu and Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson have repeatedly reiterated France's unconditional adherence to the North Atlantic Alliance and its readiness to meet the consequent commitments.⁴ That being so, can one ignore the French potential when determining the balance of forces?⁵

Michail Kirjan. I think that this question is transparently clear. There are two military-political alliances: NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. Everything that is at the disposal of the members of these alliances is designed for the single purpose of each of them. Why then should the weapons belonging to one side be taken into account in the talks and counted, and those of the other (namely, British and French weapons) should not be taken into account and counted.

One often wants to ask how our partners in the Geneva talks would react if it turned out, say, that Czechoslovakia and the GDR have several hundred missiles, with us declaring that these are not our missiles, which is why they should not be taken into account at the talks. They would surely declare such an attitude to be absurd.

Why have Euromissiles

Michalis Tombopoulos. The real reason for the U.S. insistence on installing Euromissiles is to obtain military superiority. The idea is that the Pershing-2s are capable of hitting targets deep inside Soviet territory within a few minutes, leaving the other side no time to organize its defenses. These are effectively first-strike weapons. Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger put it plainly when he said: "With those — the Pershing-2 and Cruise — we will win the nuclear war."⁶ Such a declaration leaves no room for doubt that the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe will be a highly provocative and risky step.

Carl Jacobsen. The U.S. administration's main line is to ensure "war-fighting" and "war-survival" capability. This echoes a tradition rooted in the old military-strategic doctrines of the United States, as epitomized in Carter's Presidential Directive No. 59.⁷ The United States has, in fact, always looked to the possibility of threatening to deliver a first strike.

But in its strategic planning Washington at one time recognized that there was a "bottom line," which meant that in the event of an attack, the Soviet Union was capable of destroying the United States in a retaliatory strike. But Reagan and his entourage refuse to reckon with this. The Pentagon's hope is that the deployment of missiles in Western Europe would render the accumulated Soviet equipment stocks obsolete. Meanwhile, it is perfectly clear that the Soviet Union will never agree to have the military parity upset.

The Reagan program also rests on another premise. It is that the USSR's military-scientific potential may in theory suffice to counter America's drive for military superiority, but that its economy will be unable to sustain the effort. So, Moscow must concede, or bankrupt itself. But this view is not shared by U.S. specialists on the USSR, either in academia or in the CIA.

Josef Mrazek. I fully agree with those who believe that behind the plans to deploy the Euromissiles is the U.S. urge to gain strategic superiority. These missiles have the function of instantly destroying Soviet political and military centers and even ICBMs in hardened silos. Colin Gray, a White House adviser, has frankly declared, for instance, that Pershing-2s should not be regarded as a counter-weight to the SS-20s. He holds that the United States would need the Pershings, even if the Soviet side did not have a single missile of that class.

In planning the deployment of Euromissiles,

the Pentagon expects that, in the event these are used to start a war, a retaliatory strike would be aimed at the countries of Western Europe, so leaving the territory of the United States itself intact.

Walter Schutze. In this context, it is worthwhile to recall the letter which Weinberger sent to Cardinal Joseph Bernardin in the autumn of 1982. In it he argues that it is important to "limit" the framework of a nuclear war above all to preserve the United States. And that, we believe, is the purpose of U.S. "theater weapons", that is, missiles designed for use within the confines of the European continent.

Daniel Ellsberg. One of the elements that defines the danger of the present situation is surely the desire and determination of the present U.S. administration to continue the arms race to assure the production of new weapons which do have first-strike capabilities. I believe that the idea of using medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe is a part of that doctrine, which makes the Euromissiles peculiarly dangerous to world peace. Their important place in the Pentagon's plans explains why the U.S. side has no desire to see any results in Geneva that would preclude the deployment of Pershings and Cruise missiles in Western Europe.

Fresh threat to the continent

Josef Mrazek. The deployment of U.S. missiles will destabilize the situation on the European continent and increase the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war. The resultant situation poses a threat to peace throughout the world.

Is there any need to argue that the deployment of Euromissiles sharply affects the vital interests of Czechoslovakia, a country lying in the very heart of Europe. Besides, we cannot but be alarmed by the fact that NATO's arsenals already contain nuclear weapons that can be delivered on target by tactical missiles and planes aboard aircraft-carriers of the U.S. Sixth Fleet. One can easily imagine the grave concern which our people have in the face of all this.

Joachim Wernicke. Never before has Germany (West Germany — Ed.) experienced such a dangerous situation as it does today. This danger will grow immensely as a result of the siting of new U.S. missiles on its territory. There is only one military logic for West Germans: regardless of whether an atomic or "conventional" armed conflict breaks out, regardless of whether life will remain anywhere else on the Earth, for the FRG any modern war spells the end of history.

Daniel Ellsberg. There is a widespread belief in the United States that the actual deployment of a few Pershings would bring a negotiated settlement closer. This is not just the propaganda point being made by the administration, but one finds it constantly in Congress and the media. It seems to me to be insane.

Once the missiles are deployed, a door to understanding may have been shut, not opened, and a long period of an extremely dangerous arms race may begin. I am convinced that the Soviet Union would respond with counter-measures, something that is perfectly natural for a great power to do. In a similar situation, the United States would do the same thing.

Michail Kirjan. Soviet leaders have repeatedly and unambiguously said that the Soviet Union will not allow the military parity to be upset. CPSU General Secretary Yuri Andropov emphasized in his interview with *Der Spiegel* that "for the peoples of the Soviet Union, of the United States, of the Warsaw Treaty countries and of the NATO countries," the Soviet-American negotiations at Geneva affect literally life-and-death issues, and warned that if new missiles are deployed, the USSR will find "the means to respond to the acts of the Americans both directly with respect to the territory of the United States and with respect to Europe."⁸

These are definitely not empty words. There should be no illusions on this score. To the question about precisely what kind of measures we shall take, let me answer straightforwardly: that is something I don't know. But one thing is clear: the deployment of U.S. missiles will undoubtedly draw a reaction from our side.⁹ It is equally clear that if Washington decides to set them in motion, retaliation will befall both the United States and Western Europe.

It is necessary to stop, urgently to stop! A point is approaching from which there is simply no way ahead. One cannot expect to win a modern nuclear war. To start a nuclear war is also to doom oneself to destruction. There is a need for everyone to comprehend this profoundly as a starting point in practical politics.

Josef Mrazek. The Pentagon has been framing its plans for "limited" nuclear wars primarily with an eye to Europe. They are essentially absurd. At the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar was quite right in saying: "All decision-makers know that, by its very nature, a nuclear war cannot remain limited. Once a nuclear exchange begins, there will be no way to contain it within a predetermined framework." That is

why, he stressed, "the prevention of nuclear war is not only a moral imperative, but also a question of survival."¹⁰

A similar conclusion was reached by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security.¹¹ One of its reports says: "We are totally agreed that there is no such thing as a nuclear war that can be won."¹² The well-known analysis by McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara and Gerard Smith¹³ in *Foreign Affairs* says that "any use of nuclear weapons in Europe by the Alliance (meaning NATO. — Ed.) or against it, carries with it a high and inescapable risk of escalation into the general nuclear war which would bring ruin to all and victory to none."¹⁴

There is a way out

Nikolai Polyakov. The success of détente in the 1970s showed that in the world today there can be only one rational military-political principle, the principle of equality and equal security. The political will of the USSR and its allies is in complete accord with that principle. It has been formulated in a number of declarations, including the Prague Declaration issued by the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee. All together, these initiatives constitute a real program for saving Europe and the whole of humankind from the threat of war.¹⁵

Realization of the socialist countries' proposal for a treaty on the mutual non-use of armed force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries would be an important step in attaining this goal. This implies, in effect, a mutual repudiation of the first-use both of nuclear and of conventional weapons, that is, a commitment not use any military means against each other.

Measures to limit and subsequently to eliminate all types of nuclear missile weapons are the central problem of our day. On the table of the Soviet-American talks is the USSR's proposal for a reduction of strategic weapons on a reciprocal basis by roughly 25 per cent. There is also the Soviet plan for a radical elimination of the nuclear threat to Europe. It envisages a complete repudiation of deployment on its territory both of medium-range and of tactical missiles designed to strike at targets within the boundaries of the continent. Faced with NATO resistance on this proposal, the Soviet Union formulated a number of new ideas providing, as a first step, for only a reduction of such weapons. Their adoption would make it impossible for either side to obtain any advantages. This would benefit the security of Europe.¹⁶

Regrettably, Washington did not respond to any of the Soviet initiatives. For its part, it came forward with the proposal known as the "zero option." This provides for the liquidation of all the Soviet medium-range missiles not only in the European but also in the Asian part of the USSR, with a simultaneous preservation and even increase in the nuclear-missile potential of the allies of the United States in Europe, which means the Soviet Union's effective one-sided disarmament. The "interim option" has the same purposes.¹⁷

Josef Mrazek. The creation of zones free from nuclear weapons could be a substantial contribution to reducing the nuclear threat impending over Europe. This idea was approved in the Warsaw Treaty countries' Prague Declaration. Czechoslovakia came out in support of the Swedish proposal to establish a zone in Central Europe free from battle-field nuclear weapons. Our government believes that is necessary to widen this zone to at least 500-600 kilometers, since modern military technology keeps turning out tactical nuclear weapons with a constantly growing range.¹⁸

Walter Schutze. The Prague Declaration issued by the Warsaw Treaty countries in January 1983 offers an opportunity for overcoming the contradictions through a mutual consideration of interests. That is why it should become the starting point for a resumption of the policy of détente between East and West in the true sense of the word, namely, for reducing international tensions.

Michail Kirjan. There is yet another question. It is connected with our proposal to suspend the further stockpiling of weapons for the duration of the talks, that is, to freeze them. What could ultimately be the point of negotiating if there is a simultaneous adoption of new hardware, both in terms of quantity and quality? It would be logical to stop at what is already there, and then to start reducing. It is time to recognize that the existing parity level is already too high. It is so high that we have a mind-boggling absurdity: the stockpiled weapons would suffice to wipe out the population of a dozen planets like ours.

Michalis Tombopoulos. An important element for any person of good will to judge on the crucial issue of who is for war, and who is for peace, is to consider the peace proposals made by the two sides. The United States has made two proposals: the "zero option" and the "interim option." They amount to the Soviet Union's one-sided disarmament, and for that reason are unrealistic. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has made two important proposals: the draft of an international convention for

the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons for good, and a program of general and complete disarmament under reliable control. Washington has either altogether failed to respond to these or other similar initiatives, or has rejected them. However, such an attitude on the part of the U.S. administration can hardly cause surprise, considering that the substance of its policy is intense preparation for war.

Nikolai Polyanov. In a comparison of the lines of the USSR and the United States, it is clear even to the layman that the Soviet approach is not aimed to derive any one-sided advantages. The Soviet Union seeks open and serious negotiations, honest agreements and complete fulfillment of undertaken obligations.

The other side takes a totally different approach to negotiations. Let me give only one example. In the autumn of last year, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State Richard Burt in effect admitted that the agreement to start talks at Geneva on medium-range missiles in Europe was required to create a semblance of Washington's desire to attain progress in arms limitation. Otherwise, he added, it would be impossible to make the NATO governments agree to the deployment of new U.S. missiles, while the anti-war movement would be further intensified. That speaks for itself, doesn't it?

Michael Harbottle. When, despite the ongoing talks, one side (the United States. — Ed.) earmarks \$1.5 trillion for spending on armaments over the next five years, it is very hard to see this as evidence of a sincere desire for an agreement on disarmament.

Carl Jacobsen. All the difficulties in any negotiations on limiting the arms race are rooted in the fact that the Reagan administration is not interested in either freeze or non-use. But any understanding does, after all, require both sides to have an interest in reaching an agreement. In this case, you have one side that is not interested in arriving at an agreement, and that is Washington.

Daniel Ellsberg. If the Reagan administration will not change its stand, if the anti-nuclear movements in the United States and Europe are not enough by themselves to stop the deployment, if the West European governments continue to support Reagan on this issue, the only remaining possibility is some new initiatives on the part of the Soviet Union.

I believe that the Soviet Union has done everything it could do. Its proposals are in many cases good proposals, which I would be happy to see accepted, and they are certainly better proposals than are being made on the NATO side, or by the United States. But the

chance of these proposals being accepted is as small as it was in the past. These proposals were never tested, nor were they ever likely to be tested by the U.S. government. I believe that the Soviet Union does desire to see the arms race ended. That is the basis for my hope that it can be ended.

Michail Kirjan. Of course, it is right to say that the Soviet Union should put forward initiatives and set an example. That is just what it has been doing all along. Let us recall, for instance, its unilateral commitment not to use nuclear weapons first, or the series of measures on freezing and reducing Soviet weapons, including the SS-20 missiles. The whole series of ever new Soviet approaches to the medium-range-missiles-in-Europe issue is marked by an urge to find a way out of the impasse. It would be only fair if our partners made a positive response to the Soviet initiatives at least once, even without setting an example themselves.

No time to lose

Josef Mrazek. In our day, science has an exceptional impact on people's life and work. Besides, scientists are better informed than many others not only on its tremendous constructive but also on its vast destructive potential. Scientists can and must make a contribution to helping public opinion gain a greater insight into the dangers and possible consequences of the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons.

Michalis Tombopoulos. There are several important lines along which action could be taken. Activists in the anti-war movement could, for instance, draw attention to the fact that the United States has taken a negative attitude to the idea of creating nuclear-free zones and withdrawing nuclear weapons from countries where they are deployed. It is useful to inform the public more broadly about Washington's urge to preserve military strongholds in Europe.

Daniel Ellsberg. The U.S. movement against militarization and the arms race is now as large as the action against the war in Indochina ever was. There are more people currently resisting registration for the draft than was ever true during the Vietnam war. More people are risking prison for political reasons right now than was ever true before. I believe that if there were no Americans in jail or risking jail just now, the United States would have combat units in El Salvador. So these people — to be a little optimistic here — are not only acting conscientiously and bravely, but they are acting powerfully, right now and with effect.

The same applies to the struggle against nuclear weapons, which is being joined by fresh forces. Is it not indicative that one of the most respected moderate Catholic leaders, Archbishop John R. Quinn of San Francisco, recently declared that U.S. soldiers "should refuse any order to detonate a nuclear weapon"? He interpreted the Pastoral Letter of the Catholic Bishops¹⁹ as a requirement to defy any government orders to use nuclear weapons. He went on to stress that the Statute of the International Nuremberg Tribunal, providing for the punishment of war criminals, also applies to the United States: "The Nuremberg laws, established by the Allies during the trials of Nazi leaders after World War II, made clear that individuals must defy immoral government orders."²⁰ Nothing like this, incidentally, could be heard even during the Vietnam war. This change in American politics is a revolution.

With the deployment of the Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Western Europe the situation will worsen, probably irreversibly. Everyone, unlike the U.S. President, who wants to see this arms race end must, I think, explore with the greatest urgency how she or he can contribute in new ways, going further than before and considering the possibility of risks, personal risks, career risks.²¹ I believe that Quinn has said something I must agree with: "We have to stop this now!"

Michail Kirjan. It is evidently the task of scientists and military experts, as those who are the most knowledgeable, to give correct and convincing explanations of the gist of world developments to show the true sources of the mortal danger arising for the whole of humankind. I have repeatedly heard the Soviet Union and the Soviet Army described as a force which wants nothing better than to deliver nuclear strikes, mount offensives, capture the territory of other countries, and so on and so forth. All of that is, of course, sheer slander. I declare, on the highest authority, that Soviet military doctrines have no use for aggressive wars, for any "nuclear-first-strike" strategy. There is no reason at all to link up the deployment of SS-20 missiles in our country with an urge to deliver such a strike.

That is why the task is to drive home to the widest possible public circles the substance of the Soviet proposals on limiting and reducing armaments, and to expose the true meaning of Washington's stand in this area. This could help to see whose doctrines are mortally dangerous, and whose pave the way to peace. When the popular masses come to realize that in the event of a nuclear war no one in the world has any chance of survival, they will do every-

thing to force the governments nurturing plans for armed conflict to abandon the idea of "superiority" and "first strike" and to get down to honest negotiations on arms cuts.

Walter Schutze. I think it would be useful, with an eye to the long term, to show that action in defense of peace springs from a much more profound reason than mere protest against NATO's missile decision. The present stage of the movement, unrestricted by any party framework, and involving all strata of the population, emerged at the grass roots — and spontaneously — as a reaction to Washington's total armament program and its refusal to ratify SALT-2. In the NATO countries, there was above all the reaction to Reagan's statement that a military clash in Europe need not necessarily result in an exchange of strategic strikes between the United States and the Soviet Union. The peoples of our countries saw this approach as an urge on the part of the U.S. leaders to attain their goals at the price of Europe's destruction.

Joachim Wernicke. Academic lawyers could have an important role in the struggle against the deployment of U.S. medium-range weapons in Western Europe. Their duty is to show the public, including members of parliament, that such action would be unlawful in the light of both national and international legislation.

The starting point, I believe, is to explain the incontrovertible fact that nuclear weapons are a means of mass destruction and, as such, are prohibited by a number of international treaties. It is equally important on the strength of the opinions of military experts and official documents of the U.S. administration and the NATO bloc (some of which were already mentioned in the course of our discussion) to show that Pershing-2s and Cruise missiles are designed for a first-strike strategy.

Concerning the FRG, it would be desirable to give its citizens repeated reminders that, in accordance with Article 25 of the constitution, international laws take precedence over national laws, regardless of whether other states abide by international law norms or not. The deployment of first-strike weapons on its territory conflicts directly with Article 26 of the constitution, which declares as unconstitutional any acts designed "for the preparation of an aggressive war."

Nikolai Polyanov. For some leaders, Europe may be no more than a remote "theater of military operations" on a staff map. But it is home for the Europeans, who cherish its every stone and tree, it is the home of our great-grandparents and of our great-grandchildren, the common place of our labor effort, of our future.

Europe, a seat of world civilization, and a continent that has experienced a great many cataclysms, tragedies and conquests, has the right to a peaceful future.

There is no time to lose. Everything must be done to make a start on reducing the nuclear arsenals and conventional weapons on European soil, on ridding Europe of chemical weapons, and equally on strengthening all-round cooperation between all the states of the continent. The year 1983 must become a turning point in its history.

1. Above all, matters relating to medium-range nuclear weapons. — Ed.

2. NATO's term for Soviet medium-range missiles with multiple warheads — Ed.

3. From 1966 to 1968, Nino Pasti was NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, responsible for nuclear strategy, and was later Chairman of Italy's Supreme Armed Forces Council. — Ed.

4. This stand was once again reaffirmed when Francois Mitterand signed the military-political document at the Williamsburg meeting of the leading capitalist powers in June 1983. — Ed.

5. A Joint Statement issued by the delegations of the CPSU and the French CP on July 13, 1983, said that "the French Communist Party believes that, since France is a member of the North Atlantic Alliance and, in that capacity, has consequent obligations, its nuclear forces must be taken into account within this framework in any overall count of forces existing in Europe" (*L'Humanité*, July 13, 1983).

6. Quoted in M. Tombopoulos's statement. — Ed.

7. Signed in the summer of 1980, PD 59 envisaged preparations for war, with emphasis in particular on a multi-scenario use of strategic forces, ranging from "limited" to "decapitating" nuclear strikes. — Ed.

8. *Der Spiegel*, April 25, 1983, p. 129.

9. The Joint Declaration adopted at a meeting of party and state leaders of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the USSR at the end of June 1983 says: "In the light of the interests of peace and of their own security, the states participating in the meeting declare that they will never allow any military superiority over themselves to be established. They resolutely stand for ensuring an equilibrium of forces at the lowest level." — Ed.

10. *Disarmament. A Periodic Review by the United Nations*, Vol. V, No. 2, November 1982, pp. 10 and 14.

11. It was set up in the autumn of 1980 as an independent international body under the chairmanship of Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden and leader of the Swedish Social Democrats. It included prominent public and political leaders representing countries with different social systems. — Ed.

12. Quoted in Josef Mrazek's statement. — Ed.

13. From 1961 to 1966, McGeorge Bundy was the U.S. President's National Security Adviser; in 1952, George F. Kennan was U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to Yugoslavia from 1961 to 1963; from 1961 to 1968, Robert S. McNamara was U.S. Secretary of Defense, and from 1968 to mid-1981, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; from 1969 to 1972, Gerard Smith headed the U.S. delegation at the strategic arms limitation talks, and from 1977 to 1980 was the U.S. President's Ambassador at Large and Special Presidential Representative on non-proliferation matters. — Ed.

14. McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S.

McNamara, Gerard Smith, "Nuclear Weapons and the Atlantic Alliance," *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1982, p. 757.

15. For details see the article by Pavel Auersperg and Sergei Tsukarov, "Socialism in the Drive for Peace," *WMR*, No. 3, 1983.

16. Back in 1981, the Soviet Union proposed a reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, leaving the Soviet and the NATO side 300 missile launchers and medium-range aircraft each, as a result of which 1,300 nuclear weapons vehicles would be eliminated. After this, in December 1982, in view of objections from the U.S. side, the USSR proposed the establishment within the framework of the said total level of 300 units, a sublevel for missiles, and declared its readiness to have in the European zone as many medium-range missiles as Great Britain and France had. Accordingly, complete equality would also be established in medium-range aircraft between the USSR, on the one hand, and the United States, Great Britain and France, on the other. Finally, in early May 1983, it was declared that the Soviet Union was prepared to have, at each mutually specified period, not only not more missiles but also warheads on them than the NATO side had. Realization of that proposal would result in a situation in which considerably fewer medium-range missiles and warheads on them would be deployed in the European part of the USSR than were deployed until 1976, when the Soviet Union had no SS-20 missiles at all. — Ed.

17. Washington initially declared its readiness to give

up its plans to deploy new missiles (Pershing-2 and Cruise) only if the USSR completely liquidated its SS-20 missiles. That is the "zero option." It then came forward with the "interim option," which boils down to the deployment in Western Europe of a part of the new U.S. medium-range weapons in exchange for a cutback in similar types of Soviet weapons. Neither the first nor the second option takes any account of U.S. nuclear weapons aboard aircraft based in Europe and also on aircraft-carriers in European waters. Similarly, no account is taken of the nuclear potentials of France and Great Britain, while the Soviet side is addressed with the demand of taking into account its missiles in the Asian part of the USSR as well. — Ed.

18. A similar stand has been taken by the other fraternal countries — Ed.

19. A pastoral letter adopted by an overwhelming majority at the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in May 1983 arguing that nuclear war was immoral and calling for a freeze and a reduction of the strategic potential. — Ed.

20. *San Francisco Examiner*, May 5, 1983.

21. At the end of last June, Daniel Ellsberg was imprisoned in the United States together with 800 other participants in a demonstration of protest against the U.S. administration's militaristic policy, which they staged at the nuclear laboratory at Livermore, California. — Ed.

Monetarism: economic and class content

Laurence Harris
Professor of Economics,
Great Britain

In the last years, two leading capitalist states have adopted policies characterized as monetarism. Under Prime Minister Thatcher and President Reagan, Great Britain and the United States have followed deflationary policies at a time when the capitalist economies are suffering from an international crisis. Deflationary policies have been adopted before, even during the 30-year boom that followed the Second World War, but the present policies are marked out from the Keynesianism that prevailed then by their underlying ideology, the emphasis they give to monetary and financial operations, and the attempt to construct around them a political and economic program with a direction which is opposite to that of Keynesianism.

Although Britain and the United States have become the leading testing grounds for

Concerning the present-day economic doctrines of big capital see the articles by M. Hudson, "Monetarism: Cure for Crisis?" *WMR*, No. 6, 1981; and V. Perlo, "Reaganomics: The Economic and Social Consequences," *WMR*, No. 1, 1983.

monetarism, they are not the first or only examples. For decades, the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany have applied some of the financial discipline that monetarists try to build their policies around; and before the victory of the left forces' bloc in France in 1981, Prime Minister Barre also applied an austerity program with a monetarist character.

Moreover, outside of the state-monopoly capitalist countries themselves, several economies have been subjected to monetarist policies. The best known case was that of Chile, where the fascist dictatorship, installed by General Pinochet after the overthrow of Salvador Allende's government, set about constructing a monetarist regime under the tutelage of the United States' multinational corporations it served and under the direct supervision of economists trained at Chicago University. And earlier on, since the mid-1950s a host of developing countries, for all the distinctions in their political regimes, have also been forced to adopt monetarism, for the International Monetary Fund has insisted on such

policies as a precondition for the extension of financial aid for balance of payments deficits.

Monetarist policies everywhere comprise three related elements. First, a claim to counter inflation by controlling the amount and rate of growth of money in the economy; restrictive targets for the increase in cash and bank deposits are set. Second, cuts are attempted in state spending for social needs and, especially, in the amount of it that has to be financed by borrowing, i.e., the government deficit. Third, a policy of promoting *laissez-faire*, competition and the free operation of market forces. These policies comprise the monetarist program, although the actual outcome has not fully conformed with it.

Monetarism at first appears paradoxical for its emphasis on *laissez-faire*, on limiting state spending and borrowing, and on reducing the economic role of the capitalist state seems to run counter to the tendency to enhance this role in order to stabilize the conditions under which the monopolies operate. The paradox is also increased by the fact that the theoretical basis provided for monetarism by bourgeois economics is weak and does not itself justify this radical change in direction.

These problems are considered in this article, which, first, outlines the doctrine's theoretical base and uses Marx's political economy to demonstrate its faults; and second, assesses the role of monetarist policy in state-monopoly capitalism from the standpoint of historical materialism.

Ineffective means

Bourgeois economics provides two theoretical propositions to justify monetarist policies: the quantity theory of money, and the proposition that a system of competitive markets with fully flexible prices produces a general equilibrium with an optimum use of resources.

The quantity theory of money was first developed by Marx's predecessors, the classical economists, particularly Hume and Ricardo, and Marx developed a thorough criticism of it. It has subsequently been revived and placed on a more sophisticated footing; first, by neo-classical economists writing in the late 19th and early 20th century, and subsequently, following the Keynesians' attacks on the quantity theory, by the neoclassical followers of Milton Friedman.

The theory's central proposition is simple: the price level — the average of commodities' money prices — is determined by the quantity of money in the economy. The measure of money varies over time, but today it has to include notes and coins and various kinds of

bank deposits, so the argument is that if the amount of cash and bank deposits rises, an increase in the price level will result. It is a theory of inflation, for it says that inflation of, say 10 per cent per annum, will result from a 10 per cent annual growth in the money supply. In the strong form in which monetarists believe it, it says that this is the only cause of inflation: a rise in the cost of a raw material, such as oil, will not cause inflation, unless the government allows the money supply to increase.

The quantity theory is based on several assumptions. A crucial one distinguishing it from Keynes' propositions is that the total amount of commodities is constant. If that assumption is not made, the Keynesians argue, a rise in the stock of money may lead to an increased demand for commodities which, instead of pushing up the price of the fixed supply of them, will lead to an increase in firms' output. Thus, for the Keynesians, if growth of money does lead to increased demand for commodities, it will lead to increased output at the same price, or increased output at a slightly higher price, but not simply to prices that have risen by as much as the money supply unless the reserve army of labor is so depleted that no further increases in output are possible. Monetarist theorists, however, argue that competitive markets with flexible prices ensure that output and employment are always at their maximum. If there is unemployment, it is either because trade unions prevent competition in the labor market, so that the price of labor (the wage) is not fully flexible, or else because, while the wage is flexible, people registered as unemployed are really exercising a voluntary choice against working.

The three components of monetarist policy correspond to this theoretical apparatus. From the quantity theory of money comes the conclusion that control of inflation requires control over the amount of money. The proposition that competitive markets lead to an optimum use of resources and to the maximum desired output is used to justify the promotion of *laissez-faire* and withdrawal of state intervention from markets (as well as underpinning the quantity theory). And the idea that competition generates a maximum equilibrium level of output leads to the idea that state spending should be cut because it necessarily appropriates commodities from the given quantity that would otherwise be available to the private sector. This last proposition contrasts directly with the Keynesian idea that the stagnation of capitalism could be avoided by government spending which, by increasing demand, would bring forth new output to meet

it. In addition, cuts in state spending are supported by monetarists on the grounds that borrowing to finance it leads to increases in the stock of money and so to price rises.

The fact that bourgeois economists have refined these theoretical propositions in support of monetarism does not explain why the policy has been adopted. It is the result not of theoretical persuasiveness but of the balance of forces in the class struggle within ideology, politics and economics. For in the light of Marx's doctrine, the theory itself is very weak.

Marxist critique of monetarist theory

In his works, particularly *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* and *Capital*, Marx developed a theory of the capitalist economy which in every way challenges the monetarist perspective. His critique of bourgeois or vulgar economics was bound to do this, for monetarism is merely the most extreme modern development of vulgar economics. Marxism rejects both the quantity theory of money and the theory of competitive markets' tendency towards an optimum equilibrium.

In *A Contribution*, Marx presents a detailed critique of the quantity theory propounded by Hume, Ricardo and other classical economists.¹ His argument is based on two fundamental propositions: first, that commodities' exchange values are ultimately determined by the conditions of their production, so that prices are not determined by the amount of money in the process of exchange; and second, that the role of money cannot be understood by regarding it simply as the means of circulation, as the quantity theory does.

The argument that exchange values are ultimately determined by the conditions of production is, of course, the essence of Marx's theory of value, which, in turn, is the core of his analysis of capital. In his *Capital*, he demonstrates how commodities' values are formed in the sphere of production, both finding their expression and being transformed into prices of production and market prices in the sphere of exchange, where commodities are circulated. In *A Contribution*, Marx argues that writers, such as Mill, make the mistake of assuming that exchange values are the result of circulation and the stock of money.

"Mill's whole wisdom is reduced to a series of assumptions which are both arbitrary and trite. He wishes to prove that 'it is the total quantity of the money in any country' which determines the price of commodities or the value of money. If one assumes that the quantity and the exchange-value of the commodities in circulation remain constant, likewise the

velocity of circulation and the value of precious metals, which is determined by the cost of production, and if simultaneously one assumes that nevertheless the quantity of specie in circulation increases or decreases in relation to the volume of money existing in a country, then it is indeed 'evident' that one has assumed what one has pretended to prove. Mill, moreover, commits the same error as Hume, namely placing not commodities with a determinate exchange-value, but use-values into circulation; his proposition is therefore wrong, even if one accepts all his 'assumptions.' The velocity of circulation may remain unchanged, similarly the value of precious metals and the quantity of commodities in circulation, yet they may nevertheless require sometimes a smaller amount of money for their circulation as a result of changes in their exchange-value."²

The "maximum output" at the heart of modern monetarist theory involves the same conception of a quantity of use-values which enter circulation, so that exchange-values come from circulation rather than entering it.

The question of whether use-values or exchange-values enter circulation is crucial for Marx's critique of the quantity theory, because the only aspect of money that its advocates theorize is its role in that circulation, its function as a medium of circulation. For Marx, analyzing the relation between commodities' prices and money requires consideration of money's full role, particularly its function as a standard of value and its function as "money" as such. "As regards its function as a standard of value, when money serves solely as money of account and gold merely as nominal gold, it is the physical material used which is the crucial factor . . . On the other hand, when it functions as a medium of circulation, when money is not just imaginary but must be present as a real thing side by side with other commodities, its material is irrelevant and its quantity becomes the crucial factor."³ Its function as "money" as such means that it is an embodiment of value which could be withdrawn from circulation and held idle. Thus, he argues, the error of classical political economy is that "the specific aspect of money as means of circulation is upheld against its specific aspect as money."⁴

Marx's theory of money "as money," combined with his theory of the determinants of exchange-values, leads to conclusions which are the very opposite of those suggested by the quantity theory. Instead of the amount of money in circulation determining commodities' exchange-values, the latter determine the amount of money in circulation. Thus, even accepting the assumption of the classical quan-

tity theorists that the velocity with which money circulates is constant, Marx concludes: "Prices are thus high or low not because more or less money is in circulation, but there is more or less money in circulation because prices are high or low."⁵

This "law of circulation" can only operate because money is withdrawn from and injected into circulation as necessary to achieve the balance required by exchange-values. And this withdrawal and its reverse are possible only because money acts "as money," rather than merely as a medium of circulation: it can be held idle as an independent embodiment of value outside of circulation. (A related idea was, incidentally, developed by Keynes in his theory of liquidity preference, although his overall theory was non-Marxist.)

The appropriate amount of money required in circulation is determined not just by the exchange-values of commodities but by their exchange-value in relation to that of money. When money is itself a commodity, such as gold, the conditions of production of gold determine its value: it is the fact that it is a produced commodity that enables it to act as the standard of value for other commodities. Thus, the combination of money as a standard of value and "money as money" enables Marx to analyze the laws of money in its role as medium of circulation. Its value in relation to other values affects the amount of money needed in circulation, and money's role "as money" enables it to be withdrawn from and injected into circulation to meet those needs. Thus, a rise in the values of other commodities with that of money unchanged will, other things being constant, cause an increase in the amount of money in circulation; this is the very opposite of the direction of causation proposed by the quantity theory.

Marx did not confine himself to formulating the laws of circulation of gold, for he also showed how those laws were modified when inconvertible paper money circulated at the same time as gold continued to have some monetary function. The law of circulation was modified, but remained the product of the same method of reasoning which contrasted so strongly with that of the classical quantity theorists.

Marx himself, however, did not develop the laws of circulation appropriate to the monetary systems of state-monopoly capitalism, for here fiat paper money and credit money (broadly, legal tender issued by the state and bank deposits and notes) circulate without gold playing any effective monetary role. The development of the laws of circulation under such con-

ditions is a task that remains for Marxist economists, if they are to confront monetarism's modern application of the quantity theory.

One distinctive feature of Marx's theory of money both marks it out from monetarists' theory and provides a foundation for developing the modern laws of circulation. It is that Marx sets out a theory of the historical development of different forms of money. His analysis accounts for its development from commodity money through coin and tokens to paper money and credit money. That explanation of the latter forms' development provides a foundation on which to analyze their modern laws of circulation. It also is, itself, in direct contrast to monetarists' view of money, which fails to account for the development or significance of new forms of money.

Thus, Marx's theory of money stands in direct contrast to the quantity theory. At the same time, his theory of accumulation is a refutation of the other monetarist proposition, that competitive markets with flexible prices produce a general equilibrium where resource use is optimal and employment is at some maximum desired level.

Capitalist accumulation generates contradictory tendencies, most notably the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and its counteracting influences, which make economic crises, booms and slumps, inevitable. This general law of accumulation produces and depends on a fluctuating reserve army of labor. The reserve army's function, apart from exerting a dead-weight pressure on wages and the value of labor-power, is to act as a pool of labor-power which is available for capital's expansion when renewed accumulation is possible. In Marx's theory, in contrast to the monetarists', unemployed labor-power exists as a fundamental necessity for capitalist accumulation.

The Marxian law of a crisis-ridden accumulation and of the reserve army of labor are specific examples of the more general Marxian perspective on capitalist contradictions. The most fundamental contradiction underlying the economy and driving it forward is the antagonism of capital and labor but, in addition, competition between capitalists and conflicts between different fractions of capital underlie the actual path of accumulation. Marx's conception of this dialectic is one where crises and temporary dislocation are inescapable and, hence, is in direct opposition to the monetarist idea that competition, occurring on free markets with flexible prices, yields a harmonious equilibrium.

Thatcherism and its goals

Monetarism itself is directly addressed to economic matters, but it is part of a political and ideological offensive by the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie. In Britain, the term "Thatcherism" has been applied and captures more of the policy's political scope than the economy-focused "monetarism." Within the economy, the policy's most important thrust is to smash the organized, trade-union strength of the working class. Keynesianism was marked by corporatist arrangements. They bound the trade unions closer to the state apparatus, thereby giving them a position of apparently greater power, while weakening their potential for struggle through incorporation and through government restrictions on wage increases (incomes policies).

Monetarism follows a different path to the same ends, and in that respect from 1979 until now it appears to have been successful for the bourgeoisie. The monetarist aim of "rolling back the state" and allowing greater freedom for competitive market forces led Thatcher's government to a formal renunciation of state controls over wages in the private sector (incomes policies), although in practice it has adopted very rigid controls over the wages of the large proportion of workers employed by the state. The abandonment of incomes policies, however, was not to be accompanied by renewed trade-union strength. The government's avowed belief in the efficiency of free, competitive markets, its espousal of *laissez-faire*, is used to justify laws which limit trade unions' rights to strike and undermine their organizational strength, for trade unions are attacked on the grounds that they are a monopolistic obstacle to competition. The right of individual workers in the reserve army of labor to bid against other workers and push down wages is the form of market competition monetarists seek to encourage through their attacks on trade unions. And the magnitude of the economic crisis, the size of the reserve army, gives an additional great impetus to these competitive forces.

Monetarism's attack on trade unions is undertaken in the interests of capital as a whole, but the Thatcher government's opening of the national economy to the full force of international competition has a more sectional effect, favoring international capital and the monopolies rather than national capital, and favoring financial rather than industrial capital within the country.

Monetarism has involved the government withdrawing to a great extent from operations

to set the exchange rate, and generally refusing to subsidize or support enterprises which are unable to compete (although they and their Labour predecessors have reduced corporation tax liability to a point where most companies pay none). This has occurred at a time when, as a result of the uneven development of the capitalist world economy, sharp changes are occurring in the international division of labor. The leading centers within each branch of industry have shifted both from one developed capitalist country to another and from developed capitalist countries to newly industrializing countries. The shift and the economic crisis that accompanies it generate particularly strong competitive forces which dictate the decline of major industrial sectors in economies such as Britain's. And the promotion of *laissez-faire* means that monetarism encourages the chaotic and anarchic nature of that decline.

Multinational corporations and financial capital, however, benefit from the increased international competition fostered by monetarism. For one thing, their profits are generated worldwide, and if the new international division of labor is a necessary reorganization of capitalism to strengthen long-term profitability, those sections of capital are the beneficiaries and are not harmed by the weakness of industrial capital within Britain or any other single economy. Moreover, the promotion of *laissez-faire* led to the abolition in 1979 of all controls over the export of capital from Britain. Thus, financial capital and multinational corporations have benefited from the increased freedom to lend and borrow, and to invest on an international scale.

Related to monetarism's impact upon the economy, its attempt to achieve a radical shift toward a market economy in the context of the new international division of labor, are its political and ideological force. British Marxists have assessed it as an attempt to shift decisively the character of Britain's class relations. It is not simply a question of attacking the working class, changing the balance of forces between already constituted classes, but of an attempt to change the very nature of the exploited classes. Most important here is the attempted inculcation of an individualist ethic, the belief in self-reliance, individual responsibility and competitiveness, instead of class solidarity. It is an attempt to undermine working class allegiance to trade unions and working class belief in the power of the state to protect jobs and to provide welfare benefits such as health care, care of the old, and education. Monetarism, or Thatcherism, is an attempt to undermine the

cohesion of the working class and move wage earners into allegiance to middle strata. The construction of a new right based on these middle strata is intended to produce a new hegemony over the working class and a stable source of support for the freedom of international capital.

For the benefit of big capital

Monetarism is clearly a new development within state-monopoly capitalism and poses a problem for Marxists' understanding of this stage.

State-monopoly capitalism is a stage in which the state's intervention in the economy has increased and is used to further the interests of monopoly capital. It has been conceived as a stage at which that intervention is very extensive, guaranteeing, through the welfare state, the reproduction of labor-power, guaranteeing credit and financial resources, and employing Keynesian methods in an attempt to guarantee the stability of markets. However, monetarism appears to be a serious attempt to reduce sharply state involvement in economic activity. Welfare services are being cut and placed on a market footing; state finance for industry and control over the direction of banks' credit is withdrawn; and market instability is allowed to occur without hindrance. Does monetarism, in fact, signify the dissolution of state-monopoly capitalism?

The Marxist assessment has to be that it is not; monetarism is, instead, a particular direction being taken within state-monopoly capitalism. First, it is an economic policy which benefits the financial capital that is allied with them. In that respect, it is no different from the normal thrust of policies at this stage of capitalism. Second, it is not a policy which weakens the state, even though its ideology claims to be against a strong interventionist state. In fact, its political design is to strengthen the power of the capitalist state. The creation of a hegemony of individualist ideas and right-wing petty-bourgeois ideology is designed to weaken the class solidarity and class organization that challenge capitalist rule. Its effects have been seen in Britain with the strength of support for militarism and jingoism in the 1982 war against Argentina, and with the strength of support for other reactionary policies. And while the rhetoric of monetarism has been for cuts in state spending, its expenditures on the military and the police have grown dramatically under the Thatcher government.

Thus, in a political sense, the state is being strengthened under monetarism, and it is true that its economic power, too, has been

strengthened by monetarist policies. The positive interventions for which the state took responsibility when Keynesian policies dominated have been cut, but its negative intervention has achieved a new force under monetarism. In particular, the state has used the law as well as the unemployment that it has fostered to undermine the power of trade unions over production and in wage negotiations. Moreover, the state's impact on the economy has been put onto a tighter, more centrally controlled and hence stronger basis by the imposition of tight budgetary controls throughout all the agencies of the state. The various branches of the state, central government departments, nationalized industries, local authorities and other branches have hitherto had a degree of independence in their spending and financing plans. This independence was gradually reduced after the tightening of budgetary procedures in the mid-1970s, but under the monetarism of Thatcher's government it has been effectively abolished. The economic activities of all branches of the state are now effectively under central control and, since the total amount disbursed by the state is half the size of the gross domestic product, that centralized control represents a significant sharpening of the central state's economic power.

Monetarism could never offer any guarantees that it would be more beneficial for capital than Keynesianism. It carries enormous risks for capital because of the instability generated by the withdrawal of positive state intervention, and the prospect is that the ruling class will revert to some earlier form of the Keynesian stance. Marxist theory makes clear that Keynesianism and monetarism are not simply competing policy techniques between which the ruling class chooses at will. They are each the product of objective forces and material conditions. The strength of Keynesianism for the bourgeoisie is that it corresponds to the objective fact that the state does have a great weight in the modern capitalist economy, and that even monetarist attempts to reduce the state's positive intervention will not significantly decrease the proportion of spending and production that goes through the state. Nevertheless, there were objective factors that pushed sections of capital to support monetarism.

Although Keynesian state spending did yield benefits to capital, it is unproductive expenditure. Thus, although it contributes indirectly to the production of surplus-value, it does not itself create any and has to be financed ultimately by taxes or borrowing which are a

drain on the surplus-value available for private accumulation. Because of this, capital's attitude toward Keynesian policies was necessarily ambiguous and when, in the mid-1970s, industry's profits reached extremely low levels, conditions were ripe for capital to move toward a monetarist attempt to restrict this drain on profits. From the point of view of capital, support for monetarism will wane if state intervention along Keynesian lines can be restored without imposing a great drain on profits.

From the standpoint of the working class, the struggle against monetarism is a struggle against all forms of state-monopoly capitalism. In Britain, this struggle is being constructed around a labor-movement campaign for an alternative economic strategy. First formulated

by the Communist Party of Great Britain, this strategy would bring in socialist measures to counter the movement of financial capital and commodities, the reconstruction of an enlarged welfare state, and the planned regeneration of industry with increased social ownership. Its success will depend on the strength of parliamentary and extra-parliamentary campaigns and, ultimately, upon the socialist transformation of state power.

1. Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, pp. 160-181.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 181.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 121.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 105.



Peaceful atom: a stable orbit

Mario Jose Grabivker

CC member, Communist Party of Argentina

Bronislav Kholopov

WMR staff member

POLITICAL REPORT

Most economists and futurologists seem to be in no doubt that the energy future of human civilization will in the main be determined by the use of nuclear energy. The International Institute for Applying Systems Analysis recently issued a well-grounded forecast showing that by the year 2030 nuclear plants will generate close to 40 per cent of the world's electric power. In the past few years, however, the authorities of some capitalist countries (United States, FRG, Italy) have slowed down active realization of nuclear-power programs in contradiction with that forecast. With the unstable economic situation, the growing cost of building nuclear-power plants and competition from various other sectors of the fuel and energy complex, it looks as if the orbit of the peaceful atom is losing its stability.

That being so, is there any hope that the atom can be "tamed" and made truly to serve humankind for peaceful purposes? The members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) are firmly convinced that these problems can be solved, and that they are largely being solved already.

That is why, in a speech at the June 1983

plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, defining the basic tasks of the party's integral scientific and technical policy, CPSU CC General Secretary Yuri Andropov said in particular: "The future of our energetics lies above all in the use of the latest nuclear reactors, and over the long term also in the practical solution of the problem of controlled thermonuclear synthesis."¹

Over the next decade, a number of socialist countries will already have nuclear plants generating some 20-30 per cent of their electric power. These plants are very economical, they have a high safety level, and new ones are being built relatively fast. There are many facts to show that in energetics, notably nuclear energetics, the system of economic, scientific and technical cooperation jointly set up within the CMEA framework has proved to be highly effective. This system requires further development and perfection, it does not produce the same returns in every sphere, but on the whole it has already yielded generous fruit. It sprang from the new socialist international relations based on equality, respect for sovereignty, and mutual advantage, and simultaneously on fraternal support, sincere trust

and the common interests of the socialist community countries.

So, the new social system has demonstrated that its advantages help to pave the way for broad economic, scientific and technical progress for the benefit of the working people, as will be seen from the following report, which presents some concrete examples of nuclear-power development in the socialist countries.

Czechoslovakia: preparation of the spurt

Before looking at the state of nuclear energetics in the socialist community as a whole, we decided to see what was going on in one of its countries, and began with Czechoslovakia, because that is where energetics is being most decidedly switched to the new line. Press reports say that last year Czechoslovakia's first nuclear-power plant, the V-1, accounted for 8 per cent of the country's electric power supply, and that by the year 2000, nuclear-power plants are to generate up to 60 per cent, a highly impressive figure for a country with 15 million people.

Impressive? One U.S. journal disagrees. It has hastened to express its view of Czechoslovakia's nuclear-power program by headlining its correspondent's report: "The Prague Syndrome. Nuclear Power is 'Hot' "2 and went on to claim that Czechoslovakia's nuclear program was a kind of disorder, the product of a feverish imagination, ill-considered and ill-prepared. There is a lot of bile in that report but no sign of a willingness to throw a true light on the situation. Let us look at the facts.

We began our "nuclear itinerary" with Czechoslovakia's Ministry of Fuel and Energy, where we had a conversation with Minister Vlastimil Ehrenberger. We began with the most general problems.

"Why has Czechoslovakia decided to build a nuclear power plant?"

"For the same reason as did the other industrialized states," the Minister replied. "A shortage of energy resources, which is already beginning to tell, and which will be even more acute in the future, so that we can't help thinking about it."

The Minister gave a wide sketch of his country's fuel and energy balance. Czechoslovakia has a developed industry, being among the leading countries in level of metallurgy, engineering, plastics and electric power generation. Industrial production in its western regions has a long history, which is why raw material resources, mainly energy resources, are heavily depleted. The country annually produces 27-28 million tons of hard coal, a pace of extraction at which it will last another 50-60

years, but it is needed above all by metallurgy. The extraction of brown coal and lignites comes to 96 million tons, and the deposits are expected to last another 40-50 years. The country's own oil and gas are used but they do not have a substantive role to play in the energy balance. Some of the hard coal (4 million tons) is imported from the Soviet Union and Poland. Czechoslovakia's oil and gas requirements are almost entirely met by the USSR. Now that, for objective reasons, oil has become more expensive, its use as fuel has been sharply curtailed, in view of the growing requirements of the chemical industry and transport. Czechoslovakia has no major rivers, which is why even if hydropower resources are fully used (now about 50 percent), they cannot help to right the energy balance.

Sizable deposits of uranium are the only energy raw material which the country can look to over the long term. It also supplies uranium to the USSR on mutually advantageous terms.

Consequently, the structure of Czechoslovakia's fuel-and-energy balance is already showing some signs of tightness. But the demand for energy, electric power in the first place, will continue to grow, if only because the intensification of industrial production — the main strategic line in the development of the CMEA countries' economies — is being achieved above all through automation, the use of robots, the substitution of machines for manual labor, and the extended use of electronics, all of which are unfeasible without electric power.

The reference to the problem of intensifying production naturally made us ask the Minister another question:

"Intensification also means another thing, which is the introduction of energy-saving devices, rationalization of technologies, and more efficient use of classical-type electric power plants. Moving in this direction, is it possible perhaps to ..."

"... Save so much energy that no construction of nuclear-power plants will be required?" Minister Ehrenberger was quick to add. "No, economies cannot alone meet the electric power requirements. Like other CMEA countries, we have reached the conclusion that only a complex approach can help to tackle the task. Back in 1978, a Long-Term Goal-Oriented Program for Cooperation in the Sphere of Energy, Fuel and Raw Materials for the period until 1990 was adopted within the CMEA framework. It provides for the perfection of the national fuel-and-energy balances along three lines: rationalization and economies in the use

of energy; demotion of oil as a fuel, and greater extraction and use of coal; and stepped-up development of nuclear energetics. Incidentally, our V-1 nuclear-power plant provides an example of high rationality: its capacity is used to 80 per cent, which is more than the figure for most thermal power stations."

We did, of course, visit Jaslovske Bohunice, a Slovak village near which the V-1 is situated, because it is there, on a single platform, that the whole history of Czechoslovakia's nuclear energetics is presented. In addition to the V-1 (which has two 440 mW units), a similar plant, the V-2, is being built, and there is also the experimental commercial plant, the A-1, which is no longer on active service.

Martin Spirko, director of the power plant which is now going up, witnessed and took part in the building of all three installations.

"Which is the first year of Czechoslovakia's nuclear power history?" we asked him.

"It is 1955," he said. "That was when Czechoslovakia and the USSR signed the first agreement on cooperation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes."

At that time (similar documents were then being drawn up by other CMEA countries), the world's first nuclear-power plant, the one at Obninsk, 100 kilometers from Moscow, was just one year old. It was not a big plant: it had a capacity of only 5 mW. The world's first socialist country, which had just got hold of a new source of energy, at once offered the fraternal countries its services in the use of it.

That proposal was initiated by Academician Igor Kurchatov, the outstanding scientist and organizer of Soviet nuclear science and technology. It was also he who headed the development of the Soviet Union's atomic weapons, which it had to build because the United States was using its A-bomb monopoly to blackmail the socialist countries. But how did Kurchatov himself view the military side of his work? Here is what his friend, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician Anatoly Aleksandrov, who saw Kurchatov just after the testing of the hydrogen bomb, said: "I was astounded by his altogether unusual state. I asked what was the matter, and he replied: 'Anatolius! It was such a terrible, such a monstrous sight! People must not be allowed to start using these weapons!' He keenly felt the horror which had gripped him as he comprehended the result of the tests. He went on to argue the need to ban nuclear weapons, and make use of nuclear energy peaceful."³

Indeed, the atom is two-faced, like the Roman god Janus, who was made terrible by his power over life and death. Some people in the

world want the atomic Janus to turn mainly his incinerating look on humankind. Among them is the American Edward Teller, "the father of the hydrogen bomb," who recently proposed that it should be exploded in outer space, whereupon he was invited by President Reagan for a friendly chat at the White House. But Kurchatov's concepts, which are accepted by scientists in the socialist countries, are the opposite of Teller's maniacal visions. The thrust of Kurchatov's idea is to ban nuclear weapons and make the atom serve peace.

This problem is still a long way from solution, even in technical terms, although much has already been done. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, scientists in the socialist countries started an extensive quest for the best types of nuclear power reactors. Czechoslovak specialists, with the help of Soviet colleagues, but mainly through their own efforts and with their own equipment, built a plant with a reactor operating on unenriched uranium with heavy water as the moderator of neutrons, and carbonic acid gas, which is used to transfer the heat and so cool the active zone of the reactor. The plant generated power for several years, but other types of reactors, notably the water-water reactors developed by Soviet scientists, in which desalinated water was used as the neutron moderator and the heat-transfer agent proved to be safer and economically more efficient. Czechoslovakia decided to modify its nuclear-energy conception and to switch entirely to the new type of nuclear-power plant. Does that mean that the work on the A-1 was futile?

"Not at all," Martin Spirko said. "Our scientists, like those of other CMEA countries, acquired some valuable experience on the A-1; it helped Czechoslovakia's engineering to start the production of equipment for the nuclear power industry. Of course, it is not easy for anyone to restructure a conception, but cooperation within the CMEA framework and the accumulated experience helped to do it faster."

The CMEA's stake on the water-water reactors proved to be the right one. The worldwide trend indicates that this type of reactor now accounts for over 80 per cent of the world's nuclear-power capacities. But the building of such reactors requires an advanced science and a sophisticated industry, because nuclear engineering makes use of its latest achievements. That is why, for technical reasons, small countries can afford to have a nuclear power industry only with extensive international cooperation. This kind of close cooperation in the nuclear power field has helped the fraternal socialist countries to start the batch production

of 440 mW water-water energy reactor units (WWER-440).

But how economical are the installations now in operation, say, in Czechoslovakia?

"It is, of course, not cheap at all to build a nuclear-power plant," said Minister Ehrenberger. "It costs roughly 50 per cent more than to build a conventional thermal plant. But the use coefficient of these capacities is very high, and nuclear power plants are cheaper to operate than thermal ones. In 1982, a megawatt-hour at our V-1 cost an average of 134 crowns, as compared with 222 crowns at thermal plants in Bohemia, and 378 crowns in Slovakia (the higher cost resulting mainly from transportation costs). Considering the damage done to forests, rivers and crops by the smoke belching from brown-coal fueled plants, the advantages of the nuclear plants are even more pronounced."

The main problem that worries everyone, including the people of Czechoslovakia, is naturally the danger of nuclear radiation, and we also made a special point of clearing this up during our conversation.

Nuclear plants are outwardly attractive: they are large sedate buildings painted in light colors, with high ventilation stacks, from which hardly a wisp of smoke is seen to emerge, with clouds of steam hovering only over the cone-shaped towers which cool the water coming in from the second, cold circuit. The Jaslovske Bohunice complex is situated in the midst of fields, and the plant going up at Dukovany in Southern Moravia (four 440 mW units), on a rise of ground surrounded by forests. But neither site was chosen for its picturesqueness. Josef Lakosil, Director of the Dukovany plant, explained that such a platform needs to have a hard foundation of rock, adequate supplies of water, good atmospheric ventilation and enough room for a three-kilometer-wide protective belt around the plant. It is not easy to find such sites in small, densely populated Czechoslovakia. Still, a painstaking search over a period of years has resulted in the reservation of 25 suitable spots.

"Although Dukovany will generate its first power only in 1984," Josef Lakosil went on, "a dosimetrical service has been in operation in the district for several years, studying the radiation background so as to register with the utmost precision any changes that could occur once the plant has been activated. A permanent meteorological-dosimetrical laboratory has been set up, and there are also mobile ones in operation. Air, water and vegetation samplings are made 5, 15 and 30 kilometers away from the plant."

What kind of changes could occur? Studies made in the zone of the V-1, which is in operation, and at other plants in socialist countries show that there is virtually no change. These studies are being made up to the standards and in accordance with the rules of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which the CMEA countries scrupulously abide by.

The waste of the first, hot circuit is, of course, dangerous, but it does not reach the environment. Reliable technology for its removal and isolation has been developed. The used-up heat-generating elements have the highest level of radioactivity, and after they are removed from the reactor, we were told by engineers at Dukovany, such elements are kept in special reservoirs at the nuclear-power plant for at least three years, and are then dispatched to special chemical plants for reprocessing.

Here is yet another example showing that it is impossible to develop nuclear-power plants without cooperation: a fuel reprocessing plant makes economic sense only if it caters for several nuclear-power plants with a total capacity of at least 40,000-50,000 mW. In the decade ahead, the nuclear-power capacities in the CMEA countries will add up to 100,000 mW, which is why the Soviet Union has undertaken to reprocess the fuel. This helps to keep the highly active waste in a limited number of places.

What if there is a breakdown at a nuclear-power plant? Engineers at Dukovany scrutinized this hypothesis with us in great detail, although they stressed that the probability of such a case was extremely small: the odds were 1 in a 1,000 years for every 100 reactors. Still, measures have been foreseen for eliminating the effects of the gravest breakdown imaginable, which is the rupture of the main pipe ducts and a partial meltdown of the fuel.

If an accident should occur, the reactor (which is housed in a hermetically sealed space with heavy concrete walls) will at once be flooded with boracic water to stop the chain reaction. Low and high-pressure cooling systems will be started. The mixing condenser tower (it is these towers that now mainly make the building of nuclear plants costly) rise alongside each reactor to a height of 30 metres and can take in and neutralize 70 tons of steam. That, we were told, is quite enough to totally localize any breakdown.

We took Czechoslovakia as an example to show, in the most general terms, the nuclear-power plants which are being built and which are in operation in all the European CMEA countries. We feel that what has been said debunks the charges that the nuclear power pro-

grams are ill-considered and ill-founded. The spurt by Czechoslovakia's nuclear energy, as any fair-minded person can judge for himself, is well-grounded and thoroughly prepared. Of course, when fulfilling such programs, all countries, including Czechoslovakia, have to face all kinds of difficulties. Czechoslovakia, for instance, is short of labor-power, which is why Polish builders and Vietnamese will be found at the construction sites. The Vietnamese work and simultaneously learn new building methods. Such a redistribution of labor-power between the fraternal countries is mutually advantageous.

Difficulties of a more general nature spring from the long-term perspectives in the development of nuclear energy. However, these are not tackled by Czechoslovakia alone, but together with the other CMEA countries. We discussed these problems in Moscow, at the CMEA Secretariat — its headquarters.

Perspectives of the new stage

CMEA Secretary Nikolai Faddeyev got together a group of associates to talk with us. Our questions were answered by A.F. Panasenkov, head of the Atomic Energy for Peaceful Purposes Department, B.V. Shcherbinin, head of the Electric Power Department, and M. Krajcir, head of the Economic Information Department.

"It would be wrong to exaggerate our achievements in this field, although much has been done," said Nikolai Faddeyev. "Just now, the total capacity of the nuclear plants in the CMEA countries is over 20,000 mW, with 16,000 mW of that in the USSR. Japan has roughly the same capacity as the Soviet Union, while the United States has 58,000 mW. In the past, the building of nuclear power plants was somewhat slowed down, for various reasons, among them because the CMEA countries are well endowed with fuel and energy resources, mainly the oil, gas and coal the Soviet Union has at its disposal. The socialist community is not faced with an energy crisis. But we also have some difficulties. They spring from the uneven distribution of the deposits of energy raw materials. To obtain the oil, gas and coal, the Soviet people have to go farther and farther away to the East and North, into the swamps of the Tyumen region, into the tundra of the Yamal Peninsula, and the permafrost areas of Yakutia. By contrast, there are scant energy resources in the European part of the USSR, where the large industrial potential is concentrated and where the bulk of the population lives, and also in the European socialist countries. Energy is moved from east to west on a large scale, and in the process losses are in-

evitable. That is why it is necessary to bring the sources of energy closer to its consumers, and we are sure that the peaceful atom alone can be such a source in areas which are poor in classical energy resources."

We were told that at one time the fraternal countries' cooperation in the nuclear energy field was regulated by bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and each country. The projects and equipment were Soviet, and at that time the USSR alone had the necessary cadre of specialists. However, the General Agreement on the Long-Term Development of United Power Grids in the period until 1990, which was adopted at a CMEA session in 1977, mapped out such an extensive program for developing the socialist community's nuclear energy that in order to fulfill it these countries had to go on from bilateral to multilateral cooperation.

The start of the new stage was marked by an Agreement on Multilateral International Specialization and Cooperation in the Manufacture and Mutual Deliveries of Equipment for Nuclear-Power Plants, which in 1979 was signed by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Yugoslavia.

"In volume of joint production," Faddeyev said, "this agreement is one of the major ones within the CMEA framework, and it is even unparalleled anywhere in the world. It provides for the member-countries' manufacturing more than 140 items of equipment for nuclear-power plants with 440 mW and 1,000 mW energy units. Over 50 industrial enterprises and associations are taking part in realizing the agreement."

This whole effort is coordinated by an intergovernmental commission, notably through international economic associations known as "Interatomenergo" and "Interatominstrument." An international training center has been set up at the Novovoronezhskaya nuclear-power plant in the Soviet Union, where by the end of last year more than 1,500 specialists from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR and Hungary had been trained. With Poland and Cuba making a start on the construction of their first nuclear-power plants, their citizens have also joined in training at the center.

But let us return for a brief visit to the famous Skoda Works in the city of Plzen, Czechoslovakia, for that is where one gets a good picture of the multilateral cooperation that helps to lay the national foundation for the new type of energetics and simultaneously to advance the whole of engineering.

At the power engineering works, which is a

part of the concern, we were met by engineer Jaroslav Randa, who gave us a short history of the works. At first, it made only electric turbines, then the A-1 required the manufacture of nuclear-power units on a relatively small scale, but now the works has a reactor shop which supplies and will continue to supply its products not only to Czechoslovakia, but also to the GDR, Hungary and Poland. This shop puts together the reactor from components coming in from several other enterprises in the country, where new engineering facilities have also been built up. Altogether, they constitute a kind of springboard for the nuclear energy jump.

"Our shop is designed to turn out two and a half reactors a year," Randa went on. "We are now working on the assembly of our eighth and ninth WWER-440 reactors. Altogether we are to make 14. We shall then remodel our shop and go on to making WWER-1000, also to Soviet blueprints." Randa took a look around the shop and said: "This is not bad production. At the new Soviet works called Atomash, such a finishing shop is two and a half kilometers long. Just imagine!"

Both the power engineering works in Plzen and Atomash are designed above all for turning out third-generation water-water reactor, the WWER-1000, with which are connected the immediate prospects for the development of the socialist community's nuclear energy. The WWER-1000 is only slightly larger in size than the WWER-440, but it has double the capacity. On such a reactor a megawatt of capacity costs 20 per cent less than it did on the earlier reactor, so helping additionally to save 2 million tons of conventional fuel a year. This increases the advantages of the nuclear-power plant in competition with thermal stations. The safety measures at the new reactors will be intensified: the reactor hall will be covered with a hermetical shell of reinforced concrete capable of withstanding the impact of a falling plane. The "millennaires", as the new reactors are known among those who build them, are already in operation in the USSR, a plant is under construction in Bulgaria, one is to be built in the GDR, and the plant at Temelin in Southern Bohemia, Czechoslovakia, is to start generation in 1991. Such plants will, as a rule, have a capacity of 4,000 mW.

We were told at the CMEA Secretariat that the community countries have displayed much interest in nuclear heat supply. Nuclear-powered heat supply plants with a capacity of 500 mW and nuclear power-and-heat plants on the basis of the "millenaire" designed to heat large cities have already been designed.

Two nuclear heat-supply plants are under construction in the Soviet Union.

The rapid development of nuclear energetics has produced the important problem of linking up the new plant with the existing power grids.

"It is much more profitable to use nuclear-power plants on a steady regime," Shcherbinin told us. "But the consumption of energy, both throughout the year and throughout the day, is uneven. That is why it is so important to have power grids to link up countries lying in different time zones. Within the CMEA framework, such a system has now been in operation for more than 20 years. In that period, the annual exchange of electric power between our countries has multiplied 10-fold."

"The development of electric transmission lines," Panasenkov added, "helps to fit the new powerful nuclear plants into the integral power grid, which is operated from the Central Control Station in Prague. As a first step, the countries concerned have pooled efforts in starting to build two plants — the Khmel'nitskaya and the South-Ukrainian — on Soviet territory. Both will work for the integral power grid. Each participating country is to receive a volume of energy proportional to its contribution to the building effort."

Such are the immediate prospects for the development of nuclear energy in the socialist community, but there is already a need to work for its next day, and the day after.

The next day (which lies beyond the year 2000) will, it is a firm conviction of those with whom we spoke, be determined by fast-breeder reactors which generate energy while simultaneously producing fresh nuclear fuel for themselves.

Fast-breeders are technically much more complicated than the light-water ones now in operation, but scientists in the socialist countries have good reason to be sure of the former: commercial fast-neutron power units are already in experimental operation in the USSR. Preparations are under way for building even more powerful reactors, and a multilateral agreement on cooperation in developing them has been signed. Nuclear energy of the day after is determined by works in the field of thermonuclear synthesis, a field in which Soviet scientists are also among the leaders.

Experiments and lessons of importance for all

When preparing this report, one of whose authors comes from Argentina, the question was naturally asked about the state of nuclear power in the developing capitalist countries. Argentina is a big country whose population is

almost double that of Czechoslovakia, but which consumes only half as much electric power. What is also paradoxical is that the consumption of electric power is going down. In some provinces, 20 times less electric power is consumed per head than it is in the capital. All of this is the result of the dependence of the country's economy on the imperialist monopolies, which operate in the interests of the transnational corporations and the local oligarchy.

Argentina's patriotic forces, including the military, demand a build-up of power capacities and oppose the irrational burning of oil; they insist on fuller use of hydropower resources and the rich deposits of uranium ore. In the 1950s, Argentina managed to lay the foundations for purposeful nuclear research, and this is yielding positive results. Two nuclear plants have been built, and several more are to be completed by the end of the century.

However, the leading capitalist countries use the sale of equipment for nuclear-power plants to Argentina to exert imperialist pressure on the country. By contrast, the socialist countries, which have given a convincing demonstration of their competence in building various installations in this field as well, do not seek to enslave their partners either economically or politically. That is why the communists and many other people in Argentina are convinced that their country should turn to the socialist community countries for assistance in the field of nuclear energy and also to buy its equipment there.

The record of the nuclear power industry in the socialist world is undoubtedly of much international significance. It demonstrates the new type of equitable and mutually advantageous international relations in the economic, scientific and technical sphere. That is why the imperialist propagandists have been trying hard to distort the substance of this cooperation. In the above quoted article from *Newsweek*, this cooperation is labelled as "Soviet neocolonialism." These people are, of course, in the habit of applying their old and obsolete yardstick to the new social phenomena, but what kind of "neocolonialism" is it when it helps the cooperating parties to rise to the highest level of scientific and technological progress and gives the USSR's partners powerful impulses for development of advanced industries and promotes the fuller use of natural resources for the benefit of their peoples?

The successes scored by the countries of the new, socialist world in the constructive development of atomic energy have helped to strengthen the confidence everywhere that the atom can be broadly made to serve peaceful purposes. The means to prevent the atom from escaping human control are well known, and they have also been proposed by the socialist community countries: a freeze on nuclear weapons at the existing levels, to be followed by their gradual reduction down to their total liquidation and prohibition of every kind of nuclear-based lethal weapons, with simultaneous close cooperation in the peaceful use of the atom.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have taken real measures in both directions. In cooperation for peaceful purposes, the USSR has already signed agreements with a number of non-socialist states on helping to master the power of the atom, and together with its CMEA partners, it is actively involved in the activity of the IAEA. Thus, they are engaged in broad studies of any possible radiation pollution of the Danube and the Baltic Sea, an area in which there are many nuclear-power plants, and the results of these studies are reported to the IAEA. They show that since the banning of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, the radioactive pollution of bodies of water has gone down, and that the operation of nuclear plants is having no effect on its level.

A realistic assessment of the prospects for the development of world civilization shows that it is not right to give up the advantages held out to man by the peaceful uses of the atom. The taming of the atom is as significant as was the taming of fire at the dawn of history. But to the same extent to which the power of the atom's released energy surpasses that of the bonfires stoked by man (in the boilers of thermal plants or in the nozzles of rockets, we have essentially the same old bonfires) the horizons to be opened up with the full mastery of nuclear energy surpass those of the latter. But it bears emphasizing again and again that all of this can be achieved only if people prevent the two-faced nuclear Janus from turning on us his face of war.

1. *Pravda*, June 16, 1983.
2. *Newsweek*, March 14, 1983, p. 15.
3. *Nauka i zhisn*, No. 2, 1983, p. 24 (in Russian).

People's will: restore democracy

Matiur Rahman
CC Secretary,
Communist Party of Bangladesh

A year and a half has passed since the armed forces assumed direct power in Bangladesh, imposing martial law on the country and suspending the constitutional political process. This is the third time that martial law has been imposed in the 12 years of this young country's nationhood. During this short period, the country has witnessed innumerable coups and attempted coups.

The armed forces have firmly entrenched themselves in the country's political life since August 15, 1975, when Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the leader of the independence struggle, was killed and his government overthrown. Since then there has been a rightward and reactionary reversal of national policies, with repeated curtailment and sometimes total extinction of democratic rights and freedoms, increasing instability and virtual continuation of direct or indirect control of state power by the armed forces. In the mid-1970s, through a series of coups and counter-coups power came into the hands of Ziaur Rahman, at the time Army chief of staff and later President of the country.

In order to put up a show of democracy, which was necessitated by some national and international factors, Ziaur Rahman set up the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) as the ruling party and unrolled a constitutional system. The army, however, remained the pivotal force in the country, operating from the background. Later on, contradictions developed between Ziaur's BNP and the military bosses. The socio-economic climate particularly deteriorated and became very critical by the first half of 1981.

On May 30 of that year, President Ziaur Rahman was killed by a revolting section of the army, and a few months later a presidential election was held in the country. Victory in these elections once again went to the BNP. But having lost its "navigator," the BNP government became weak and was rent by internal strife, while the armed forces put forward the categorical demand for a greater role in state affairs and institutionalization of this role on a constitutional basis. On the plea of the govern-

ment's failures, extreme incompetence and corruption, and the alarming deterioration of the state of law and order, the armed forces took over power under the leadership of Lieut.-Gen. Hossain Mohammad Ershad (March 1982). That showed once again the bankruptcy of the overall system backed by the ruling sections and classes.

Main policy lines

The military have suspended the constitution, curtailed fundamental democratic rights and freedoms, banned open political activity, and imposed undeclared censorship on the press. In spite of its declaration of being only a transitional government and its assurance of a quick return to democratic constitutional rule, the Ershad government has taken some very symptomatic steps in the economic, political and administrative fields.

The policy of nationalization has been further abandoned, many public enterprises have been handed back to the private sector, doors have been thrown wide open for foreign capital, which has been assured of special rights and privileges, the budget and national economic policies are being increasingly tailored to the needs of imperialist capital and reactionary petrodollars, external dependence is being increased, and the strings of foreign "aid" are being tightened.

In agriculture, capitalist relations are being encouraged to make further painful inroads into the rural economy. Although the government is talking about land reform and a special committee has submitted a report on this matter, the report itself hardly touches upon the basic problems of the rural economy. It recommends the maintenance of the existing extremely unequal distribution of land and does not even suggest the need for the elimination of the feudal remnants that still fetter the rural economy, but shows an obvious bias in favor of capitalist methods of farming.

In short, a policy of "free" local capitalism effectively dependent on imperialism and an all-out open-door policy for foreign capital are being energetically pursued in Bangladesh,

while very little is being done by way of new industrial investments. Hence the further deepening of the economic crisis and the worsening condition of an overwhelming majority of the people. Over 85 per cent of the Bangladesh people live below the poverty line.

The ruling circles are trying to initiate a new political system which would ensure permanent domination of the armed forces, planning constitutional alterations for this purpose. Laws are being drafted to reduce the number of political parties. The government has already started to set up a new administrative structure, aiming to entrench military personnel at different levels of civilian administration. It has also started to shake up the judiciary. The authorities want to prohibit political movements for all time, to stop their activities and the strike struggle of the workers and other sections of the people. They have declared a new education policy, which will result in a greater influence of reactionary ideas in the ideological and cultural fields. The secular basis of the state is being abandoned, and attempts are being made to turn it into a theocratic "Islamic Republic."

In foreign policy, the authorities are playing up to imperialism, extending relations with the USA and reactionary Arab countries. In order to show their greater competence as recipients of "aid," they are in effect accepting the dictates of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and other international financial agencies controlled by imperialism. The regime has recognized the notorious and illegal "Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea" of Prince Sihanouk and has shown sympathy with the Afghan counter-revolutionaries.

Although the authorities are firmly pursuing reactionary and anti-popular policies, they have not been able to overcome their own internal conflicts or attain unanimity. There are divergent trends and tendencies within the ruling circles, complicating their activity, preventing its coordination, and making the political situation uncertain and fraught with further deterioration.

The stand of the parties and the attitude of the masses

Over the past year and a half, the condition of the masses has further worsened. Workers are being laid off, deprived of democratic rights, and mercilessly exploited. Trade union rights have been drastically curtailed by martial law ordinance. The process of pauperization is continuing in the rural areas, with untold misery for the agricultural workers, an increase in the number of poor peasants, and the ruin of

share-croppers. All sections of the peasantry have been hard hit by the government's decision to raise the prices of agro-inputs and reduce the prices of agricultural produce. The economy is in a state of stagnation, and the recent economic measures have led to a further decline. Even the affluent sections of the society are dissatisfied.

Hostility toward the regime is greatest among the student community, the most politically enlightened and active section of the people, which has traditionally opposed all anti-democratic measures. The students are dissatisfied with the education policy, which limits educational opportunities for the poorer sections.

The government has become practically isolated from almost all sections of the people. The masses are increasingly disenchanted with the government's line and seek a way out. This runs only through a progressive restructuring of the existing socio-economic order. Such a revolutionary step is impossible without a left, progressive force which can act as a national alternative enjoying popular support. Unfortunately the toiling masses — the main force for bringing about radical change — are not organized or ideologically equipped.

The Communist Party of Bangladesh pursues a policy of building up unity and understanding among the parties of left-progressive orientation, at the same time forging unity with broad democratic forces in the struggle for democracy, for constitutional rights and freedoms.

After its third congress in February 1980, the Communist Party took special initiatives to bring closer the parties of left-progressive orientation. Seven political parties have been carrying on consultations in this direction for quite some time. Among these are the National Awami Party (both the factions led by Muzaffar Ahmad and by Choudhury Haroon-ur-Rashid) and the Ekota Party, both close allies of the CPB in this work. The Jatiya Samajtantrik Dal (JSD), which in 1972 broke away from the Awami League (see below) also cooperates with us. True, the JSD has recently become seriously handicapped by an internal conflict caused by a group within the JSD which wields major influence among its activists and is pursuing an adventurist line. This threatens the movement toward a closer seven-party alliance. On the other hand, the Workers' Party, once a follower of Maoist politics, has shifted from its old Maoist line and is now working in understanding with the CPB. The communists seek to build up such unity among the parties on the basis of a left-radical program. The seven par-

ties have already managed to draw up a common program document, and there is a possibility of some other ex-Maoist parties joining this alliance. One can naturally expect many difficulties in the building up of an effective left-progressive alliance.

The CPB, together with the left-progressive parties, is now trying to build up a broad democratic unity against martial law and for democracy. The Awami League, the leading party of our liberation struggle and the party which ruled the country under the leadership of the late Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, is the most prominent among the democratic parties, but it has not been able to recover, and is at present beset by inner-party strife. There is a liberal bourgeois section which is powerful among its leadership. Another, relatively progressive section has good support among the activists, but it often adopts adventurist positions.

In spite of the difficulties, all the patriotic circles have continued to draw closer together. It has recently been possible to set up the unity of as many as 15 parties on the issue of democracy, and this is undoubtedly a major success. The Nationalist Party, recently ousted from state leadership, is internally divided and does not have any capacity to influence the masses all by itself in any direction. As for the rightist reactionary forces, the Islamic fundamentalists,¹ they are still active in the political arena.

The CPB is trying to draw more workers, peasants, students and other sections into the democratic movement through mass organizations. Its efforts have been instrumental in forging united action committees of student organizations, trade union federations and associations of peasants and agricultural laborers. The student action committee has been particularly active and is in the forefront of the nation-wide struggle for democracy.

Alarming start of the year

At the beginning of the year, the political situation in the country worsened sharply, following months of rallies and other protest action at educational institutions, primarily over the government's education policy. The student action committee had decided to stage a procession in the capital and go to the Education Minister with their demands on February 14, and on February 21, the Language Movement "Martyrs Day,"² the 15-party alliance had planned to declare their demands in front of the people and invigorate the struggle for democracy. But the events took a tragic turn. That day, the students who had assembled on the University campus in very large numbers tried to avoid any provocation. But the authorities had

other plans. Even before the students had come out of the campus area, the government let loose its police and armed forces on the peacefully advancing procession. The unarmed students were fired upon, beaten up, more than a thousand were arrested, the university campus was occupied, and educational institutions were closed down. Soldiers combed the adjacent neighborhoods.

A general strike was called in protest against the repression and killings, and the 15 progressive democratic parties supported the call. The clashes spread to other cities.

To prevent the spread of the disturbances, army patrols were moved into the streets and army posts were set up everywhere. A curfew was imposed in the capital. The media were not allowed to publish any news about the incidents. A wave of repression rolled across the country.

Most of the main leaders of the protesting parties, including Mohammed Farhad, General Secretary of the CPB, were arrested on February 15. They were taken blindfolded to a military barracks and interrogated. Since the news of the arrests was not announced for a few days, the "disappearance" of a group of well-known political leaders produced apprehensions about their physical safety. When at last the list of the arrested leaders was made public, the names of the arrested CPB leaders were left out. That was a source of concern: was "special" action being planned against the CPB?

The events of February 14 and 15 demonstrated the government's isolation and further alienation from the people. Sporadic action in protest against the lawlessness continued for over a week in several parts of the country. But gradually the movement waned owing to the army crack-down, the lack of unity within the 15-party alliance and the political inertia of a sizeable section of the people.

However, our common struggle was not in vain. The government has been forced to release almost all of those arrested and even to call formally for a dialogue with the political parties. Since April, it has also allowed "parlor-politics," or the holding of meetings within the four walls of a room.

Approach to dialogue

The government is trying to start up a dialogue with the parties on constitutional and political problems. There are reports that different formulas are being planned by the authorities. The common aim of all of these is to ensure the army's control over the future constitutional government. The army seeks to remain at the

helm and to maintain its control over state power and administration.³

Most of the political parties, including those of the 15-party alliance, are demanding the re-introduction of the 1972 constitution based on the system of parliamentary democracy. They have demanded the lifting of martial law, democratic elections and a return to constitutional rule. They want the situation normalized through the release of political prisoners and a judicial inquiry into the February 1983 tragedy. They have not turned down the proposal for a dialogue, but are insisting on the need to create a suitable social atmosphere which would offer them as many opportunities as possible to carry on their activities.

There are leftist and rightist tendencies within the party alliance itself which greatly obstruct the united action of the 15 parties. There are extremist, adventurist tendencies alongside the influential forces who are eager to work out a compromise with the regime. The CPB is trying to take a concrete approach to the situation and evolve a line which would ensure united action by these parties, something that is particularly important in view of the balance of political forces in the country.

Recent events in Bangladesh show that political instability has become a permanent feature. The experiment with the Nationalist Party has failed, and the left-progressive forces have not been able to emerge as an alternative either. Nor have the democratic forces managed to fill the political vacuum. This has caused the breakdown of any attempted constitutional process, and the army has come to the fore. As a result, martial law is being imposed again and again, and coups and change of government have become commonplace. The fundamental cause of instability lies in the country's socio-economic realities.

The problems of the people's day-to-day life are so acute that only a radical transformation of the social order can bring any results. Without such a revolutionary transformation, the miseries of the multitude will remain unmitigated. That is why the struggle for social revolution is of vital importance.

The program for a national democratic revolution as the alternative must be placed before the people, a people aroused and organized for achieving revolutionary changes and a national resurgence on this basis. That is how the third congress of the CPB formulated the task facing the country. The congress stated that there are objective conditions for such a struggle, but that the lack of sufficient consolidation of left-radical political forces remains the central problem. To enable these forces to provide an

alternative, the communists are working particularly hard to strengthen their own party, while doing all they can to unify the country's left forces.

The CPB takes a positive attitude toward the parties which are showing signs of moving away from Maoist policies. Several ex-Maoist parties and groups have already changed their old views on national and international politics. The CPB is trying to accelerate the process, also keeping in mind the need for an uncompromising ideological struggle against Maoist policies and demonstrating vigilance against a revival of Maoist tendencies.

Through its work among the oppressed masses, the party is trying to expand its social base, especially among the workers and the toiling rural population, and to strengthen the communist ranks. We respect the religious feelings of believers, for Islam is the religion of 90 per cent of our population. Concentrating on its activities among the masses and their politicalization, rallying the country's left-radical forces, while seeking to forge a broad unity in order to ensure democratic rights and freedoms, the CP Bangladesh is resolved to go on fighting for the working people's cherished goals and ideals.

1. Islamic fundamentalists — clergy and politicians advocating Islamization of the country, and a spread of the conservative religious order to every sphere of social life. — Ed.

2. On February 21, 1952, the Pakistani police shot down a demonstration of students, who demanded recognition of Bengali as one of Pakistan's official languages. The demands put forward by the students in early 1983 include a lifting of martial law, an end to the country's Islamization, and a repeal of the decision on the compulsory study of Arabic. — Ed.

3. Gen. Ershad recently announced another postponement of the date for the restoration of civilian government in Bangladesh. The national election scheduled for October 1984 has been put off until May 1985. — Ed.

Trade Among Capitalist Countries

P. Khvoinik

**cloth 285 pp \$5.95
PROGRESS BOOKS**

**71 Bathurst St.
Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6**

From African realities to the socialist ideal

Jean-Pierre Thystere-Tchicaya
CC Political Bureau member,
Congolese Party of Labor

It is two decades since the Congolese revolutionaries opted, among the first on the African continent, for the socialist orientation. Semou Pathe Gueye, CC Political Bureau member, Senegal Party of Independence and Labor (SPIL) and its representative on *WMR*, asked Jean-Pierre Thystere-Tchicaya, CPL CC Political Bureau member responsible for ideological work and education, to tell of their experience, and this was done in a conversation which centered on the key problems in building the new society, problems that have now acquired special theoretical and practical significance for vanguard parties in African and Asian countries, whose platform is that of the scientific ideology.

The experience of progressive transformations in Congo has been reported on the pages of this journal before.¹ Still, which aspects of revolutionary practice within the framework of our topic are, in your opinion, most in need of theoretical comprehension? What helps to gain a better insight into the current line of transformations?

I think it is the character of the stage. Even after having set up a vanguard party (1969), we had to face such a large number of unforeseen circumstances, including inner-party problems, that we had to return to this matter once again. During the CPL's extraordinary second congress (1972) it became manifestly necessary once again to identify the stage of our struggle and to map out our main goals in the light of its character.

Having analyzed the situation in depth, we reached this conclusion: the country is in a state of economic dependence on imperialism, and dependence on the structures of the state apparatus inherited from the colonial period also remains in the political and administrative spheres. We were faced with the task of explaining to the Congolese people that the chief enemy against whom the battle is being carried on is imperialism generally, and French imperialism in particular. We described the present stage as one of national revolution,

when it is especially important to rally all the anti-imperialist forces. The need also transpired to create structures ensuring the effective involvement of masses of people in the management of social affairs, and this makes the stage of national revolution also a stage of democratic revolution. Finally, we also had to pave the way for transition to socialism, i.e., to create the prerequisites for a socialist revolution. And this meant that the democratic revolution had to be carried out for the benefit of the working masses, whence its popular character.

How is the character of the present stage in the struggle taken into account when working out the strategy of class alliances, and what are its specifics for Congo?

It was highly important for Congo's Marxists to define their positions vis-a-vis the other classes and strata of the society with the utmost clarity. We told ourselves: since the country is at the stage of national revolution, there is a need to rally all the anti-imperialist forces.

First of all, we had to draw a dividing line within the national bourgeoisie. We really have a national bourgeoisie operating in the agrarian sector, building and petty trade. The nature of its enterprise is such that it could be interested in fighting against imperialism, and so acting as our ally. That is what we emphasize in our propaganda work. On the other hand, there is also a bourgeois stratum which can be qualified as a compradore stratum. We have also realized that the state apparatus inherited from colonialism tended to produce a type who sought to use his official status for self-seeking purposes. This went to increase the compradore elements and their henchmen, and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, against which we have been carrying on a constant and persevering struggle.

An analysis of the middle and intermediate strata showed that those who are engaged in professional activity (lawyers, doctors, teachers) can hardly be qualified as "candidates" for the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Many of them come from families of peasants and employees.

But there is a need to carry on persevering educational work in their midst so as to help them to side with the working class and take a stand in support of our party.

It was also important to "integrate" into the revolution the countryside, where nearly 61 per cent of the Congolese population lives. How is that to be done? By beginning to set up political organizations in that area? No. After a long discussion we reached this conclusion: first, there is a need to awaken interest among the peasantry in organization as such. We put forward the slogan of cooperation and declared the priority role of agriculture, stressing that we would be appropriating for it some of the funds now being received from the export of oil (which has become a key source of state revenue). Thus, mobilizing our efforts to restructure life in the countryside and advancing the cooperative movement, we took more and more steps forward in involving the peasant masses in the revolution.

Congo is famed for its traditions of revolutionary syndicalism. Led by the vanguard party, the working class in the country is acting as the key motive force in the process of radical transformations. But it is numerically small. To this day, tribal notions and survivals have an influence on the world view of a section of the working people. Could you illustrate with some examples the sort of difficulties you have to cope with when working in that environment?

The working class is not only numerically small, but its distribution is uneven. It is concentrated mainly in the south, in the industrial areas around port Pointe Noire. Its mentality is influenced by the burden of family ties and this is frequently fraught with the danger of compromise with the class enemy.

Now and again, most workers at some enterprises are taken on as a result of string-pulling by relatives (brothers, cousins, and other kin). In such cases, the workers retain ties with those who help them get the job, and these are frequently elements connected with the bureaucratic bourgeoisie or dependent on it, or its secret agents. Others may themselves be members of the administration. It will be easily understood that if the labor force is recruited on a "family" basis, the personnel will give unconditional support to the line pursued by that management. It is important to explain to the working people the great danger of the "kinship" approach. Now and again it can turn the worker into a plaything of our class adversaries.

What, apart from educational work, is being done to overcome the negative phenomena?

At one time, we even decided on a temporary closure of a state-owned textile factory. Elements of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie had effectively insinuated their clients at the enterprise and inflated its staff to twice its size (1,200 people instead of 600). It is not surprising that the factory became a loss-making enterprise. We had to explain to the workers that the bourgeois-bureaucratic elements, while pretending to display "good will" to them, that is, taking them on by means of patronage, were actually pushing the enterprise into bankruptcy. Their economic operations posed a threat to the future of all who were working there. A thorough selection of personnel on the most objective basis possible was subsequently carried out, and the jobs were assigned to the most proficient workers. The enterprise began to pick up once again. In this way, we show in practice that the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, even if it does strut in the garb of an ally, is actually most hostile to the working people's vital interests. However, a great deal still remains to be done for the enlightenment and the ideological and political education of the working class, so as to enable it truly to become a "class for itself."

It looks as though we have come close to yet another key question: that of the role of the masses in the management of social affairs, production and the state. After all, the enhancement of their role is an organic feature of all genuine revolutionary transformations. If these are carried out consistently, they give scope for the working people's historical creativity, and the people become masters of their own destiny. Much depends on how radically the old colonialist-bureaucratic structures of administration are rooted out, and what is being done to set up new organs and the executive apparatus of power. In short, we are faced with the key question of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the state. I should like to ask: what practical experience do you have in this sphere, and what has already been done for actively involving the masses in the administration of social affairs?

We have always believed that the state apparatus inherited from colonialism must be liquidated through a democratization of the administrative structures. In 1973, we had our first experience in setting up the people's power, when we held elections to the local people's councils headed by executive committees and vested with administrative functions.

But the experiment was only a partial success. At that time, the representatives of the people were given political powers and the

councils were provided with the necessary cadre. At the same time, we displayed much timidity in asserting the new approach to the management of economic affairs, especially on the local level. Finances remained centralized, and the conception of development itself was similar in character. While having displayed confidence in the masses, we lost sight of the need for actively involving them in the formulation of economic and social plans. Before these plans acquire a national significance, they need to be discussed with the participation of the local population, of masses of people.

The first experiment in the exercise of popular power was cut short by the death of President Marien Ngouabi, while the military committee which took over the state leadership put an end to it altogether. But the situation has undergone a fundamental change since the February 5, 1979 movement.² We now regard the revival of this experiment as a matter of honor. With the adoption of the new constitution (1979) another major step was taken toward the establishment of the people's power.

Let me mention yet another mistake. During our first experiment, we acted in something like a bourgeois way: everyone was entitled to carry on his own mini-electoral campaign and get elected to the organs of power. This opened up a loophole for their infiltration by elements of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, who went on to try to bend them to their own will.

These lessons have not been in vain. We now have a system under which those who are nominated by the party, by the mass organizations (trade unions, etc.) and the peasants can be elected to the district councils (lower administrative units), the regional councils and the National People's Assembly. The masses can learn the art of administration by taking part in the work of the people's councils. Within their competence are approval of the local budget, control of the distribution of funds, and formulation of development programs for their district or region. The councils are also represented on the National People's Assembly, and their deputies take part in working out financial policy and exercise control over the executive organs.

Is the national bourgeoisie represented on the people's councils? After all, a part of it, as you said, is objectively capable of being an ally of the progressive forces.

In order to provide no pretext for charges of infringement of political rights or persecution of national bourgeois elements, persons nominated on an "individual" basis — not on behalf of the party or mass organizations — may be

represented on the councils. Thus, the candidate of a group of villagers or people in other populated localities can be elected to a people's council (for various meritorious acts).

When taking part in the work of the organs of power, our comrades are responsible to the CPL and the people's organizations. But the "independents" are not accountable to them. This is a temporary concession on our part. But thanks to the differentiated approach, we have managed to avoid a repetition of the mistakes of which I spoke.

There are other forms in which the laboring masses take part in the management of, say, production. Are there any interesting aspects here in Congo's experience?

At the state enterprises, we have the rule of the "definitive triangle," which means the joint participation in management, decision-making and common responsibility of the representatives of the party, the management and the mass organizations for production and the affairs of the work collective. Once the director has received his mandate from the "triangle," he begins to act, from that point on being the "pilot" of the whole "ship." In order to avoid any abuse of his great powers, the fulfillment of production tasks and discipline are supervised by comrades' courts, led by the party. The director may not take decisions on his own in giving awards to or advancing anyone to a higher post without considering the opinion of the trade union-led social commission.

CPL documents and our conversation make it clear that Congo's Marxists attach tremendous importance to the role of the party. But the question could also be formulated as follows: how do the masses view the party's leading role, and what are the hopes they pin on it?

Today, on the basis of the CPL's experience of 13 years, one could safely say that the idea of a leading party is not only accessible to the masses but is accepted by them and has struck deep roots among the people. In our country, the party has become a living and tangible reality. It is the Congolese people's vanguard organization, guiding the masses in fulfilling the tasks of the revolution, and steadily consolidating its positions in the society.

But your question is a natural one. In the minds of the people, the idea of a vanguard party is, after all, associated with social justice. If the leaders provide any pretext for saying that they use their party posts for their own benefit, they will instantly lose the people's trust. We also see to it that there should be no great gap between what is paid for the work of responsible functionaries and of other categories of

working people. The Congolese are highly sensitive to matters of social justice.

Today one has the impression that everyone wants to join the CPL. We are faced with the task of safeguarding the party from the infiltration of alien elements. The CPL's extraordinary third congress in 1979 set up an important barrier to such infiltration. There is a consideration of the candidate's activity in mass organizations and he has to go through a probation period which could be as long as two years. Only then is the question of admission decided.

In view of what you have said about the character of the power, the working people's participation in administration and management, and the mission of the vanguard party which has declared Marxism-Leninism to be the basis of its activity, can one say that there is now a dictatorship of the proletariat in Congo's specific conditions?

A dictatorship of the proletariat? That could be an exaggeration. We have yet to reach that stage. We still have to spike the plans of those who would like to impose their will on the authorities: I have in mind the elements of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie capable of infiltrating the state apparatus. Besides, the people must be convinced from their own practice that we are the winning side in the administration of state affairs. Simultaneously, the party seeks to give the masses a sense of confidence in their strength and to help them gain a more profound awareness that a leader is worth very little without their support. Is it possible in such conditions to speak about a dictatorship of the proletariat, especially in the light of the peculiarities of the present stage of development? I think it would be more correct to save this concept for the future.

Up to now we have dealt mainly with political and social problems. When it comes to economics, what do you think here deserves primary attention from the standpoint of a country which has opted for the socialist way?

From the very outset, the basic question for us has been the unevenness of economic development. From colonialism we inherited a polar distribution of the productive forces: to the south of the capital — Brazzaville — runs a railway to port Pointe-Noire, the industrial center and simultaneously the country's "lung" (the Brazzaville-Pointe-Noire corridor). Meanwhile, other areas remain economically backward. The party sets itself the task of developing the whole national territory by building up facilities in transport, communications, and local industry, and other prerequisites for normal life (schools and medical, cultural and other institutions).

There is another key problem which we now have to tackle most closely. It is the need to organize the work of the state sector, the industrial enterprises above all, on a highly efficient level.

We have always believed that socialism cannot be built without a strong and flourishing state sector. It now covers every sphere of the nation's economic life. It is the state sector that is to help solve the main problems of the Congolese revolution, and that is to enable us to win economic independence over the long term.

At the same time, we have to take a realistic view of things: some state enterprises have made considerable progress, while others have scant successes and their viability is often very tenuous. There are also some units whose activity needs to be restructured. For us, the question of the more efficient functioning of the state enterprises has become imperative — one of the crucial lines in the struggle. According to the guidelines of the recently adopted five-year plan (1982-1986), nearly one-third of the funds at our disposal are to be used to improve the health of state enterprises. It is important to bring about a radical change in the state of things in this area, so that the invested funds should bring returns. Otherwise, some of the state-owned facilities will simply turn out to be so many drains.

It is frequently said that at state enterprises profits are distributed fairly. But how is one to share the losses, how is one to make a factory or a plant profitable? These problems are presented by life in a most acute form. Their solution is being hampered not only by the subversive activity of the class enemies and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, but also by the lack of experience and the force of habit in taking a bureaucratic approach to such problems, for instance, by constantly inflating staffs. We reject such methods and seek optimal ways of getting out of the difficulties, in an effort to make the state sector truly serve the people.

It will apparently take more than one day to overcome the bureaucratic practices and other manifestations of the old mentality. A great role belongs to the education of the people, above all youth, in the spirit of the new orientation and the progressive values asserted by the revolutionary power. Consequently, a great deal depends on restructuring the system of education inherited from colonialism. Is that so?

That is true. As the center of the former French Equatorial Africa,³ Congo had a fairly high level of education even in the old days, and we have subsequently made some use of

this fact. But the system of education introduced by French colonialism was of a privileged character, few people of medium and higher qualification were trained, while school graduates had to be content mainly with service in the colonial administration.

• Since independence, we have pursued a resolute policy of democratizing the education system. The whole population is involved in primary education. The statistics show that the number of schoolchildren in primary schools has doubled, while the total number of schoolchildren has more than doubled. Since 1980 we have had a law binding state agencies to exercise scrupulous and mandatory planning in the placement of school-leavers after a 10-year period of education.

Interviewer's afterword. There must surely be other problems that will subsequently be

resolved in practice with the benefit of the available experience. What appears to be more important is that a whole group of African countries oriented toward socialism is now taking a similar approach to key questions. The revolutionaries' attention is focused on the struggle to effect radical changes in every sphere of social life, to consolidate the organs of the people's power, and to strengthen the leading role of the vanguard parties. I think that our conversation is fresh evidence of this fact.

1. See Marien Ngouabi's article "Scientific Socialism in Africa," *WMR*, No. 5, 1975; and D. Sassou Nguesso's article "The Congo: Key Tasks of the Current Stage," *WMR*, No. 4, 1978. — Ed.

2. Led by the present party-state leadership, it attacked the right opportunist factional grouping of General J. Yhombi-Opango, who, after the murder of President Ngouabi, headed the military committee. — Ed.

3. Including the present-day territory of Congo, Gabon, the Central African Republic and Chad. — Ed.

A mighty instrument of peace

James Aldridge
British writer

THE ARTIST IN THE RANKS OF FIGHTERS

When I first came across Henri Barbusse's *Le Feu* I was very young, and when I had read it I had to face up to my father, because his point of view on the book was different from mine. It was really an argument about the nature of war and the nature of peace. I said that anti-war really meant peace, but he disagreed and said to me: "What you are forgetting is that *Le Feu* is a book about war, and even if it is anti-war, that doesn't make it a book about peace."

I had to agree with him, and later when I read many other "war books" published in the 20s and 30s, I realized that though Hemingway and Remarque and Aldington and others, writing intensely about war, were telling us what a stupid waste it was, nonetheless like Barbusse none of them, strictly speaking, was writing specifically about peace. What was more important, they could all write about war, even in hating it, because it reflected on the behavior of characters and individuals in extreme circumstances. Prince André and Natasha in *War and Peace* are individuals in war. So are Frederick and Katherine in *A Farewell to Arms*, and so are all those schoolboy soldiers in *All Quiet on the Western Front*.

This has always been the case. Even in classi-

cal literature, fighting heroes were personalities, as well as fragments of war. The *Odyssey* was not only a record of combat and violence, it was a complex search (often moral in the context) of what conflict and combat did to the human spirit, and how men could somehow survive the worst of it. Ultimate survival has always been the safe haven for literature about war, even when war has been pictured for us as heroic. Sometimes it is. But men have always survived to go on with their private lives in a rebuilt world that was, despite its devastation, rebuildable.

But now, as we face the holocaust, how are we to persuade ourselves in our literature that we can survive another war as individuals, and emerge once more into a rebuilt world? What a writer has to face now is not the lessons of a war already fought and survived, but a war that hasn't taken place at all. In fact if we are to have any future literature of any sort, about war or about peace, a new war must never take place. Because after a nuclear war there would be nothing left of the individual, nor anything else for that matter.

Almost the only way to deal with this obvious fact is first of all to look at the causes of our present dilemma to see what has happened in human affairs that can bring us all to a point

of self-destruction. The simplest answer is political and social, and you can solve it all by taking sides. But that isn't where literature can give answers to our troubles. What has happened to ordinary men and women who seem helpless or unwilling or passive or confused, and who allow this situation to exist? What has been done to us? And why do we seem so helpless, unwilling or confused? If there are sociological and personal answers, then there have to be psychological and moral answers as well. If man has been corrupted to the point of mass suicide, then man himself is still the subject, and you have to find the reason and the explanation of it in him too.

This should be the special realm of the writer, the seeker of our passions and our suffering, the prober of our tenderest sensibilities which can explain or at least try to unravel our behavior in all its marvellous complexity. If we are to have a literature that will give us a human explanation and make that deep psychological plunge into our predicament, then we have to begin with what literature has already contributed to the present situation. At the moment it must be said that modern literature in the West is contributing little, if anything, to explain our inability to look after ourselves. It is as confused as the situation itself. Or worse — much of it is actually contributing to the moral and social confusion that leaves us so helpless and inadequate and apparently lacking in the will to survive. If there are men and women who are now resisting and showing a will to survive, then it is no particular thanks to most of the contributions you find in our bookshops. If Western man now seems corrupted to the point of annihilation, then it has to be said that our literature of late has helped him get there.

It isn't that writers have deliberately set out to corrupt, but rather that they have accepted the apparent failures of a dangerous society that has left the individual with almost nothing to believe in, and no other passions except the flagellation of tortured love and a sort of biological vivisection we call sex. Love and sex are inevitably built into the human drama, but if that is all we have to offer, then that is why we are failing. And when it comes to the threat of war and the chances of peace, our inability so far to create a serious literature of involvement in the choice, tells us that the writers' failure now is more real than it has been at any other time in history.

The trouble is that bad literature can spoil the chances of good literature because it eventually damages any confidence people have in any literary treatment of human behavior. Prurience might tempt us to read the primitive and

the scatological in literature, but we know they are not relevant to the larger part of life which is, after all, the *real* life we live, surrounded as we are by social conflicts and private problems. If personification is limited to the flesh, and if literature no longer tries to comprehend what flesh has become heir to, then all we are left with is a sickness. And real life is not a sickness.

That is the problem for the writer now. What we are all facing is a sort of induced sickness that seems incurable because we seem to be infected by men who are hopelessly diseased. Somewhere here is the source for any literature of peace, because the disease of self-destruction is what it has to deal with. Peace isn't simply a word, or even a condition. If we look at it dialectically it isn't even the opposite to war. It is the product of the same conditions that make war, because the real choice in society is what people do with their conditions. That is where literature should begin.

In practical terms it isn't always easy. If one asks the question what should a writer do about peace, the answer could be quite simple. He should write about it as best he can, and do whatever is possible in other areas to help its cause. But I have never heard of a writer saying to himself: "I'm now going to write a novel about peace" and then simply sit down and write it. The chances are that if a writer did that it wouldn't turn out very well. It isn't a matter of satisfying a subject, or even fulfilling a duty. In any case most Western publishing houses wouldn't even look at it. The kind of popular literature saturating the bookshelves and libraries and stores is now measured almost entirely as a purely marketable commodity, and peace isn't calculated in that sort of arithmetic. Nonetheless what a writer needs to do now is deal with the corruption of the spirit in such a way that he sets about revealing whatever is in man that chooses life instead of death. Or explains man's preference for ordinary human morality in the face of an inhuman pressure to abandon everything to the violence of a final solution for all of us. We are all facing the choice, we are in need of a morality, and there ought to be some sort of literature coming from the huge conflict that besets us all — in our personal lives as well as our social surroundings.

We have to set about reconstructing the moral atmosphere we live, not by preaching but by finding out the real truth of our lives, at this particular moment. Our lives now have become tangled into a sort of confrontation between destruction and survival. In the same category, peace is a product of our society as much as war. But if war is in part the result of per-

sualtion, deception, brainwashing and the ruination of all our intelligent sensibilities, then in the loss of our innocence for life there is raw material for the literature of peace, not because we have to find something to write about, but because that is what life is now concerned with. This is what we are all heir to, and what is going to affect us all. So how do we stand up to it, because whatever else happens to love and emotion and quarrels, and even sex, now has a shadow over it. If we are to look over our shoulders at what governs our hopes of survival, then anything we do in ordinary life has to be measured by the future that is threatened.

Even when I pick up a children's book these days I find that I am looking for what horrors children are being persuaded to think and feel. The influence that adult behavior has on our children seeps through into children's literature, and here too the pressure is on young minds to accept violence, hostility, hatred and deception as normal. Brutal, holocaust comics exist, they are sold in their millions in every Western country. War in these comics becomes a game, a sports arena for armed combat to persuade young boys that war is proof of their growing manhood.

Books and comics and TV and films have taken the same violence into outer space. Almost every day we can see something on TV, or pick up a comic or a book that portrays the future in space as one of violence or of distorted alien bodies that threaten and kill. It's only fun they say. But take it all together, piece it into the complete jigsaw, fragment by fragment, and what our children are surrounded with is an education and even an instruction in death-dealing systems that influence the very foundations of their thinking as youths and adults. Children are being taught how to kill before they are taught how to live.

The main argument for all this violence and rot in our literature is that it is a reflection of life, and that anyway it is all true, and that is how people behave, and what they think and feel. And aren't we all corrupted anyway? So what is the use of hiding our heads in the sand? The literature of do-gooders or the rantings of moral preachers would be so boring that nobody would believe them anyway. Well ... parts of all this are true, but only parts of it.

Whatever is corrupt in our society is a problem that has to be faced, and who is going to read the kind of literature that tells us lies about ourselves in order to persuade us to be good? That isn't the point. Life is many-sided and ridden with contradictions. We too have to look at the emotional and physical violence that affects us so deeply. Yet, given the choice, it

seems only logical that most people would choose life over death, and non-violence in preference to violence. If that is what we are struggling for, and suffering for, then it seems clear that the aim of even confused human beings is to choose to survive. This is the area of life we writers need to look at, and that is what we will have to restore to our literature if we are to rescue ourselves. It doesn't have to be a literature of peace with a capital P. It simply has to be the literature of life itself, against death and those who deal in death.

Inevitably in this conflict of ideas one has to look for the social and political reasons that distort our lives so dangerously. Many writers are not very politically minded, and many of those who are politically minded, and do their best to understand, are themselves confused. There are plenty of writers who are downright reactionary, in fact far too many. So here we have a mixture of political thinking among writers, which means that they cannot all be lumped together as a group with one idea and one hope and one aim. In the end we writers have to be educated too, educated in an understanding of what is happening and why it is happening.

Socialism is the opposite to capitalism, but there are plenty of people who call themselves socialists who are perfectly willing to accept President Reagan's ideas on nuclear weapons' deployment. On the other hand there are capitalists who don't like President Reagan's ideas on nuclear weaponry at all, and are as afraid of them as any member of Britain's CND. We have Generals, even Field Marshals, disagreeing with the introduction of Cruise and Pershing missiles into Europe. So there is at least some common level of understanding possible, even from opposite ideological sides. The reason for this is not a collapse of ideology, but quite simply that the nuclear arms race has now reached such a dangerous stage that people of any idea or shade or character begin to see that unless nuclear weapons are limited and controlled then we will all be wiped off the face of the Earth.

So far so good. This is an education in reality that doesn't require much more than common sense and a desire to survive. But it still leaves open the real question of who is threatening us with nuclear weapons. Who is it that believes in the "manifest destiny" of one society to dominate and shape the world in its own image, by threats if necessary? Who, on the other hand, is always offering compromises and clear-cut propositions for limiting nuclear weapons and even doing away with them altogether? What is it in these two societies that

makes them take opposite views of war and peace?

Somewhere here is the root of the problem, and here too begins the real issue for the writer. If we don't understand the difference between the two societies, and the state they are in, then we cannot begin to comprehend what is happening. Nobody wants to claim that one society is perfect and the other imperfect. There are perfections and imperfections in both. That isn't what we are trying to understand. What we need to know is the source of the different outlooks. Which society is educating its people to war? And which one instructs its people, almost from birth, in the need and nature and passionate desire for peace? If we look for reasons to explain the differences, then we are half way to understanding the crisis in the world.

The man who claims to be a communicator (what else is a writer) needs to take an honest look at the differences if he wants to fulfil his role as a seeker of the truth. It is all in there somewhere.

There are a thousand reasons why writers in the West have difficulty fulfilling their proper function. The economics of publishing in the West has become the economics of marketing soap. At a pinch, even that could be acceptable, except that so much of the "soap" being offered is like that trick stuff you can buy which irritates your skin instead of getting rid of the sweat. These days even good writers have to compromise with vulgarity in order to get anything published, or rather to sell what they write. And if there is a current taste in pornography then it is inspired rather than something natural, and writers have to cope with that influence as well. So practical problems also make difficulties for any writer in the West who wants to take a longer and deeper look into man's soul, rather than go on probing and probing the joys of tactile flesh.

Somehow we have to revive the very principle of literature, because there is a principle to it. An English gentleman named Viscount John Morley in the 19th century said that "literature consists of all the books where moral truth and human passion are touched with a certain largesse, sanity, and attraction of form." We are now facing the problem of life and death, and that is where the largesse comes in, not simply for the generosity of spirit but our need for size and width in a vast imagination. If we cannot extend our view of life now, then it will be goodbye to literature when the world punishes us for our neglect.

This inevitably takes us into extra-territory. We are, first and foremost, men and women

who walk the streets like everybody else. And we have to do what every intelligent person has to do. At some point it doesn't matter whether we are writers or not. All that matters is that we make our own alliance with those men and women who seek real nuclear disarmament, a real nuclear freeze, a real agreement on arms limitation. There are no options any more. Putting pen to paper has to have some value, otherwise it is a worthless occupation. If writing is what we do best, if it is our life's blood, then that is what we have to do.

It isn't simply a matter of peace and war, but of who it is that wants war, and who it is that wants peace. That is the overall human problem we face, and the one we have to deal with in our daily lives as well as in our professional lives. We have a tradition, too, and it is an honorable one, of writers who hated war, and though my father and I disagreed over the nature of war and peace in Barbusse's *Le Feu* we did agree that it was anti-war. That is where the tradition began for me and it continues until now with our most illustrious and best writers. In fact it goes back long before Barbusse because our best writers have always been on the side of life, and that is what counts. That is where my father and I could agree about Barbusse and all the others. They were life-lovers, not death-lovers.

Disarmament and the Economy

R. Faramazyian

A comprehensive study of not only the economic and social effects of the arms race, but also the effects of converting a military economy to peaceful uses.

A book which supplies the facts and the arguments to counter the idea that disarmament would cause unemployment.

cloth 172 pp \$4.95

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

Popular protest in Chile

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Chile has been swept by a tide of popular protest. The whole country has come into motion. That was not at all unexpected, for the grapes of popular wrath have been ripening for a long time. The passive refusal to accept the regime again and again developed into active struggle. Those who have openly defied the dictatorship have many acts of genuine heroism to their credit. The Chileans have overcome the fear syndrome, which Pinochet tried to make a guarantee of his "New Reich."

Since last year, this wide protest began to acquire the proportion of a mass offensive. On August 19, September 30 and December 15, massive popular demonstrations were staged throughout the country. This year was marked by powerful popular action on March 8 and 24, and then by May Day demonstration. After that, the Confederation of Working People of the Copper Mining Industry called for a Day of National Protest on May 11, and this was supported by the National Coordination Center of the Trade Unions, the trade unions of builders, textile workers and steel workers, the peasants' organization, El Surco, students and other social groups. In massiveness and activity of participation that action exceeded all the expectations of its organizers. Despite the repression mounted by the regime, the working people largely managed to paralyze production and public life. The country's major newspaper, the extreme-right wing *El Mercurio*, was forced to admit: "The days of protest called by various trade union organizations constitute the most serious challenge to the government in the past 10 years."¹

The opposition forces are more closely united in the course of the mounting and massive struggle. Following the first day of protest, a National Governing Council of the Working People was set up by five leading trade unions. The Council's activity now also involves many other organizations (young people and university students, engineers and technicians, workers in culture, teachers, old-age pensioners and inhabitants of the poor neighborhoods), effectively representing all the opposition trends.

The emergence of such a unitary body is one of the most important events of the past several

years, because it paves the way for a new stage in the struggle. The Council sees its tasks in guiding the anti-dictatorship popular movement into a single channel and coordinating action for the re-establishment of democracy in Chile.

The second Day of National Protest was staged on June 14 under the Council's leadership. The Chileans' participation confirmed the urge for joint action and expansion of the front of struggle, involving fresh strata of the population in the battle against the dictatorship. This became most obvious when a general strike staged on June 23 was joined by the truck owners. Fearing a spread of the strike to all the major copper mines, the authorities surrounded these with troops and tanks. Thereupon, at the urging of the Catholic Church, the Confederation of Working People of the Copper Mining Industry decided to end the strike in order to avoid bloodshed. But on July 12, the people once again thronged the streets to mark the third Day of National Protest. The mass action assumed the most diverse forms: street demonstrations, rallies in the working-class neighborhoods, strikes at enterprises and in the universities, the erection of barricades, clashes with the police and many other acts. That night, as planned, Chileans began to bang on empty pots and pans, cisterns, tin roofs and church bells, and to flicker out street and house lights. Millions of people took part in this protest demonstration, which was supported even by the residents of Barrio Alto, the privileged area of the capital. Thus, even the propertied part of the population voiced its dissatisfaction with the arbitrary acts of the authorities, and the economic, political and moral crisis into which they had plunged the country.

These days of protest, strikes and other action by masses of people demonstrated that opposition to the regime has never been as wide as it is today. It involves virtually all the Chileans, including a large section of the right-wing circles. The dictatorship is opposed not only by the laboring population but also by employers and landowners.

As is their wont, Pinochet and his clique resorted to brutal repression, when faced with the growing isolation and the loss of their last few supporters. Once again the stadiums are being turned into concentration camps, as they

were during the September 11, 1973 coup, the torture machine has been switched into high gear, and the number of "disappeared" is multiplying.

In June, Pinochet declared: "If I have to toughen up my government, I will toughen it up, whatever the price." And he was as good as his word. But that is something that there was obviously no need to warn about: it was quite clear to all the Chileans what they could expect of the tyrant.

The regime began to toughen up its policy at the first signs of the upsurge in the popular struggle. The Chilean Human Rights Commission testifies: "In February 1983, the number of arrests tripled, as compared with the figure for the same month in 1982 . . . The violence is mounting in menacing proportions. This has produced a situation in which police operations with the use of helicopters, police dogs and tear gas are becoming ever more commonplace . . . Physical torture, with the use of electric shock, is being ever more often applied."² Last year, 415 persons were arrested and incarcerated for political reasons, but this year, from January to March alone, the figure reached 553. In May, the number of arrests shot up sharply, and now they run to thousands. Dozens of trade union leaders, including those of the copper mining industry, builders, food workers and peasants have been imprisoned. Industrial workers and employees involved in the strike movement are being fired in droves.

Total raids are being staged in the poor neighborhoods. The army and the paramilitary police have been given orders to shoot. And they have been shooting. Participants in demonstrations and even bystanders who look suspicious are being killed in the streets or on the porches of their own homes.

But no amount of repression can stop a people who have risen to struggle for their freedom. A statement recently circulated in Santiago by the Communist Party of Chile stressed that the main, crucial task just now is to mobilize all the forces to overthrow the Pinochet dictatorship. Every Chilean, the CP Chile says, can and must do something to prevent the tyrant and his satraps from having a single day of peace. It is necessary to organize at the industrial enterprises, in the rural localities and in the schools to give battle to the dictatorship.

Our party has called on the opposition to unite and to start action under a common plan. The communists understand the aspirations of the masses whose action in practice embodies the idea of such unity. There is good reason why today, like a decade ago, Chileans chant in the streets of Santiago: "The People United Will Never Be Defeated!"

Carlos Zuniga

CP Chile representative on WMR

1. *El Mercurio*, May 7-13, 1983, p. 3.

2. *Comision chilena de derechos humanos. Informe mensual*, No. 14, February 1983, p. 3.

Big lie brings big sting

James West

CC Political Bureau member,
CPUSA

Still another anti-Soviet slander stands exposed. This time it is the lie invented by Washington about "yellow rain" that has been washed down the sewer of lost causes. It turns out that the toxic effects of "yellow rain" are caused not by the Soviet Union but by the excrement of bees, no less. But about this, a little later.

It was eight years ago that tales about "yellow rain" first came out of Southeast Asia. Four years later, at the 35th session of the UN Human Rights Commission, the U.S. delegation charged that the Soviet Union used poison gas in Laos. Although the charge was strongly denied by the representatives of that country, the then Secretary of State, Alexander Haig, said in

September 1981, that "physical evidence from Southeast Asia" confirms the use of "poisonous substances not indigenous to the region which are highly toxic to man and animals."¹ The U.S. State Department then issued a "fact sheet" claiming that "yellow rain" contained mycotoxins "that do not occur naturally in Southeast Asia." The allegations were based on a leaf and a stem coated with a yellow powder ostensibly coming from Kampuchea.²

At the time, these charges were greeted with general scepticism by the mass media in the United States and abroad. Not so, however, *The Wall Street Journal*. This outspoken defender of capitalism published some 50 articles on "yellow rain" in the 18 months following Haig's

speech in support of his contentions.

Then, in 1982, Haig sent a 32-page report to Congress on "Chemical Warfare in Southeast Asia," in which he openly placed the blame for the toxic "yellow rain" on the Soviet Union. He was soon followed by President Reagan himself, who, in a speech at the UN, directly accused the USSR of violating the Geneva Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention. Saying that the evidence was "conclusive," he used this allegation to throw doubt on the value of negotiations with the Soviet Union. Then, in November, the new Secretary of State George Schultz sent a report to Congress in which he indignantly proclaimed: "... The world cannot be silent in the face of such human suffering and cynical disregard for international law and agreements."³

Under such pressure, the mass media cast aside their scepticism and transformed the tale about "yellow rain" into a veritable cloudburst of anti-Soviet calumnies. With an air of vindication, the editor of *The Wall Street Journal* and his editorial page writer, Robert L. Bartley and William P. Kucewicz, wrote a lengthy malicious article, "'Yellow Rain' and the Fu-

ture of Arms Agreements." Published in the 1983 spring edition of *Foreign Affairs*, it was clearly aimed at consolidating all the "evidence" of Soviet complicity in the "yellow rain" toxic weapon, at "proving" that the Soviet Union does not respect treaties and that it is practically useless to negotiate arms control agreements with it. In other words, the aim was to create a political climate to justify U.S. intransigence in arms control and reduction talks, and to justify the Reagan administration's 10 billion dollar plan to resume production of biochemical weapons.

Unfortunately for the administration of *The Wall Street Journal* editors, the results of a study of "yellow rain" by five prominent U.S. scientists were published soon after *Foreign Affairs* reached its readers. Reporting to the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the five scientists said that the "yellow rain" samples they had examined were pollen-filled faeces dropped by bees in flight.⁴ "The best explanation of the 'yellow rain' is bee excrement," they said. "Bees of the genus *Apis*, like the honey-bee and its cousins in Southeast Asia, stay in their nests all winter without defecating. In the spring, they emerge on cleansing flights, excreting drops of digested pollen grains ... The spring cleansing flights might explain why toxic 'yellow rain' samples have been retrieved only in February, March and April."⁵

Reviewing the scientific findings, the *New York Times*, a leading bourgeois paper, observes: "The administration's thesis stumbles from the outset on the fact that 'yellow rain' contains far too little toxin to make a useful weapon ... The United States' charges have poisoned relations with the Soviet Union and confidence in its respect for treaties ..."⁶

The tale of "yellow rain" is instructive for how rumors, innuendo, the flimsiest of evidence and the constant repetition of little lies are transformed, by means of Washington alchemy, into the big lie of a Soviet threat. The White House, the State Department and their mouthpiece, *The Wall Street Journal*, stand neck-deep in bee excrement.⁷ As Lyly, a 16th-century English writer, put it, "the bee that hath honey in her mouth hath a sting in her tail."

1. *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1983, p. 811.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 812.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 816.

4. *International Herald Tribune*, June 2, 1983.

5. *New York Times*, June 3, 1983.

6. *Ibid.*

7. Later on, faced with objective, scientific information, the paper had to admit that the anti-Soviet allegations were false. — Ed.

Soviet Foreign Policy

Fourth, revised, enlarged edition
Chief Editors: A.A. Gromyko and
B.N. Ponomarev

Volume 1 From the Great
October Revolution to
World War II
500 pages

Volume 2 The aftermath of the
the war to the present day
728 pages

Cloth \$25.00 the set

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



Crisis exported to developing countries

ECONOMIC SURVEY*

The development of capitalism in the 1970s and early 1980s exemplifies "the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the condition for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule."¹ The cyclical recessions of 1974-1975 and 1980-1982 in the industrial countries spread to African, Asian and Latin American countries and so evolved into world crises of the world capitalist system, once again demonstrating that its mode of production was historically limited.

The deepening contradictions in the non-socialist world induced reaction in some countries to mount an offensive along the whole front of social relations. The most conservative forces, which are trying to solve their economic problems by stepping up the arms race, curtailing the rights of the working class, depressing the working people's living standards and more fiercely exploiting the newly free countries' manpower and natural resources through international monopoly capital, have moved into the forefront of political life in the United States and several other industrialized countries.

The U.S. administration's overt use of "aid" and foreign trade to secure its military strategic interests, and its tactics of blackmail, boycotts and sanctions, have done grave harm to international economic ties and have blocked, among other things, efforts to implement the program to set up a new international economic order sponsored by the developing countries. The imperialist powers and the international monopolies have made the most

of these countries' recent monetary and financial difficulties to increase pressure on them and obtain political concessions and additional privileges for foreign capital.

World market: who is on the way out

The past 10-12 years have been marked by a significant expansion of trade, and scientific, technical and financial ties between the industrialized capitalist and developing countries, ties which for the latter have continued to be inequitable. In 1979 and 1980, trade between these two groups of countries (\$600 billion) was 7.3 times the 1969-1971 figure. In that period, the price of the technology being sold by the industrialized capitalist countries to countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America increased roughly 5-fold, to an estimated \$10 billion.

The integration of the developing countries as a whole into the capitalist monetary and financial system has gained in depth. The average annual influx of every form of capital into these countries from Western Europe, North America and Japan has swelled. Asian, African and Latin American countries have become active borrowers on the loan capital market. In 1980, the private credits they received totalled \$180 billion. The rich oil-producing countries of the Middle East have emerged as a major financial center within the framework of the developing world, and a number of important focal points of international banking operations have appeared (Singapore, Kuwait, Bahrain and Panama).

The involvement of most developing states in the system of the capitalist world's economic ties has manifestly intensified the negative impact which crisis phenomena in the capitalist centers have on every aspect of their economic life. This was most pronounced in industry, whose development largely depends on external finance and imports of machinery, equipment and components.² In the 1970s, the developing countries' gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate dropped by one-twentieth, as compared with the figure for the

*Sources: UNCTAD. Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, N.Y., 1982; Doc. TD/B/863. 1981; Doc. TDR/2, Vol. 1, 31 July, 1982. OECD. 1982 Review. Development Cooperation, Paris, 1982. UNIDO. First Global Study on the Capital Goods Industry. Strategies for Development. Sept. 1981. UN. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics; Doc. A/S-11/5, 7 August, 1981; World Economic Surveys 1979-1980, 1980-1981, 1981-1982, N.Y. The World Bank, World Development Report, Washington, 1981.

preceding decade (from 5.9 to 5.6 per cent), and their industrial growth rate, by more than a third (from 7.2 to 4.9 per cent). The decline was most apparent in the extractive industries, which work mainly for export and which are most dependent on economic conditions in the citadels of capitalism. In the 1970s, extractive output growth averaged 2.4 per cent a year, as compared with 8.3 per cent in the 1960s.

The crisis phenomena in the capitalist world, together with the growing instability of world prices, trade and international flows of capital, tended to increase the uneven economic development of Asian, African and Latin American countries and to accelerate the process of their differentiation.

The measures taken by the developing countries which are the leading oil producers³ to assert their sovereignty over their natural resources brought about a substantial change in price formation on the world oil market, a process once entirely controlled by the international monopolies. That was the first time these states were able to fix oil prices in the light of their national interests. During the 1970s, the price of a barrel of oil (159 liters) increased 5-fold in real terms, and more than 16-fold at the prevailing exchange rates.

The "oil-price revolution" enabled the OPEC countries to fortify their economic positions appreciably. In the 1970s, their GDP growth averaged 5.8 per cent a year (that of the rich oil-producing countries in the Middle East, 6.1 per cent), their share of world trade swelled from 6.2 to 16.2 per cent, while their balance-of-payments surplus aggregated \$684.5 billion. Unable to put all these oil revenues to productive use at home, some OPEC countries invested vast amounts of money abroad, mainly in the United States and other centers of imperialism.

Meanwhile, the monetary and financial condition of the absolute majority of countries in the developing world took a sharp turn for the worse. Their export-import operations generated proliferating deficit: from 1971 to 1980, their deficit with respect to the industrialized capitalist and OPEC countries added up to more than \$293 billion.

Among the non-OPEC countries, those whose industry grew fast developed most dynamically.⁴ In the 1970s, their GDP growth averaged 7.1 per cent a year. Despite the worsening international economic outlook, they also managed to maintain a high rate of export growth (an average of about 12 per cent a year). In many instances, this was achieved, first, through drastic capitalist rationalization which depressed the working people's living

standards, spreading unemployment and producing even more glaring material inequality; second, "denationalization" of entire industries, with a bolstering of the positions of foreign capital; and third, the rapid growth of external indebtedness.⁵

The decline in world prices for many raw materials and tropical products has had an extremely painful effect on the economic condition of the least developed countries,⁶ which were especially sensitive to the market ups-and-downs because of their single-crop exports. Although the rate of their economic growth in the 1970s did go up slightly, as compared with the 1960s, it remained low (3.2 per cent). The situation was especially tense in sub-Saharan Africa. In the 1970s, the income per head of the least developed countries in Africa grew on the average by only 0.2 per cent, as compared with 1.1 per cent for Asian countries in the same income bracket, and 3 per cent for the whole developing world. From 1960 to 1970, the least developed countries increased their exports by an average of 4.4 per cent a year, whereas from 1970 to 1980, they shrank by 0.4 per cent a year. Over the past 30 years, these countries' share of world exports has declined steadily (from 1.5 per cent to 0.3 per cent). For all practical purposes, they were being ousted from world capitalist exchange.⁷

What then are the channels along which the crisis phenomena originating in the industrialized countries are transmitted to the countries of the developing world?

Raw-material exports: shrinking potentialities

First of all, there are the processes in the sphere of trade relations between these two groups of countries. Under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution and also of the energy and raw-material crises, the structural changes in the economy of the industrialized countries have long since generated a trend enhancing the role of the science-intensive (and usually less material-intensive) industries in capitalist social production. These changes also tend to generate a lag in the growth of world demand for raw materials exported by developing countries behind the growth of production in the industrialized countries, while the slow-down in output growth, to say nothing of an absolute drop in production at the crisis phases of the cycle, inevitably causes a drop in the demand for raw materials.

This tends to exert a corresponding pressure on prices. According to data issued last January by the UNCTAD Secretariat, real prices for some raw-material commodities dropped to the

lowest level for the past half-century. In 1982, the prices of many raw materials were less than half of the 1950 prices. As a whole, in 1981 and the first three quarters of 1982 alone, these prices fell by 30 per cent. As a result, from 1980 to 1982, the developing countries lost almost \$21 billion.⁸

The drop in prices also caused a loss for the industrialized capitalist countries which are simultaneously major producers and exporters of raw materials, but because of their diversified economies they were, first, less dependent on raw-material exports, and second, able more flexibly to adapt themselves to changes in the world market outlook.⁹

The decline in raw-material prices was a real tragedy for the many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America whose production and foreign-trade structures are not flexible and little diversified and whose exports consist of two or three raw-material commodities. In the late 1970s, of the 102 developing countries for which data were available, only 7 had a share of raw materials in the total value of exports that came to under 50 per cent; 76 countries had over 85 per cent, and the rest — virtually 100 per cent. Since the lion's share of these exports went to the capitalist centers, the trade in raw materials, like the whole of the economic development of African, Asian and Latin American countries, was heavily dependent on the gyrations in business activity in the industrialized capitalist world.

In view of the crisis, the capitalist powers have intensified their protectionist policies, and this has had negative effects for the developing countries. In the 1970s, the capitalist powers made some cuts in their foreign-trade tariffs, but at the same time they did much to extend and refurbish the panoply of their non-tariff barriers. In 1974, about 40 per cent of their entire trade was variously affected by non-tariff barriers, but at the end of the 1970s, the figure had gone up to 55 per cent. New items — leather goods, pig iron, steel, ships, household electronic gadgets and chemicals — were added to goods like foodstuffs, textiles and garments, whose imports have always been traditionally subjected to protectionist limitations. Alongside the traditional set of non-tariff barriers (quotas, licenses, technical restrictions) wide use was made of covert forms of protectionism, like imposition on trade partners of inequitable agreements on "voluntary restriction of exports," "organized trade," "orderly marketing," etc. These mostly applied to manufactured goods and so were especially painful for developing countries with an average level of income per head.

Soaring inflation, disordered finances

The acceleration of inflationary processes and the dislocation of the monetary and financial system of capitalism have done much to worsen the external economic positions of the majority of countries in the developing world. In the 1970s, the consumer prices in Asia, Africa and Latin America grew more than twice as fast than they did in the industrialized capitalist countries: from roughly 9 per cent in 1969-1972, they went up to 19 per cent in 1973-1978, and to 30-35 per cent in 1979-1981. There is an intimate connection between the movement of consumer prices in the citadels of capitalism and in the developing countries. From 1971 to 1979, a rise in the consumer price index in the developed capitalist countries by 1 percentage point led to a growth of 1.9 percentage points in the developing countries, including 1.3 in the OPEC countries, and 2.0 in the oil-importing countries.

There is no doubt that the leap-frogging of oil prices transmitted fairly powerful impulses to the inflationary spiral in the world capitalist economy and in the oil-importing developing countries. However, the adverse influence of the growth of oil prices fell far short of the impact of yet another factor, namely, the steady spiralling of prices in the capitalist centers, including the prices of foodstuffs, machinery, equipment and other goods which constitute a sizable part of the developing countries' imports (this factor was, in effect, the prime cause of the sharp hikes in crude oil prices by the OPEC countries). Taking the aggregate growth of the import price index in the non-oil-exporting African, Asian and Latin American countries in the 1970s as a base of 100, 61.6 came from manufactured goods and only 25.6 from oil (the other 12.8 came from raw materials). The growing cost of imports had an effect on the internal inflationary process both directly — through the prices of imported consumer and investment goods — and indirectly — through the growing cost of production at enterprises using imported raw materials and fuel.

The mounting inflation unhinged the mechanism of the monetary, credit and financial system of capitalism.¹⁰ The Bretton Woods system, which was based on firm currency parities, was wound up in March 1973. The industrialized capitalist powers switched to a system of floating exchange rates, and this created grave difficulties for most developing countries whose exchange rates are tied to those of the leading capitalist currencies. The unpredictable swings in the latter tended to

increase, among other things, the element of uncertainty in estimating the real value of export revenues and import costs and markedly complicated the planning of foreign trade operations and investments, and the regulation of the external debt.

The effect was similar from the growing dependence of the oil-importing developing countries on foreign private banks. The deepening of the crisis contradictions in the system of capitalist reproduction had a palpable effect on the dynamic and structure of external financial resource flows. On the plea of economic difficulties and the need to cut back budget expenditures in order to contain inflation, a number of industrialized capitalist countries put a brake on the expansion of "aid" to African, Asian and Latin American countries.

From 1972 to 1977, there was virtually no real growth in the total volume of "official development aid" from the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). It increased, more or less substantially, only in 1978 and 1980, but still fell short of the 1975 level. In 1981, their "aid" once again dropped by nearly \$2 billion, or 7 per cent, as compared with the previous year's level of \$27.3 billion. The sharpest drop was registered in U.S. "official aid" — from \$7.1 billion to \$5.8 billion — as its share of the gross national product of the leading imperialist power contracted from 0.27 to 0.20 per cent¹¹ (as against the 1981 average of 0.35 per cent for all the OECD members).

In these conditions, more and more developing countries were forced to seek the "services" of international finance capital: from 1970/1971 to 1980/1981, the share of resources made available for these countries on commercial terms went up from 51 per cent to 64.6 per cent of the total receipt of these funds from abroad, including those from private banks and export credits, from 27.6 per cent to 33.7 per cent.

Steeped in debt

The growing share of private loan capital in the external financing of oil-importing developing countries greatly increased their dependence on international financial markets, where outlook and conditions are notoriously unstable. Thus, during the 1970s, the annual average fluctuations of the London inter-bank interest rate ("libor") on the Eurocurrency market was 3 to 5 per cent. By the end of the decade, the bulk of the commercial credits was being made available to these countries at unfixed interest rates, which were corrected for inflation.

One must bear in mind that private credits frequently have a destabilizing effect on the economic development of young states. The banks, for instance, tend to expand credits whenever there is a growth in the world prices of raw materials and, conversely, to withhold loans whenever export earnings tend to fall. Another example is provided by export credits, which are an essential element of the neocolonialist strategy of imperialism, enabling the industrialized countries, first, substantially to expand the sale of their goods in the developing world, something that is highly important in a crisis, and second, to tighten the financial bonds of the developing countries' dependence. From 1970 to 1981, almost 10 per cent of the industrialized countries' exports to developing countries (including up to 20 per cent of the producer goods) was financed precisely in that way.

The growth of borrowing on loan capital markets boosted the developing countries' external debt and intensified their exploitation by international finance capital. From 1971 to 1982, the debt of non-OPEC developing countries multiplied nearly 6.7-fold, to almost \$468 billion. In that period, their annual debt servicing — repayment of principal and interest — increased roughly 11-fold, to \$82-85 billion. According to UNCTAD estimates, these countries' debt could go up in 1983 to roughly \$539 billion, and their debt servicing, to almost \$94 billion.

Meanwhile, the worsening of the world economic outlook tends to undermine the payment potentialities of most African, Asian and Latin American countries, and the situation is being compounded by the Reagan administration's policy of keeping interest rates high. The result is a steep rise in the cost of international credit ("libor" rates went up from 5.6 per cent in 1976 to 16.4 per cent in 1981). Besides, there is obvious discrimination against the oil-importing developing countries on the loan capital market: loans made available to them from 1977 to 1981 carried interest rates that rose on average from 7 per cent to 18 per cent, being 1.4-1.6 percentage points above the "libor" rate.

All of this has fast increased the developing countries' financial burdens.¹² IBRD estimates for 33 developing countries with the heaviest external debt showed that in 1980 and 1981, a rise in the "libor" rate by a single percentage point pushed up annual interest payments by \$1.8 billion. In those two years, payments by oil-importing developing countries rose by nearly \$29 billion.

The least developed African and Asian coun-

tries found themselves in the most dire plight. Following the slow-down since 1975 in the influx of "official aid" (in real terms) and the worsening of the external economic situation, they were forced to resort more extensively to IMF and IBRD loans and credits, which had not only economic but also political strings attached. This gave the imperialist powers, notably the United States, which control these bodies, additional instruments for bringing neocolonialist pressure to bear on the developing countries.

How to reduce dependence

In the crisis years of 1974-1975, the oil-importing developing countries, relying on relatively large foreign exchange reserves, markedly increased their government expenditures for the purpose of cushioning the negative effect of the deteriorating external economic situation. Things are very different today. From 1980 to 1982, government spending, including spending on social needs, was curtailed and the process of capital formation slowed down in many countries. GDP growth dropped from 5.6 per cent from 1971 to 1980, to 1.4 per cent in 1981, the first time in the post-war period that the GDP growth rate was lower than the population growth rate. This rapidly extended the scale of unemployment (by the end of the 1970s, the number of fully and partially unemployed in all the developing countries was estimated at 500 million). Social tensions and class conflicts were exacerbated, and the struggle between various social groups over how to escape from the grave economic situation was intensified.

Recent experience has thrown a strong light on the dangers of the developing countries' taking a one-sided orientation toward the industrial centers of capitalism and their heavy dependence on the vagaries of the external economic situation. It was made abundantly clear that in order to reduce this dependence there was a need for the utmost mustering of internal resources and potentialities. This task is being tackled in several ways.

First, efforts are made to substitute national products for imported foodstuffs and energy raw materials. Many developing countries have begun to give more attention to the development of agriculture so as to increase their self-sufficiency in food. In the recent period, primary importance has been attached to the agrarian sector in Angola, Benin, Zambia, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania and Ethiopia. More countries have been framing and implementing special programs in this field.

The non-OPEC countries markedly invigo-

rated their efforts to build up their fuel and energy potentials and reduce their dependence on oil imports. One priority is to diversify the national energy base: increase the share of gas, coal, oil shale and alternative types of energy, including nuclear energy, in the energy balance; make more economical and rational use of fuel resources; and develop less energy-intensive industries. Investments in the working of local energy resources and the construction of small-scale hydro, solar and wind-energy units are being increased. From 1966 to 1975, the developing countries' investments in the power industry averaged \$12 billion a year; in 1980, they went up to \$34 billion; and UN experts estimate that by 1985 they should go up to \$54 billion (in constant 1980 prices).

Second, the commodity and geographical structure of exports is being diversified, in particular by increasing the exports of manufactures and extending economic ties between the developing countries themselves. This is facilitated by two factors: the emergence of the OPEC countries as a powerful financial center, and the differentiation of these countries in industrial development levels, a process which has markedly intensified over the past several years.

In view of the deeply-rooted depression phenomena in the economy of the leading capitalist centers, the development of economic ties with the socialist countries is of special importance for Asian, African and Latin American countries. These ties are regulated by long-term agreements, which makes them balanced, and are concentrated mainly in the state sector and the basic industries.¹³ That is why the further development of economic cooperation with the socialist world provides the developing countries with additional potentialities for expanded reproduction on a national basis, helps to consolidate their economy, stabilize their foreign trade and reduce their dependence on the ups and downs in business activity in the industrial centers of capitalism.

Nikolai Markov
staff member,
Institute of World Economics and
International Relations,
USSR Academy of Sciences

1. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 489.

2. In the late 1970s, 90 per cent of all the production items imported by African, Asian and Latin American countries came from the capitalist countries. They also covered 55 per cent of their requirements in investment goods through imports.

3. Mainly members of the Organization of Petroleum

Exporting Countries (OPEC), which in terms of oil extraction in 1982 ranked as follows: Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Iran, Indonesia, Nigeria, United Arab Emirates, Libya, Iraq, Kuwait, Algeria, Qatar, Ecuador and Gabon.

4. Brazil, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, among other countries and territories with an income of over \$1,000 per head. In 1980, they accounted for 4.9 per cent of world exports, as compared with 3.4 per cent in 1970.

5. Brazil, for instance, is at the top of the heavy-debt league (\$87 billion in late 1982, i.e., almost 14 per cent of the developing countries' aggregate external debt). In 1983, its debt obligations were well in excess of its export earnings, and it was forced to inform its foreign creditors that it was incapable of making the payments which fell due, that this year it would have to confine itself to paying only the interest, but only with the aid of a new loan from the International Monetary Fund. This has further increased its financial dependence on imperialism.

6. Those with the lowest GDP per head (\$183 in 1979): 21 states in Africa, 9 in Asia and Oceania, and 1 in Latin America.

7. The worsening economic condition of the least developed countries is also due to the fact that their constantly sharpening domestic economic problems, above all a growing food shortage, were aggravated by their external difficulties. In most of these countries, food output per head either remained the same or declined. This tended to accelerate inflation, to exacerbate payments problems and to increase their financial dependence on the capitalist states.

8. The raw-material prices did not, of course, plummet, but declined in the course of fluctuations, with swings amplified by the recurrent cyclical depressions in the economy of the industrialized countries and the faster growth of inflation. Prices were also in no small measure rendered more unstable by the policy of the international monopolies, which control a sizable part or even the bulk of the raw-materials trade (in the second half of the 1970s, they controlled 70-75 per cent of the developing countries' exports of bananas, rice and rubber, 75-80 per cent of the

tin, 85-90 per cent of the cocoa, tobacco, cereals, jute, forestry products and copper, and 90-95 per cent of the iron ore and bauxites).

9. Characteristically, in the course of the 1970s, because of lower prices, the "purchasing power" of the industrialized capitalist countries' raw-material exports (excluding oil) fell by only 25 per cent, whereas that of developing countries with an average income-per-head level plummeted by 50, and that of the least developed countries, by almost 70 per cent.

10. For details see WMR, No. 11, 1982.

11. The Reagan administration has openly declared "aid" to be one of the instruments of its imperialist policy aimed to secure its own military-strategic, political and economic interests. It has sharply increased arms deliveries under the heading of "aid," thereby speeding up the arms race in the developing world. At the same time, it sliced appropriations under programs without military objectives. Thus, despite the fact that overall outlays on "aid" to developing countries in the U.S. 1982 budget went up by \$1.4 billion, those for non-military needs were cut back by \$1.3 billion. The annual U.S. contribution to the budget of the International Development Association dropped from \$4.1 billion in 1981 to \$2.6 billion in 1982, with the result that easy credits for India and other low-income-per-head countries in Africa and Asia were substantially cut.

12. The rise in interest rates has also had a negative impact on other aspects of economic development. Thus, it has induced many industrialized countries to run down their strategic raw-material stocks, a practice that tends to depress world raw-material prices. Furthermore, short-term private capital has started to move out of some developing countries. In order to stem the outflow of capital, many countries were forced to raise the interest rate on internal credits and loans and this, for its part, was a heavy blow at investors and led to a contraction of consumer credits. This sliced aggregate demand, and inflicted the heaviest losses on the industrial sector.

13. For details see, in particular, WMR, No. 11, 1981, and No. 11, 1982.

Trip across the USSR

Jay Higginbotham, *Fast Train Russia*, Dodd, Mead & Company, New York, 1983, 114 pp.

This is a non-political book that has significant political implications. The author, an American, made a trip on the Trans-Siberian Railroad 17 years ago when he was a young teacher. It was part of a round-the-world trip and like so many travellers, he kept a diary.

It never occurred to him to write a book about his journey. Years later, in his home town of Mobile, Alabama, he made the acquaintance of a Soviet journalist from Vladivostok. When the Soviet journalist learned of Higginbotham's trip across the Soviet Union, he encouraged him to write a book about his experiences. "From what you've told me, I think such an account would prove quite intriguing — not only to Americans but to Russians as well," the Soviet journalist told him.

Higginbotham had doubted that his travel experiences would be of much interest to anyone outside a close circle of family and friends. Nonetheless, he finally decided to put his experiences down on paper and sent it off to his Soviet friend with whom he had developed a lively correspondence.

"*Fast Train Russia* is not about nuclear war, geopolitics, or the clash between communism and capitalism. It is the story of a young American who climbs aboard a train, alone, at the farthest tip of south-eastern Russia in 1966, and travels six thousand miles to Moscow. At the outset of the trip he is isolated from his fellow

He subsequently learned that his book had been published in the Soviet Union and had been exhibited at the International Book Fair in Moscow. It was then he decided to submit it for

publication in the United States and the result is this book.

I have seldom found what publishing houses in the United States say about the books they issue to be exactly what they claim. But about this book, I must agree with the publisher, Dodd, Mead & Company:

passengers by a language barrier, cultural differences, and an ingrained sense of apprehension. Gradually he befriends the children, and, through them, the adults. At the end of the trip he leaves scores of friends. Rarely does a simple account of a journey have the emotional impact or provoke the thought that *Fast Train Russia* does. Appearing in the midst of a barrage of horrifying statistics on nuclear war... at a time of great fear and mistrust, this touching true story provides a moment of relief and reminds us that as long as people are capable of becoming friends, there is hope."

To this I would add that appearing at a time when the White House is intensively stoking up the fires of venomous anti-Soviet hatred, *Fast Train Russia* is, in its own way, a contribution to peace and friendship between the two countries. It is a book the U.S. militarists will not like, because it exposes those who, like

Ronald Reagan, depict the Soviet Union as the source of evil.

Jay Higginbotham made his trip across the USSR at a time when the United States was waging war against the Vietnamese people. He was fully aware that the Soviet Union fully supported Vietnam, and that, in good part, accounted for his apprehensions and misgivings when he boarded the Soviet train. Yet, when he finished his round-the-world trip, he found that, in his own words, "the most memorable segment was the one that took me across Russian from the Sea of Japan to the beaches of Odessa." At the present time, he is involved in the Sister Cities Federation to promote ties between Mobile, Alabama and a similar Soviet city.

I would like to emphasize, once again, that this simply-told account of a train trip is a powerful argument for increased contacts between the peoples of the USSR and the USA, for peace and friendship. And this is why this delightful, straightforward, clearly honest book has deep-going political significance.

Steven Mark
U.S. journalist

Bitter fruit: who is it for this time?

S. Schlesinger, S. Kinzer, *Bitter Fruit. The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala*, New York, Doubleday, 1982, 320 pp.

Guatemala City, midnight, June 27, 1954. Two ranking CIA agents in this country called on Colonel Carlos Diaz. The latter had some hours earlier taken over from President Jacobo Arbenz, who had been forced to step down. The visitors had been thoroughly aroused by Diaz's public pledge to continue the anti-imperialist policy adopted by the government in October 1944 and to expel from the country the hired gang of counter-revolutionaries inspired and funded by the USA. Washington had invested heavily into this coup* and felt it had the right to appoint a president of its own choice.

Surprised by the visit of the Americans, Diaz argued his case with references to the promise

made by the U.S. Ambassador in Guatemala John E. Peurifoy to support his candidature.

"Well, Colonel," one of the CIA men said, "there is diplomacy and then there is reality. Our ambassador represents diplomacy. I represent reality. And the reality is that we don't want you."

The CIA man had not said everything. Peurifoy, who had master-minded the coup in Guatemala and the two-week-long criminal land and air attacks on civilian and military targets that forced the resignation of Arbenz, had already agreed to the removal of Diaz. At 4 a.m., accompanied by the same two CIA men, the U.S. ambassador arrived for a talk with Diaz. His instructions were categorical: within 24 hours "remove" all the Guatemalans named in the "long list." Some days earlier Peurifoy had agreed on the list with the U.S. Secretary of State. The motivation was that these people were communists. Diaz refused "to soil his hands and soul with this repugnant crime." So the ambassador cabled the Opa-Locka operation center in Florida: "Bomb!" And reinforced

*Guillermo Toriello, who was Foreign Minister in the Arbenz government, estimates that the mercenary invasion of Guatemala cost the U.S. State Department six million dollars (see Guillermo Toriello, *Tras la cortina del banano*, Havana, 1981, p. 295).

by a new air squadron the aggression continued.

A week later there were five obedient members of the Guatemalan junta among the many guests at the reception given in the U.S. embassy to mark U.S. Independence Day. A few thousand dollars and the promise of lucrative diplomatic jobs enabled Peurifoy to persuade the still vacillating members of the junta to agree to Colonel Carlos Castillo Armas, a disreputable and mediocre person and an opponent of the reforms started in Guatemala, becoming "president." Armas had neither popular support nor a conscience. At first he had headed the mercenaries who invaded the country and then been elevated to the rank of "libertador" by the CIA.

More reminiscent of the plot of a lurid detective story had they not brought tragedy to an entire people, these facts are from *Bitter Fruit*, a book published in New York. Its authors are Stephen Kinzer, correspondent of the American newspaper *The Globe*, and Stephen Schlesinger, a lawyer who was deputy director of issues for Senator Edward Kennedy during the 1980 presidential election campaign.

They have produced an objective study of hitherto little known aspects of events that took place nearly 30 years ago. To write this book they used a huge number of sources, including documents (nearly 1,000 pages) from the archives of the CIA and the U.S. State Department.

A virtual gallery of personages is presented to the reader: banana magnates and businessmen, politicians and advertisement "geniuses" subservient to them, hack writers and mercenaries in the U.S. military adventure in Korea, senators and lobbyists, diplomatic representatives of Central American dictatorships (in some cases the dictators themselves), and even a papal nuncio. In other words, the reader sees a mammoth machine set in motion by the United Fruit Company, the CIA, and the U.S. Department of State in order to depose the lawful government of Guatemala that had ventured to oppose American corporations with the aim of achieving progress (incidentally, by no means socialist) in one of the most backward Latin American countries.

To justify their actions the Yankees charged that President Arbenz was an agent of international communism and hence a threat to U.S. security. However, the authors write, "American national security considerations were never compelling in the case of Guatemala. State Department analysts in late 1953 treated the influence of communists as relatively trivial... The much-publicized claim that Guatemala could become a base for a So-

viet seizure of the Panama Canal was also difficult to sustain. Guatemala had no diplomatic or military links to Russia or any Eastern European country... No serious evidence ever turned up after the coup establishing a secret tie to the Soviets" (p. 107).

The authors prove that what was involved was neither more nor less than the mercenary interests of the United Fruit Company, which in Guatemala owned the largest estates, the only railway, and the main port on the Caribbean. The interests of this company were affected by the agrarian reform launched by the Arbenz government. Some of the company's heads had ties of kinship with influential people in the U.S. government. The book eloquently shows that the coup was conceived by the masters of the United Fruit Company (chapter "The Overlord: The United Fruit Company," pp. 65-77). Using its technical experts, the mass media, and personal contacts to senators in Washington, the company was able to mobilize sufficient support to ensure the success of its conspiracy in small, peace-loving Guatemala and the blessings of President Eisenhower and the Dulles brothers (who headed the CIA and the State Department respectively). The scenario for the coup and the list of its main executors and victims were drawn up by U.S. intelligence agencies and approved by the Washington administration.

This book reveals the mechanism by which the leading imperialist power flagrantly interferes in the internal affairs of Latin American states, the baseness and corruption of local politicians representing the oligarchy, and the interventionist police role of Central American dictators who feared the revolutionary infectiousness of Guatemala's example.

The sad course of events is well known: while the United Nations Organization was paralyzed by the actions of the USA and found itself unable to respond to the mass protests in our region, a force of thugs supported by American aircraft crossed the Honduras-Guatemala frontier across land owned by the United Fruit Company. Within days, as a result of the baiting in the reactionary press and the threats, the imperialist-bribed and frightened command of the regular Guatemalan army, which was not distinguished in terms of morale, preferred to surrender to the invading force, which hardly numbered 400 mercenaries.

Currently, the U.S. government is again engaged in an effort to stage a counter-revolutionary coup, this time in Nicaragua. Once again the authorities in Honduras have subserviently allowed their country to be used as a spring-

board for aggression against a peaceful neighboring state. American "advisers" have made themselves at home in the Honduran capital of Tegucigalpa, training remnants of the Somozistas in modern methods of wrecking and annihilation. Once more, as 30 years ago in Guatemala, the plot is coordinated by a representative of the U.S. State Department — the U.S. ambassador in Honduras.

But Nicaragua today is not the Guatemala of 1954. The anti-dictatorship revolution brought to power forces that articulate the aspirations of the entire people. The aggressor is opposed not by demoralized and corruption-prone troops but by a motivated revolutionary army that is helped by the population. A movement of solidarity with this courageous nation is widening throughout the world. Those who today hope to repeat the Guatemalan scenario are grossly miscalculating. This time it is they who will have to taste the bitter fruit of defeat.

The tragic experience of Guatemala had a considerable impact on the further development of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America. It showed that whatever the tactics used by the democratic revolution, the social changes wanted by the working people cannot be achieved without the participation of the masses in the revolution and their ability to resort to armed action if necessary, and without a radical reorganization of the army. This was seen not only by the communists but also by other revolutionary forces fighting the bloody dictatorship. The Guatemalan events of 1954 strongly influenced, for example, Ernesto

Guevara, a young Argentine doctor at the time. During the fatal days of the aggression he was in Guatemala, from where he soon had to go to Mexico. There he linked his life to the Latin American revolution and the Cuban people. "It was Guatemala," recalled Guevara's wife Hilda Gadea, "which finally convinced him of the necessity for armed struggle and for taking the initiative against imperialism" (p. 184).

The book ends with a brief history of Guatemala after 1954. The nation slid deeper into poverty and backwardness. Genocide became the guideline of the semi-fascist regime, which destroyed 80,000 people. The local élite made fortunes by criminal means. American monopolies got a free hand to pillage Guatemala's resources and make fat profits. It would seem that reaction has been triumphant. But the authors of this book do not think so. Their dedication is: "To the people of Guatemala." These words express sadness and hope. And they are a call for solidarity.

Throughout a period of just under 30 years the struggle of the Guatemalan patriots against the dictatorship has not ceased for a single day. Indians, who formerly had remained aloof, are now battling shoulder to shoulder with the resistance fighters. Close-knit, experienced progressive organizations are now heading the people's struggle. The patriots are striking ever more telling blows at the hated regime, whose last hour is inexorably drawing nearer.

Manuel Delgado
Costa Rican publicist

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, Palestine, 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., \$12.50 a year. Institutions, double rate.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, Amharic, French, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Por-

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

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

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

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

Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England
Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada
Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA
New Horizon Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich
Société Populaire d'Éditions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique
Éditions 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-Wakt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc
Dar Al-Hilal
16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckach, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 København K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakaulehti 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,
Mena dru 66, Athens, Greece
People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya, English,
Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden
16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

ROMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia
Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR
Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador
Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama
Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantacaro, Caracas, Venezuela

SWEDISH EDITION: Internationell Revy,
Fack, 12206 Enskede 6, Stockholm, Sweden

TURKISH EDITION: Baris ve Sosyalizm
Sorunlari, PK: 41, Sirkeci
Istanbul, Türkiye

VIETNAMESE EDITION: S'ô xuất nhập,
Khẩu sách báo 32, Hai Bà Trưng,
Hà-Nôi, Vietnam

