

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

December 1979, Volume 22, Number 12 \$1.00



Israel / 27

**22nd Convention
of the CP USA / 23**

**The illusion of 'social
partnership' / 63**

**Theatre in the
changing world / 46**

**Environmental
movements / 10**

Lebanon / 18





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

December 1979, Vol. 22, No. 12

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 3 Commentary. The new Soviet initiative
and the struggle for its materialization
P. Boychuck
- 5 The party and the masses
K. Nemeth
- 10 Environmental movement: results
and prospects
J. Angenfort, J. Heimbrecht
- 15 Lenin as a political thinker
F. Konstantinov

The party

- 18 How to end the crisis
N. Chaoui
- 23 The USA at a crossroads in the 1980s
J. Pittman
- 27 Consistent patriots and
internationalists
D. Khenin
- 31 New experience

Exchange of views

- 36 The way to security: deterrence
or disarmament

*WMR and International Institute of
Peace in Vienna*

- 41 Modernization of economic dependence
S. Romero, A. Glinkin
- 46 Theatre in the changing world
T. Lomnicki
- 51 Capitalist regulation methods in crisis
B. Fine

Viewpoints

- Latin American Panorama*
- 54 Acute problems in Guyana
C. Jagan
- 56 A foredoomed strategy
O. Millas
- 59 The 'battle' of Puebla
J. Rosales
- 63 The illusion of 'social partnership'
H. Rizy

Facts and figures

- 66 The strike struggle in Asian and
African countries in the 1970s
- 69 Index of contents 1979

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

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

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

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

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Arabic, Bengali, Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Finnish, Flemish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Malayalam, Mongolian, Norwegian, Oriya, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Pun-

jabi, Rumanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

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

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

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





Commentary

Peter Boychuck

Alternate member, CEC CC of Communist Party of Canada,
member, WMR Editorial Council

THE NEW SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVE AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ITS MATERIALIZATION

The new peace initiative of the Soviet Union set out by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in Berlin on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic is in the focus of attention the world over. The peoples see it as a further confirmation of the principled and humanist nature of Soviet policy, which expresses the vital interests of the whole of peace-loving mankind. The new proposals are in line with socialism's traditional policy of peace and peaceful coexistence. They are an important contribution to peace in Europe and the world and to the effort to promote détente, including military détente. Special attention is attracted, therefore, by the statement about the unilateral withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet troops, 1,000 tanks, and a definite quantity of other military hardware from the GDR within one year, as well as about the Soviet readiness to reduce the number of medium-range nuclear missiles in the western areas of the Soviet Union provided NATO refrains from deploying such weapons in Western Europe.

The new Soviet initiative, which carries forward earlier Soviet proposals for military détente, offers the world a new opportunity to abandon the dangerous road to military confrontation. It is fresh evidence of a simple fact, which bourgeois politicians and ideologists ignore or distort so often, namely, that the Soviet Union threatens no one, that it advocates disarmament and is, in fact, willing to take important unilateral steps in the interest of détente. The peoples of peace-loving countries hail, above all, the guarantee contained in the new Soviet proposals to the effect that the Soviet Union will never use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to manufacture or purchase such weapons and have none on their territory.

The significance of the Soviet proposals stands out in the light of the Western governments' approach to military détente. Some bourgeois leaders speechify about their desire for peace but their deeds are by no means aimed at cutting armaments. The West still opposes numerous proposals of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries for military détente in Europe. Indeed, NATO is continuing its arms buildup. From 1976 to 1978, its annual military spending increased from \$148,300

million to \$188,400 million. It plans a still higher rate of increase in military budgets. The Pentagon and NATO generals insist that West European governments should agree to the deployment in their countries of new medium-range nuclear missiles in addition to the theatre-based weapons they already have. In other words, they demand the basing of weapons that would considerably depreciate SALT-II and upset military parity in Europe, ¹ for these weapons could hit targets on Soviet territory. British Conservatives, West German revanchists, and reactionary French politicians and generals are bringing strong pressure to bear on their governments to make them accept the sinister plans laid by the Pentagon and NATO, which want to gain military advantages by means of the new missiles. All these dangerous efforts are camouflaged by stepping up the slanderous hue and cry about the so-called Soviet danger, and by insisting on the need to 'renew,' 'update' or 'improve' NATO's tactical nuclear weaponry.² Yet it is not a question of modernizing old weapons but of lending the arms race a new quality as *Frankfurter Rundschau* rightly noted. ³ The plan to transform Western Europe into an outpost of U.S. nuclear strategy is fraught with enormous dangers. If carried out, it would expose densely populated countries of the continent to a direct strike and compel the socialist countries to adopt further measures to strengthen their security. Adoption of this plan would increase the threat to the peoples of Europe and the world and add to the back-breaking burden of the arms race. ⁴

This situation forces many bourgeois politicians and propagandists, too, to recognize the vast importance of the Soviet proposals. The measures announced by the Soviet leadership, said *Le Monde*, the influential Paris daily, may pave the way for ending the deadlock in the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. ⁵ SPD Chairman Willy Brandt commented that the West would badly miscalculate if it missed the opportunity to engage in substantive talks.

Sober-minded, realistic-thinking West European politicians are aware of the need to react earnestly to the Soviet Union's initiative, to study its proposals and under no circumstances to drown them in empty talk. They realize that to reject these proposals would mean sacrificing the security of the continent to illusory hopes for military superiority. Yet developments create the impression that some U.S. and NATO quarters would like to minimize or

obscure the significance of the proposals. Meeting the press at the White House a few days after the new Soviet initiative was made public, President Carter described the proposals as interesting and promising, but tried in the same breath to minimize their significance. He insisted on carrying out U.S. plans for the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

A fact giving cause for concern at this writing is the protracted debate in the U.S. Senate on SALT-II, specifically the persistent attempts to link ratification to the deployment of new medium-range nuclear-missile systems in Europe. Nor is Europe an exception in these global designs of imperialism. The U.S. presence in Japan is increasing, Peking's ambitions for aggression are encouraged, a 100,000-strong punitive 'quick response' force is being formed, the U.S. is deploying a new fleet in the Indian Ocean, and so on. It should be clear that these developments, which are taking place even after the signing of SALT-II, may dampen confidence and put off the prospect of signing SALT-III; furthermore, they may destabilize U.S.-Soviet relations, add to universal insecurity, and heighten the war danger.

Among the bellicose reactionaries of Britain, West Germany, France, Belgium and other countries there are those who want the Soviet proposals to be disregarded and insist on the speedy implementation of all NATO arms buildup plans. They try to shrug off the Soviet proposals as 'propaganda' and to create the impression that the Soviet Union can be put under pressure by building up armaments and making new demands. The Peking hegemonists have joined readily in these attempts by urging Western Europe and the United States to arm at a fast pace.

There is no ignoring the fact that in view of the present state of détente and cooperation, the Soviet initiative has put all these reactionaries in an awkward situation. The Belgian communist daily, *Le Drapeau Rouge*, says that Leonid Brezhnev's Berlin speech has made it harder for militarists to insist on the alleged imperative need to deploy hundreds of the most up-to-date U.S. 'medium-range' missiles in West Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium.⁶ The Soviet Union's act of good will has exposed anti-Soviet slander campaigns and myths about the 'Soviet threat' spread by the sponsors of the arms race to justify their dangerous schemes. It has shown again that the evolution of international relations should be attended not by the threat of conflicts and wars but by the prospect of a more peaceful life, greater security, and the possibility of creating greater material and spiritual benefits. But if this prospect is to materialize, it is essential that the constructive initiative be taken at government level be widely backed 'from below,' by democratic mass movements and all else who treasure peace and progress.

The working people and the democratic peace movement in various countries, that is, those who succeeded not long ago in defeating plans for the

manufacture and development of the neutron bomb in Western Europe, will undoubtedly be emphatic in their rejection of the new Pentagon and NATO plans. The peoples of Europe and the world have no interest in the materialization of these plans, nor do they intend to take the bellicose advice of the present Peking leadership. After all, it is the peoples who would have to bear the burden of a new round of the arms race. The militancy of international public opinion, which highlighted Action for Disarmament Week last October, and the emphatic 'no' to U.S. 'Eurostrategic' missiles that rang out at the forum of European opinion on disarmament and security in Belgium showed that the peoples demand a constructive answer to the Soviet proposals and want détente and disarmament to make progress.

The communists have always been among the front-line fighters for peace. Prompted by the national interests of their countries and the internationalist objectives of the working class and other working people, they champion an end to the arms race, call for disarmament, détente, peaceful co-existence and mutually beneficial cooperation, and mobilize the working people and progressive world opinion to defeat the sinister plans of NATO and prevent the basing of new nuclear missiles in Europe. The communists regard the new Soviet proposals as an impulse enabling Europe and the rest of the world to choose the road of peace.

The 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, realizing its immense responsibility and the extreme complexity of the international situation, stated confidently that 'peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is a realistic matter in our days.'⁷ Naturally, it is very hard to eliminate the war danger altogether. But it is logical that this task has become a concrete, realistic goal precisely today. The struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence is a reflection of the historical optimism of the new, socialist formation coming into its own on the planet, of the historical optimism of the working class, which has no need for wars to achieve ultimate victory. This is also indicated by the new Soviet proposals, a further proof of the sincere desire of the socialist countries to free the peoples of the world from insecurity and fear, and guarantee present and future generations security and dependable opportunities for further economic and social progress.

Note

The Pentagon plan to deploy intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe makes one think again of the roughly 2,500 U.S. military bases and other installations on foreign soil.

Early this year, 498,700 men, or nearly one-fourth of the more than two million-strong U.S. armed forces, were being trained at these bases. By far most of them — 330,000 — are stationed in Europe, in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Moreover, this force is being increased.

U.S. servicemen abroad			
	1978	1979	Increase
FRG	224,500	234,300	9,800
Britain	20,500	22,300	1,800
Italy	10,200	12,100	1,900
Turkey	4,900	5,100	200
Other European countries	21,300	21,700	400
Sixth Fleet	31,700	34,800	3,100
Total	313,100	330,300	17,200

The United States has numerous military bases in Asia and the Pacific, where it keeps 142,400 servicemen.

Japan	50,000
South Korea	41,600
Philippines	14,400
Guam	8,400
Seventh Fleet	25,900
Others	2,100
Total	142,400

There are 10,000 U.S. officers and men in the Bermudas, on Diego Garcia, in Canada, and at other bases of the area. Another 16,000 are stationed in the Panama Canal Zone and Puerto Rico, and at Guantanamo, on Cuban territory.

The U.S. military bases and other installations on foreign soil are a key instrument of the imperialist policy of aggression and a major source of inter-

national tensions. Their geographical distribution is self-explanatory. It shows clearly enough that there is a U.S. and not a Soviet threat to peace and hence to the security and very life of the peoples of the countries where the U.S. has its bases. Winston Churchill admitted this as far back as 1951. He said Britain should not forget that by establishing an American base, she risked becoming a target herself, and perhaps the bull's eye of that target.

1. That there is such a parity was admitted even by so fanatical an advocate of the arms race as NATO Secretary-General Joseph Luns in a recent interview to Dutch radio and television. However, this did not prevent him from insisting in the same interview on 'modernizing' NATO's nuclear armory. — Author.

2. For details, see *The Twentieth Century and Peace*, bulletin of the Soviet Peace Committee, October 1979. The bulletin is published in Russian, English, French, German and Spanish. — Author.

3. *Frankfurter Rundschau*, October 9, 1979.

4. The Metalworkers' Trade Union International estimates that 1,800,000 new jobs could be created if the provisions of SALT-II were implemented. The peoples, primarily those of the developing countries, would gain still more from acceptance of the earlier Soviet proposal to cut the military budgets of the permanent Security Council members by 10 per cent and allocate for development part of the funds released as a result. — Ed.

5. *Le Monde*, October 9, 1979.

6. *Le Drapeau Rouge*, October 10, 1979.

7. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, Moscow, 1969. Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969. p. 48.

The party and the masses

Karoly Nemeth

CC Political Bureau member, Secretary,
Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

In 1980 it will be 35 years since Hungary's liberation by the heroic Soviet Army. In that period, radical changes have taken place in our country. The foundations of socialism have been laid, social relations have been transformed, the political system of socialism has been consolidated, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism have acquired a dominant influence in society, the mass consciousness, the very character of the social thinking of the working classes and sections has been radically renewed. The leading role of the working-class party has been consolidated, and the relations between the HSWP and the masses are based on mutual trust. This is a reliable guarantee that our socialist state can exercise the functions of the proletarian dictatorship, and an earnest of ever broader participation by the working people in guiding, developing and strengthening socialist democracy.

The power of the working class established in our society is, in effect, a popular power. It is based on the unity of the working class and a broad circle of its supporters, allies and the people as a whole. In

our postwar history, mistakes have been made in conducting the class-alliance policy. In the 1950s, much harm was done to the cause of socialism, to our party's cause, by the personality cult, and by the practice of underestimating the role of political allies and the masses generally. This led to a weakening of the popular power, and of the ties between the party and the working class. Together with the then necessary curbing of the activity of the rightists, reactionary forces, democratic forces loyal to socialism were removed from active participation in state life. There were distortions of the agrarian policy. The alliance of the working class and the peasantry was impaired.

These mistakes were resolutely eliminated by the HSWP. Today it is our constant concern to have the class-alliance policy pursued correctly, in strict accordance with the goals and tasks of socialist construction. This policy continues to be a class policy, pivoted on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, which is the basis for the cohesion of the whole working people and for the cooperation of

the communists and non-party people. It is entirely designed for building socialism, which is inseparable from the effort broadly to involve the masses in the practical exercise of power. We are deeply convinced that socialism can be built only by the working people, by the whole people, as Lenin said.

Thanks to the creative application of Lenin's class-alliance policy and consistent and principled political struggle against rightist and leftist deviations, after the rout of the counter-revolution, political and economic consolidation on the scale of society as a whole was fairly rapidly achieved, the workers' and peasants' alliance was consolidated, and the intelligentsia began to take a more active part in socialist construction. A historic success of our policy was the completion of the socialist reconstruction of agriculture and the laying of the foundations of socialism in People's Hungary. Such deep changes accelerated the drawing together of classes and sections and achievement of the nation's full socialist unity. As socialist democracy develops and as broad masses of working people are involved in government and the administration of social affairs, the power of the working class increasingly becomes the power of the working people as a whole.

Let me emphasize that during the revolutionary upswing in 1919 and in 1948, there was a unification of two parties of the working class, with the result that a one-party system has developed in the country. What can be said on this score? The substance of socialist democracy, according to our experience, does not consist in a number of parties. From the standpoint of the people's interests, the crucial point for us is the actual establishment of the working-class power, practical participation by the masses in its functioning, realization of the aspirations of the working people, and of all the classes and sections of socialist society, and satisfaction of their common social needs and aspirations, in the first place.

Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the HSWP Central Committee, says: 'It is incumbent on the party to reckon with and coordinate the various interests within society. Social and political development has led to the elimination of the former exploiter classes, so that today there are only friendly working classes and strata whose basic interests coincide. Nevertheless, beside the overall interests of society, there are different group and personal interests. The party recognizes this and considers it its duty to cater for them, but with priority to the overall interests of society. The social and mass organizations and movements, notably the trade unions, cooperatives and youth organizations, play an important part in expressing these group and personal interests.'* One of the most characteristic features of our society's democracy is the effort to bring out, take into account and harmonize these interests.

Further extension of socialist democracy in Hungary bears on all the elements of its political system. There is above all the strengthening of the party

leadership and inner-party democracy; the growing importance of representative organs in decision-making; effective social control over the activity of state institutions; enhancement of the prestige and influence of social organizations directly representing the working people's interests; broad involvement of working people in discussing current and long-term tasks, in management, in the organization and verification of the performance, of the activity of management, of all the echelons and persons vested with power.

We believe that consistent implementation of the Marxist-Leninist proposition on the leading role of the working-class party is the key condition for socialist construction and the development of socialist democracy which is organically interconnected with it. The party is the core of the political system of socialism. It embodies and realizes the socio-political hegemony of the working class, and its policy and day-to-day activity serve the interests of the whole people.

The party's general task is to exercise ideological and political guidance of social processes. This implies not merely the ability to sum up the requirements and trends existing in society, but also the ability ideologically and politically to influence their formation, producing an optimal blend of the working people's vital interests and those of progress of socialism, of concern for the present and orientation upon the future. In its political work, the HSWP resolves important tasks and promotes the attainment of long-term goals.

The party's leading role is expressed above all in the fact that the HSWP formulates its goals on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist approach, goals which meet the present historical stage of socialist construction in Hungary, and ensures ideological and political guidance of the development of our society. All of this is reflected in the Program Statement, adopted by the HSWP's 11th Congress, which defines the tasks facing the Hungarian people in the light of our concrete conditions and strategic goals.

We believe that the party must bring out opportunely the contradictions and problems which attend the country's socio-economic development and give scientifically grounded answers to the questions which arise, taking into account the opinion of the people. It must formulate a policy based on the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the international communist movement, and fully meeting the country's national, historical and present-day specifics. The party cannot, of course, confine itself to formulating policy. It is necessary to use persuasion to secure its policy's approval by the masses, and to organize practical work for its implementation and control. Of crucial importance here is the similar interpretation of this policy at every level of party organization, its unanimous adoption by the communists and daily painstaking and tireless propaganda among the people aimed at securing their wholehearted support. Practice shows that the way the HSWP's leading role is exercised in this or that region or in this or that sphere does not depend on the number of

* WMR, January 1977.

party members in the area. It depends mainly on how adequately and successfully the communists conduct the party's political line.

In content, the party's leading role is not something that is cut and dried, rigid or given once and for all. It tends to change and is enriched with the emergence of new problems and tasks in the course of socialist construction. But what remains invariable is the consistent observance of the principles of democratic centralism, which regulate the party's internal life. The breaches of these principles in the first half of the 1950s undermined our party's unity and minimized its leading role. Subsequently, we drew the necessary conclusions, and the HSWP now devotes special attention to undeviating observance of Lenin's principles of democratic centralism.

Our discussion and adoption of decisions is collective, but the communists bear personal responsibility for their execution. At every level, party work is directed by elective organs, with the lower organs subordinate to the higher.

It is well known that a ruling party faces the danger of ossification and of sliding down from its positions of vanguard of social progress. In order to avert this danger, the HSWP takes the necessary measures, constantly renews itself and is replenished from the inexhaustible internal source. The broad and effective party democracy ensures in-depth analysis of every aspect of party activity, inner-party criticism and self-criticism. The level of its development determines the communists' attitude to party work as a whole, and to mistakes and shortcomings, and reliably protects us against harmful complacency. On the strength of our experience, we can safely say that the more consistently inner-party democracy is practised, the fuller and deeper is the democratic process in society. Open exchange of opinion, comradely discussion and the effort to bring out different views are necessary to formulate an effective policy, to enable the party successfully to fulfill its leading role, and to muster the people for carrying out the party's strategy and tactics.

The HSWP arranges broad, free and democratic discussion before decisions on various issues are adopted. Although the most important decisions are taken by the leading organs, each party member, according to the Rules, has the right to reserve his own view; where this differs from the adopted party decision, the party member has the right to apply to the superior party body and to stand up for his views at party forums. Still, fulfillment of party decisions is binding on all party members, including those whose views do not coincide with the stand of the majority. In implementing the party line, there must be unity of evaluation and unity of action. Let me note, too, that the principles of democratic centralism applied in the party's activity have a great influence on the whole political system of socialist society.

The building of developed socialism entails a raising of the consciousness and social activity of the masses and an extension of the scale of democ-

racy. Now and again one hears that the emergence of more intricate and difficult tasks in socialist development necessitates greater centralism and a simultaneous narrowing down of democracy. That is a mistake. Our experience shows that the building of socialism and the overcoming of any type of difficulties must rest on an extension of socialist democracy and a harmonious blend of rights and duties. The more thoroughly the people's view and experience are taken in consideration, the broader becomes their participation in fulfilling state tasks and plans and their socio-political activity.

In developing socialist democracy, the party attaches vital importance to various elements of the political system: state organs, public organizations and mass movements. The HSWP formulates policy and ensures the conditions for its successful implementation, but it does not substitute for other institutions and organizations. The party's leading role necessarily implies that all the institutions and elements of the political system function independently, in accordance with their purpose, and in pursuance of the responsibility conferred on them.

The state of the proletarian dictatorship is the chief element of our political system. In the light of the fundamental propositions of Marxism-Leninism, the HSWP consistently exercises party guidance of state organs, giving close attention to the theoretical and practical aspects of state life so that relations between the party and the state rest on the principles and norms of socialist democracy.

Experience warrants the conclusion that the state structure will remain necessary for a long time to come. With the progress of socialism, state activity is extended to an ever wider range of sectors and spheres of social life. While extending the organizational functions of the socialist state, we work actively to root out bureaucratic practices and eliminate superfluous duplication and excessive regulation.

Lenin's program idea that the socialist state functions normally only if its activity is effectively controlled by society continues to be meaningful for us. In Hungary, we now have a ramified system of such control, and we are working steadily to improve its mechanism. In this context, let me note especially the growing role of the State Assembly and all the other representative bodies. At the same time, we keep emphasizing the importance of the principle of independence in economic, cultural and other spheres of social life. We believe that independent activity in localities is a norm which predetermines the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of concrete participation by the masses in administering the affairs of society and the state, in adopting decisions and verifying their execution. That, we feel, is a potent means for rooting out bureaucratic practices and promoting a responsible approach to every kind of activity.

Current tasks in improving the activity of our state include enhancing the efficiency of the central administration, improving the interaction between central and local organs, developing of every form of accounting and control, ensuring efficient ful-

fillment by councils of their economic, cultural and coordinating functions, and raising state administration as a whole to a higher level. We believe that improvement of the quality of administration, simplification of administrative procedures, and erection of insuperable barriers to bureaucratic deviations are a necessary condition for the functioning of our system of socialist democracy.

Our experience teaches us that we must deal very seriously with so-called minor matters, which in their aggregate acquire great social importance and have a marked influence on the character and extent of democracy in social life. State administration must do its utmost to help citizens arrange their personal affairs, and this is one of the basic requirements of our social and political system.

In constitutional development, the HSWP sets itself the following task: to orient development — in accordance with the goals of developed socialist society — toward a state of the whole people and to promote the gradual shaping and unfolding of the elements of self-administration inherent in a communist organization of society. A deepening of socialist democracy is the only way to achieve this.

In formulating and implementing its policy and working to deepen socialist democracy, the HSWP invariably relies on mass organizations and movements. Principled political leadership is the main instrument of party influence. The party does not issue mandatory decrees, orders or instructions. The communists who work in the mass organizations secure implementation of the party line by means of persuasion, by the power of their own example and prestige.

Mindful of Lenin's precepts and drawing on its own experience, the HSWP attaches fundamental importance to the trade unions, which organize and educate people, induce them actively to increase the country's political and economic strength, see to the satisfaction of the workers' material, social and cultural requirements and needs, and represent and protect the working people's interests and rights which are guaranteed by the law.

Hungary's Constitution and laws give the trade unions broad rights. They have the right to influence the content of current and long-term economic plans while these are still being drafted, i.e., before the final decision is taken: they are entitled to speak out on the whole range of matters bearing on the people's status in production. They have the crucial say on the use of everyday, social and cultural funds of enterprises. Let me also emphasize the importance of the joint meetings held by trade union group organizers and trade union councils (committees) at enterprises.

One must recall in this context that trade union rights in our country do not exist on paper alone: all the material and political conditions are provided for their realization. The HSWP believes that the trade unions must fulfill their functions independently, dealing with the problems of their concrete occupation, sector and enterprise with a full sense of responsibility. We do not see the use of party organs pedantically interfering in the work of trade

unions and besetting them with petty tutelage. Of course, the independence of the trade unions does not imply any kind of political apartness. By their activity they fortify the political and economic foundations of the working-class power. They support the initiatives coming from the people, notably such forms expressing socialist democracy as the movement of socialist-work teams and socialist emulation.

The trade unions have a big part to play in developing democracy, in production. Democracy at enterprises — factories, plants and cooperatives — is an organic component of our democratic system. In Hungary, we now have diverse forms in which the working people participate in managing enterprises. We believe that the most important of these, alongside party meetings and conferences of party and trade union leadership, are trade union meetings, production conferences, meetings of trade union organizers, leaders and members of work-teams.

All of this provides sufficient opportunities for unfolding democracy on the shopfloor. That is why we now believe that the point is not to invent new forms but to fill the existing ones with more concrete content and to make them more effective. The emphasis is on providing the people with ample and more regular information about the activity and plans of their shop, plant or enterprise, on the ever fuller realization of the rights and duties of democratic production forums, and on ever more actively inducing industrial and office workers to voice their ideas and make proposals and critical remarks with a knowledge of what they are doing. Production democracy forums stimulate the people's enthusiasm for work, economic concerns and useful initiatives, while cutting short formalism and voluntarism in production practice.

The tasks of the trade unions in organizing the system of industrial-democracy forums, in making them more effective, in enriching the content of their work, and in involving the people in the management of enterprises are becoming ever more multifaceted and responsible.

The Patriotic People's Front (PPF) provides a comprehensive basis for the HSWP's policy of alliance of the working classes, for the socialist unity of the nation. In character and compass, it is a truly nationwide movement expressing the close connection between the party of communists and the broadest masses of people. The PPF has no formal membership, and operates by means of its own instruments, uniting the members of the organizations within the front, and also citizens who are not members of mass organizations but who support the socialist platform.

The PPF's activity ranges over every important sphere of Hungary's political and social life. It takes part in nominating candidates to popular representation bodies, and in preparing and holding elections, and systematically promotes the activity of deputies to the State Assembly and the councils. It organizes discussion of bills and convenes various public forums, like the annual rural assemblies. It

makes a tangible contribution to the programs for developing towns and villages. PPF committees are engaged in diverse political activity organizing voluntary work for the modernization of population centers and other socially necessary measures.

Continued progress of our society and development of socialist democracy largely depend on the convictions and socio-political and labor activity on the rising generation. The HSWP believes that it is up to the whole of society to educate the young in the spirit of socialism. It seeks to help young people to understand and adopt the communists' ideology and policy as a guide to action, and to enable them ever more vigorously to work in tackling the tasks facing society in every sphere of social life. The Hungarian Young Communist League is a reliable aide of the HSWP. We regard the HYCL's traditional organizational forms of activity — YCL meetings, annual meetings of working people and students, etc. — as a major contribution by the young to deepening socialist democracy. Among the new initiatives of the Young Communists are regular meetings of young workers, engineers and technicians, and workers in the arts, an activity which is of outstanding importance. Such meetings produce many new ideas and recommendations and enhance the social and labor activity of the rising generation.

Following the socialist reconstruction of agriculture in Hungary, a Hungarian Council of Producer Cooperatives and regional associations of producer cooperatives were set up to convey the opinions and requirements of agricultural producer cooperatives to the decision-making party and state organs, to represent the interests of cooperatives with the state, to explain national interests and problems to members of the cooperatives, to help extend and consolidate cooperative democracy, and to help formulate and implement the HSWP's agrarian policy. Cooperative democracy is a major instrument strengthening producer cooperatives and in furthering the dynamic development of Hungarian agriculture. Responsible independence in collective farming and in electing cooperative leaders is essential to success in production and to the education of cooperative members in a spirit of collectivism. Alongside the general meeting of cooperative members, increasing importance attaches to forms of direct democracy like conferences of workers in specialized sectors and branches of agricultural production, and team meetings. Growing social activity in the countryside shows that cooperative democracy is on the rise.

What I have said warrants the following conclusion: by its mass political work, its guidance of the state, and its work in various social organizations, the HSWP pursues the aim of ensuring at each stage of development the people's solid unity, active support for the party's policy, and involvement in the shaping and implementation of party policy.

The HSWP is now preparing for its 12th Congress, which, we are sure, will reaffirm the party's general political line and map out the tasks in economic and cultural construction. Nor do we

have any doubt that our advance will continue to be based on a strengthening of the party's leading role, on its ever stronger ties with the masses, and a deepening of socialist democracy. Here, we concentrate on the following.

First, we need ceaselessly to strengthen the party's ideological, political and organizational unity. The HSWP is now united, but we have fully learned the historical lessons which told us that unity must be consistently consolidated whenever new problems arise. This is done through open and frank exchanges of experience and opinion, and extensive and timely information. While improving our party propaganda, raising the level of information and encouraging inner-party exchanges of opinion, we seek to spread the democratic and comradely discussions which help to consolidate unity and cohesion in conducting the political line. All the activity of the elective party organs must be under the control of party members. That is, incidentally, what the Rules provide, for they enjoin elective organs regularly to report on their work.

The party's capability of fulfilling its historical mission is determined by its membership's composition, qualitative level and capacity to act. The HSWP — the vanguard of the Hungarian working class — is also a mass party which unites almost 10 per cent of the adult population within its ranks. It shapes its membership consciously and purposefully. According to the present occupational status, more than one-half, and according to the original occupational status, three-quarters of its members are industrial workers and peasants. In the period since the party's 11th Congress there was an exchange of party cards for the purpose of strengthening the party's inner unity and capacity to act, and also to prepare the communists for successfully fulfilling the Congress decisions. The four years since then have shown that this campaign is productive. The number of persons who have left the party or have been expelled in that period (for political reasons) is insignificant, only 34. In the course of individual conversations, the communists expressed their personal views on the problems in our social life, made proposals, and confided their concerns. As a result, our party's unity has been further cemented, inner-party democracy has been strengthened, and the communists are better equipped than ever to carry out their tasks.

Second, the party's ties with the people, which are based on mutual trust, are a cardinal element enabling it to fulfill its leading role consistently and develop socialist democracy. This implies both constant and sustained interaction within the party, between its leading organs and rank-and-file members, and ever closer cooperation between the communists and non-party people, and consolidation of the people as a whole. Hence the demand for the perfect functioning of the mass media and channels of information along which the people's opinions are relayed to the governing party and state bodies. It is our immediate party duty to respond in good time to the people's remarks and proposals. It goes without saying that

only the adoption of concrete measures amounts to a substantial reply. The people's proposals do not always correspond to the objective potentialities of society and the state, but there must also be a response even to such proposals and wishes, to let the people know the party's view of their initiative, and to convince them that the party takes their opinions and experience into account in its activity.

Third, we intend tirelessly to improve the party leadership of state and social organizations. In the outgoing decade, we have achieved much in this respect, but a great deal still remains to be done. For instance, functions are not always correctly distributed between party, state and economic organs. Public organizations do not make adequate use of the resources at their disposal, and now and again do not satisfactorily coordinate their activity. We need to keep in closer touch with the distinctions in the approach to social problems, to see to the demarcation of functions between the party, the state apparatus, and economic and public organizations,

and more thorough coordination of the diverse forms of activity on the various planes, so as to eliminate undesirable duplication.

The HSWP is aware of the responsibility it bears for the development of socialist democracy in its capacity as the ruling party. This responsibility tends to grow in modern conditions, when intensive economic development brings to the fore new problems and tasks arising from the ever more complicated economic situation, which requires further improvement and greater efficiency of the system of administration. In developing party democracy, supporting the independence of state organs and economic organizations, and encouraging concrete activity of the democratic institutions, we seek to have the HSWP exercise its leading role ever more productively. The superiority of socialism is expressed, in particular, in the steady deepening of the democracy of our system, and the party of communists was, is and will be the chief guiding spirit and leader of this process.

Environmental movement: results and prospects

Jupp Angenfort

Presidium Board member, German Communist Party

Jorg Heimbrecht

researcher, German CP Board

In the recent period, the civil initiative groups' movement has spread in the FRG, involving over 2 million men and women. A study by the Government's Council of Experts on Environmental Matters shows that there are now up to 20,000 civil initiative groups in the FRG, of which 25-30 per cent are concerned with environmental problems.¹ According to a poll carried out by the FRG Ministry of the Interior, 98 per cent of FRG citizens believe that environmental protection is an important or even a highly important matter, while 70 per cent want to see more money appropriated for environmental protection than for defense.²

The positive public assessment of the civil initiative groups' activity has grown together with interest in environmental protection. Almost two-thirds of FRG citizens think that it is on the whole purposeful and successful.

Groups of civil initiative for protection of the environment first emerged in the late 1950s. Following the economic crisis of 1966-67, the burden of which was borne by the working people, this movement entered its first big upward phase. Up until the late 1960s, the FRG did not have, with a few exceptions, any environmental protection laws or regulations limiting water and air pollution and noise levels. In their drive for profits, the concerns polluted air and water, almost unhampered by any state control. But there was growing alarm among

the population following the succession of pollution scandals which broke out in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In 1969, nearly all the fish in the Rhine below the Main River were killed by effluents from the Hoechst Works. In Holland, an emergency was declared in the drinking-water supply services because the Rhine is not just Central Europe's biggest 'sewer' but also a major source of drinking water for 25 million persons. In 1971, violations of the accepted rules for the storage of arsenic by Stolberger Zinc AG, and the unlawful dumping of 2,000 tons of sodium cyanide by Orm-Fairtec near Bochum posed a grave life and death hazard for the population.

The SDPG-FDP Federal Government came out with an extensive program for environmental protection largely because of the activity of the civil initiative groups. It announced its intention to solve the main problems of the environment, naturally, without curbing the power of big capital. However, in the seven years since the program was adopted, as little has been done to solve the ecological problems as in the previous 20 years under the CDU/CSU government. None of the environmental-protection laws adopted by the SDPG/FDP coalition is aimed against the big concerns. Thus, according to the Federal law on preventing pollution, the concerns can be made to build purification installations only when this is 'economically ac-

ceptable to the enterprise.' The fines for any breaches are trifling: according to the Federal Government's Council of Experts, over the past several years fines have averaged DM537. It is generally hard to catch those who pollute the environment: every industrial inspector has to oversee between 600 and 1,000 enterprises. There is no democratic control, involving the working class, its trade unions or civil initiative groups, capable of effectively curbing the dangerous activity of the concerns.

Besides, a 1978 report by the Council of Experts makes it clear that since 1970 appropriations for environmental protection have been well below requirements. The situation has slightly improved only in some areas. On the whole, the report says, only additional efforts will help to change the trends in the desired way.

Indeed, today air and water pollution is frequently much heavier than it was in the early 1970s. It would be a joke to talk about environmental protection on the shop-floor. The FRG is close to the top of the world league in shop-floor accidents and occupational disease.

Ecological problems in the country have sharpened, and it is not surprising, therefore, that in the past few years there has been a marked spread of the environmental movement. It is not true to say, as some bourgeois newspapers in the FRG have done, that the movement is now subsiding. Together with its rise, there is a growing interest among the population in environmental problems. Nearly one-half of the FRG citizens believe that the threat to the environment has been growing, while two-thirds hold that the state has not taken a firm enough stand against those who harm nature.

Democratic civil initiative groups are a response to the diverse manifestations of the crisis of capitalism and the abuse of scientific and technological progress in capitalist society. The crisis of the capitalist system in the FRG has hit virtually every area of social life.

The concerns use the economic crisis as a pretext for ignoring the FRG's totally inadequate decrees on labor and environmental protection. One of the major conflicts in the FRG's capitalist society consists of contradictions between the people's right to use scientific and technical progress to improve living conditions and protect the environment, and monopoly capital's abuse of science and technology for the sake of profit, which leads to a reduction in the number of jobs, the development of new weapons systems and destruction of the environment.³

The urge of capital and its political spokesmen to shift the whole burden of the crisis of capitalism and the capitalist use of scientific and technical progress onto the working people has recently met with growing resistance, as will be seen, above all, from the militant action for jobs at enterprises where there have been mass dismissals (especially in the steel industry), the struggle by workers and employees for higher wages and salaries, and insistence on measures of protection against the ef-

fects of capitalist rationalization of production, and against abuse of new technology.

Government measures for protecting the environment designed for a long term and frequently requiring considerable financial outlays have also been sacrificed to the proliferating structural crises, the chronic inflation and the short-term economic-policy measures catering for the interests of monopoly capital. Because the pollution of air and water has produced numerous problems in the FRG's traditional industrial regions, a number of projects have been carried out to relocate enterprises in areas where the use of natural resources has not yet become a limiting factor on the development of production and, consequently, on the making of profit. Alongside the relatively unpolluted regions of agricultural production in the interior, the concerns have looked to the coastal areas where the conditions of production promised to be more favorable for the making of capitalist profit. Earlier governments supported these flanking maneuvers of the monopolies by means of vast subsidies from tax receipts.

But even in the newly developed industrial areas no radical measures were taken to prevent dangerous air and water pollution. The concerns had a powerful instrument for putting pressure on the communities because the cities receive appropriations from the taxes levied on industry. In 1975, a poll by *Umwelt* showed, 60 per cent of all communities 'now and again' or 'very frequently' made concessions to enterprises to the detriment of the environment, being motivated by competition between the communities for the location of enterprises.

It is true that now and then the government ordered expert studies to establish the 'tolerable ecological stress' in the planned industrial centers, but this was not followed by any practical action. It is virtually impossible to have structural planning geared to the maintenance of the working people's health and their social interests so long as the decision on building or closing down a factory or electric-power station is taken only by the company board. Within a few years, the uncontrolled siting of industrial enterprises has produced a situation in former holiday areas like the Lower Elbe in which air and water pollution and noise levels have risen to that of the traditional industrial areas. In this way, more and more people are directly confronted with the results of the policy conducted by the concerns. The fact that environmental pollution is always a hazard to human life and health and that the blame for the pollution falls on, say, a neighboring industrial enterprise, can be precisely established has always had a strong mobilizing effect on civil action. Thus, nearly two-thirds of FRG citizens are prepared to take an active part in civil initiative groups, if unfavorable phenomena are discovered in their locality.⁴

The growing strength of the environmental protection movement has resulted in numerous, albeit small, successes. In the past few years, these have been scored almost exclusively where people have acted in an organized manner. According to an

Umwelt poll, the municipal authorities admit, for instance, that over three-quarters of the environmental measures have been adopted as a result of action by those immediately affected by its pollution.

The German Communist Party has always vigorously supported action against the big concerns, which are to blame for the environmental crisis. Together with those directly faced by the danger, the GCP exposed some environmental scandals, for instance, in Bochum and Darmstad, and got the relevant measures to be adopted. It was the GCP which in 1974 made public the fact that several hundred workers fell ill, and some died, at a number of polyvinyl-chloride (PVC) enterprises in the FRG because of inadequate labor protection and safety measures. Together with the workers, it secured adoption by the chemical concerns of measures to improve labor protection at enterprises making PVC. The GCP, the trade unions and the production councils also secured the reduction in food-packaging plastics of noxious substances to below health-hazard levels. Since 1975, the GCP has had a mobile laboratory for testing the state of the environment. Many communists have been taking part in the activity of civil initiative groups.

Only some 10 years ago, nearly all the civil initiative groups dealt exclusively with concrete problems which directly affected the interests of inhabitants in this or that area. After success or failure (roughly 50 per cent of these groups believe that their activity is successful) these groups, as a rule, disbanded. Today, nearly 60 per cent of all the civil initiative groups for environmental protection still set themselves goals which are significant only for their communities.⁵ But in the past several years there has been growing awareness of the fact that the crisis cannot be overcome only by solving local problems. A great many people have displayed direct concern with environmental problems, and that not only as a result of expansion by the concerns. The number of the inter-regional demonstrations, measures and meetings held by civil initiative groups has grown markedly. An inter-regional organization — Federal Association of Civil Initiative Groups for protection of the environment — was set up in 1972, and it now unites almost 1,000 such groups. There is a marked growth of membership also in other inter-regional associations (like the Society for Combating Aviation Noise).

Of course, in the present conditions in the FRG, the higher level of organization not only produces advantages for the development of the civil initiative movement, but also some big problems, because for the time being most of those involved in it have fairly little political experience and have yet to realize that the people's long-term interests can be met only through consistent anti-monopoly struggle. Diverse right and left-opportunist elements, including anti-communist elements, seek to acquire influence in the inter-regional associations of civil initiative groups (in the FRG, at any rate).

However, the problems which tend to complicate the activity of these groups spring not only from

possible pressure from outside, but from internal factors as well. Thus, there is some advantage in spontaneous protest and rapid mobilization of the masses for some concrete initiative, but the spontaneous nature of the action hampers work in the civil initiative groups and their associations, and also their relations with partners and allies.

The social composition of the movement also has an important influence on the formation of its goals. There is a disproportionately large participation by government employees (teachers in the first place), members of the liberal professions, like lawyers, architects, etc., students and senior civil servants,⁶ and this is a specific feature of the civil initiative groups for environmental protection. Workers make up only 8 per cent of these groups. There is hardly a single group in which the workers are represented in accordance with the actual social importance of their class. But this is characteristic only of the environmental groups, and the social makeup of civil initiative groups against the reduction of jobs or the creation of new jobs presents a totally different picture.

Very few participants in the civil initiative groups regard the environmental crisis phenomena as resulting from the crisis of the capitalist system, and are aware that the problems facing the working people in the country in connection with scientific and technical progress are rooted in the capitalist use of modern productive forces. Under the influence of bourgeois propaganda, most of those involved in the movement regard the environmental crisis as a phenomenon which is characteristic for the whole of mankind, or see only this or that particular aspect of the crisis, and outside the context of the causes which are rooted in the capitalist system. Although over one-half of the FRG population, according to the Federal Ministry of the Interior, know that the environment is polluted chiefly by industrial enterprises, they do not think that the evil springs from the capitalists' inherently predatory approach to nature. They regard the problems of scientific and technical progress chiefly or exclusively as scientific and technical problems unrelated to the social conditions in our country. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of these people find themselves in a silly position: after all, their own experience provides proof that the use of scientific and technological achievements in the FRG is always aimed against the working people's interests.

Spokesmen for the monopoly bourgeoisie, the bourgeois parties and the bourgeois press have vigorously maintained this view, because then the blame for the environmental crisis falls on science, technology and economic growth, while the social causes are obscured, and monopoly capital is cleared of responsibility. The bourgeoisie is no longer capable of completely neutralizing the indignation produced by its political, economic and ideological mediocrity, which is why it tries hard to prevent the people from becoming aware of the true causes of the crisis. And who can be more confused than the burgher who regards science and technology as a hostile force!

Groups which reject science and technology — both those involved in the environmental movement and outside of it — nurture the hope that the problems facing our society can be solved or, at least, evaded by rejecting scientific and technical progress and opting for an alternative way of life. Many of them attack scientific and technical progress generally, and call for a return to nature, zero economic growth and even a closure of industrial enterprises, and believe that a return to rural life and a limitation of consumption is the only way to overcome the present catastrophic state. They have given up the struggle because they failed to identify their enemy.

Of course, far from all the civil initiative groups take this approach, but such hostile attitudes to science and technology are fairly widespread. They are especially pronounced among members of the numerous civil initiative groups opposing the construction of atomic power stations. They are all unanimous in rejecting the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, but many of them also, in principle oppose the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, believing that it is altogether impossible to solve the problems of security and elimination of the risks arising from the construction of nuclear power stations. They point to the large number of accidents at nuclear installations in the FRG and draw the conclusion that the operation of atomic power stations is in any case a great hazard for the population, regardless of the social system under which atomic power stations are built and run. But the accidents which have taken place do not mean that nuclear energy cannot, in principle, be used for peaceful purposes, but that the atomic power stations are designed and built much too hastily, and that the necessary safety techniques are not duly observed in their operation; in short, that in the capitalist countries even the productive power of nuclear energy is geared to profit-making.

Besides, in the FRG there is a one-sided stepped-up development of nuclear energy, while coal mining is being steadily reduced, resulting in the dismissal of nearly 400,000 workers in the mining industry.

The GCP advocates a moratorium on the Bonn government's atomic energy program, but for reasons which differ from those put forward by many civil initiative groups. Its program says: 'The GCP wants a national and democratic policy in the sphere of energy to ensure reliable energy supply in the Federal Republic of Germany at accessible prices which does not harm the environment. The basic prerequisite of this is the transfer of the whole energy economy into the hands of the state under democratic control. It requires maximum use of our rich national coal deposits with the use of modern technology and minimum damage to the environment. It is especially necessary to encourage the development of new technological methods in saving energy and energy production which do not damage the environment, as a potential alternative to the sources of energy being used up to now.'

'The GCP wants the use of all the potentialities of

scientific and technical progress for improving the working people's living conditions. That is precisely why it advocates the peaceful use of nuclear energy. But it resolutely protests against the abuse of nuclear energy for the capitalist drive for profit and imperialist domination, against any attempts to sidestep the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Its consent to the construction of atomic power stations and other nuclear energy installations is contingent on the provision of guarantees of security for the population and those who operate them, adequate measures of environmental protection, effective democratic control, and provision of evidence that the necessary electric-power requirements cannot be met by means of other energy sources. Until these conditions are met, the GCP will reject the construction of new atomic power stations and other nuclear installations in the FRG. Complete security for man and the environment under democratic control needs to be ensured at the operating installations. The operation of enterprises which do not meet these demands must be stopped.'

Ideologically, the civil initiative groups present an extremely checkered picture, for they consist of people with different world-views, members of different parties (GCP, SDPG, FDP and even CDU) and also non-party people. That is why these groups can operate successfully only if all the participants in the movement, while realizing their ideological and political distinctions and contradictions, still treat each other as equal partners, and if the activity of these groups is aimed at some concrete common goal for which the various forces have, in fact, united.

The GCP emphasizes that the civil initiatives movement is of great importance. Its program says: 'The GCP regards development of diverse actions for peace and disarmament, in defense of democratic rights, social and cultural interests, for the rights of women and protection of the environment as an important achievement of our country's progressive forces. It has taken an active part in the democratic movements, the civil initiatives groups and alliances. In the process, it has not raised the question either of world-view or creed. Its assumption is that in each case the content and forms of struggle are determined by the movement itself.'

'The GCP has consistently worked to realize the common demands and goals. It has advocated equal partnership and cooperation of all the participants both in particular and in broad alliances. It respects the political motives, ideology and organizational independence of its partners in the alliances, and expects them to take the same attitude to the GCP. While taking part in the alliances, the GCP has laid no claim to leadership. It intends to secure respect and authority only through its initiatives in advancing joint movement, only by the energy and consistency of its members.'

The essential distinctions between the political and ideological attitudes of those involved in the civil initiative groups movement will, of course, continue to exist, and as the past has shown, their

action can be successful only if their participants reckon with these distinctions. But that does not mean that a political consciousness cannot take shape and develop within the movement.

Over the past 18 months there have been numerous attempts to undermine the common basis for the activity of the civil initiative groups. A special danger in this respect was posed by the attempts to limit the activity of this movement to the framework of political parties by putting forward diverse electoral rolls whose political spectrum varies from the ultra-leftist to the ultra-rightist. This cuts across the interests of democratic civil action. The GCP rejects any attempts to convert the civil initiative groups into an electoral bloc or to abuse this movement for political-party purposes.

Many of those who sympathize with and support the candidates on the 'green' and the 'many-colored' electoral rolls in parliamentary elections in the FRG undoubtedly act under the influence of their disappointment in bourgeois parties. They support the rolls of candidates advocating protection of the environment because they do not yet regard the GCP's anti-monopoly demands as an acceptable alternative. But many of the behind-the-scenes sponsors of these rolls may be suspected of seeking in this way to weaken the civil initiative groups' movement or even to recruit forces for their self-seeking political advantages from its ranks. There is much evidence that the overcoming of the existing crisis and solution of environmental problems is not their actual purpose. Some of these electoral groups enjoy the support of patently fascist organizations (like the 'German Soldiers' Combat Union,' 'Union Forces Loyal to the Constitution' or the 'Community for Action for a National Europe'). Leaders of other electoral groups also campaigning under environmental slogans are, on the contrary, members of ultra-leftist, splinter groups seeking to use such electoral rolls only as a springboard for election to parliament. What is more or less common to all these groups is anti-communism, hostility for the trade unions, and demagogic demands. They have borrowed some of the important demands put forward by the GCP, without indicating, however, those who resist these demands and those who have to provide the funds for their implementation. The emergence of electoral groups campaigning under environmental slogans has temporarily weakened a large number of civil initiative groups, because many of their participants, members of different parties, have left the groups for the election period to support their party candidates. It goes without saying that the GCP does not advocate political absenteeism in civil initiative groups at election time. On the contrary, these groups should use the electoral struggle to publicize their concrete demands, to put these demands before the parties, and to urge the electorate to vote according to the attitude of the parties and candidates to these demands.

The stand taken by many civil initiative groups on the trade unions has done much harm to the environmental movement. Hostility for the trade

unions has been brought into the movement by the 'green' and other electoral groups and also by most of the mass media in the FRG. This hostility springs from the fact that many participants in the movement regard science and technology as their enemies. Accordingly, they claim, if the environment is to be protected, enterprises must be closed down and their work force dismissed. In the past, such demands by individual civil initiative groups produced serious contradictions between the environmental movement and the working class and its organizations, and these contradictions are being amplified by the anti-trade union attitudes of the leaders of electoral groups campaigning under environmental slogans.

Employers' unions also assert that environmental protection tends to jeopardize employment, the argument they use to pit the working class against civil initiative groups in their own interests. The communists oppose these false views and seek to show the working people that the elimination of jobs does not result from measures aimed at protecting the environment, but from action by the owners of the concerns, and that, on the contrary, more jobs will be created by environmental protection, like the building of purification installations and their operation.

The GCP stand on scientific and technical progress and the ostensible limits to growth is quite clear. It declares: 'One must not allow oneself to accept the idea that the limits of the capitalist social system are simultaneously the limits of mankind's development. Nor can there generally be any question of some "limits of economic growth" having already been reached. There are vast potentialities for the ever fuller satisfaction of social requirements through the use of science and technology.' Specialists say that the technical problems of keeping the air and water pure have largely been solved, and the point is merely that science and technology are not being used at all adequately for the protection of man, animals and plants. This shows that the fundamental limits to the state-monopoly regulation of the environment are determined by social factors: orientation upon monopoly profits prevents the balanced and complex shaping of the interaction between science and nature. Life shows that the attempts to solve environmental problems by means of the 'market economy' are sure to fail.

The GCP regards more intense environmental protection as one of its primary tasks. Its Program says: 'Making use of the achievements of science and technology, there is a need to resist, in every possible way, pollution of the environment, especially of the air and water, and high noise level. Through a consistent application of the culprit principle, the concerns must be made to allocate funds for preventing and even for eliminating damage to the environment. Democratic control needs to be established for effective protection of the environment.'¹⁰

The FRG communists believe that their task is to

cooperate even more actively in the future within the civil initiative groups for protection of the environment and to drive home to their participants with even greater conviction that it is not science, not technical progress, and not the trade unions that are their adversary, but that the evil is rooted in the domination of monopoly capital. Objectively, workers in industry and the civil initiative groups for environmental protection have one and the same adversary: big capital. Its power can be curbed only through common struggle against this common adversary, so securing effective and qualitative improvement of the environment.

1. Umweltgutachten 1978. Bundestags-Drucksache 8/1938, 1978, p. 462.
2. Umwelt, Bonn, 1977, No. 58, p. 3.
3. Programm der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei. Düsseldorf, 1978, p. 28.
4. Umweltgutachten 1978, p. 463.
5. Umweltgutachten 1978, p. 465.
6. Ibid.
7. Programm der DKP, p. 43 (our italics — Authors).
8. Programm der DKP, p. 80-81.
9. Bericht des Parteivorstands der DKP an den Mannheimer Parteitag. Für eine Wende zu demokratischem und sozialem Fortschritt, p. 40.
10. Programm der DKP, p. 44.

Lenin as a political thinker

Academician Fyodor Konstantinov
President, Philosophical Society of the USSR

There is much in history to show that political leaders and thinkers of world stature as a rule appear in the arena of social life in critical epochs which pose qualitatively new problems. Each such epoch produces its own historical type of individual who accords with its character, requirements and tasks. The urges, aspirations and hopes of the working class and all the other working people in the epoch of the greatest class battles, socialist revolutions and national-liberation movements were expressed by Lenin, a thinker of genius, and the founder and leader of a new type of Marxist party.

The epoch in which Lenin — his 110th birth anniversary will be marked in April 1980 — lived and worked is a highly important one. That is the epoch in which mankind began to move from its prehistory, which paved the way for the great achievements of our revolutionary age, to its history in the true sense of the word. In that epoch, social life posed a great many problems on whose solution depended the destiny of hundreds of millions of people. Lenin was an outstanding philosopher, economist and sociologist. His profound knowledge of the most diverse aspects of social life and his scientific approach to them made him one of the greatest political thinkers.

As a political thinker, Lenin analyzed and solved a very wide spectrum of problems, ranging from the general concept of policy to the concrete problems of contemporary political life. He examined the various aspects of the struggle between classes and political parties, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement, and analyzed the dialectics of war, peace and revolution, and the problem of political blocs and alliances, the prospects for the growth of bourgeois-democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions, relations between nations and the nationalities question. He elaborated and sub-

stantiated the basic principles of Marxist political science and worked out its key propositions.

Today no one — neither friend nor foe — will deny that Lenin's life, work and legacy are of tremendous historical and political importance. No serious bourgeois political thinker will refuse to admit that Lenin was one of the greatest politicians. His name and work are associated with events that have radically changed the political map of the world in the 20th century. But an effort is frequently made to present Lenin as a brilliant but lone politician who succeeded in 'inspiring' the revolution and creating a political organization of society representing a 'historical anomaly.' This voluntarist interpretation of Lenin's historical role is the very opposite of the truth. First, because the whole of Lenin's theoretical and practical political work was always based on the Marxist principle that the people, the masses, are the subject of history and politics. Second, because the epoch related to Leninism differs from all the others in that it set in motion great masses of people, turning them into conscious makers of history.

Lenin always insisted that the depth of social transformations depends on how actively broad masses of working people are involved in political life, on how well they have mastered political culture. He rejected elitist notions about political activity being a sphere of professional competence for a narrow circle of politicians, about the 'intrusion' of the masses into the holy of holies of power having destructive consequences. He believed that participation by the masses in social life was an indispensable condition for a revolutionary policy leading to progressive social changes. In this way, Lenin's political thinking overcame the contradiction — one that is insoluble for bourgeois concepts of politics — between political parties and their leaders, on the one hand, and the masses, on the other.

He proved in theory and in practice that the stronger the organizing influence of truly revolutionary parties and their leaders on the working class and its allies, the deeper and more successful the progressive changes.

Lenin repeatedly emphasized that the working class cannot win political power, transform the economic structure of society and build socialism without the creative initiative of the masses. He wrote: 'Socialism cannot be decreed from above. Its spirit rejects the mechanical bureaucratic approach: living, creative socialism is the product of the masses themselves' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 288). This principle has been borne out by the experience of the Soviet state and the other socialist community countries.

Lenin summed up the revolutionary experience of the working-class movement and on that basis substantiated scientific principles for the political persuasion of the masses. He elaborated the scientific concepts of political influence on the consciousness of the masses, agitation and propaganda, the leading and organizing role of the party, and the revolutionary initiative of the working people.

Lenin worked out the philosophical and methodological principles of revolutionary political thinking. Philosophical ideas are not just facts of science, but a powerful weapon in the class struggle, the struggle between the two world systems. But philosophy has an even greater influence on social life in its capacity as methodology of political thought and action. Advanced philosophy is always connected with politics, with the struggle of classes and parties. This connection is most pronounced on the eve of and during revolutionary epochs. Thus, the philosophy of the great French materialists and enlighteners of the 18th century, with its atheistic and anti-clerical edge, denunciation of serfdom and of secular and clerical despotism, and its struggle against reactionary ideas, prepared the minds of Frenchmen for the forthcoming bourgeois revolution. In Germany, German classical philosophy, from Kant to Hegel and Feuerbach, became one of the factors which paved the way for the bourgeois revolution of 1848. The philosophy of Marxism developed by Lenin was the ideological and theoretical prerequisite for the first triumphant socialist revolution and the working-class struggle for peace, democracy and socialism throughout the world. Having been adopted by millions of people, it has become, in our epoch, a mighty material force for mankind's development and advance to communism.

In the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Lenin relied on the propositions of Marxist theory for his creative application of the Marxist revolutionary methodology in cognizing the new aggregation of economic, political and spiritual phenomena in society. The doctrine of dialectical and historical materialism, which Lenin developed, has become the philosophical foundation for the solution of important problems in social life.

Lenin's methodology of political thought and ac-

tion rests on cognition and generalization of the objective laws of historical development. It is based on materialist dialectics, to whose development Lenin made an invaluable contribution. A distinctive feature of Lenin's political thinking is its harmonizing of the historical and the logical approaches and the conjunction of the historical and the theoretical explanation of reality, which safeguards theory from becoming fossilized and dogmatic, so making it possible constantly to reflect the changes in historical reality.

Lenin's political thinking was informed by a profound historical optimism, which sprang from his scientific methodology of political analysis and social cognition, from his scientific anticipation of trends and prospects in social development and his understanding that the antagonistic-class organization of society would inevitably be abolished and socialism and communism built in its stead. Lenin turned the principle of scientific prevision into one of the basic principles of the communists' political activity and elaborated the methodological principles of planned social development. Socialism can be built and socialist society's development guided only on the basis of scientific prognostication and planning.

The organic blend of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice is the distinctive feature of Lenin's political activity. His approach to social life is characterized by a strict unity of scientific objectivity and the class and party approach. That is the light in which Lenin examined the strategy and tactics of the Marxist parties and the perspectives of the world revolutionary process.

Marxist philosophy emerged as a summing up of the political and theoretical struggle of a new revolutionary class — the proletariat — against capitalism and the bourgeois ideology which sanctified it, and inherited the best traditions of progressive philosophical thought. Marx supported Feuerbach's philosophical materialism and his struggle against idealism, religion and mysticism, but believed that his weakness lay in the fact that he gave too little attention to politics. In a letter to Arnold Ruge (March 13, 1843), Marx wrote: 'Feuerbach's aphorisms seem to me incorrect only in one respect, that he refers too much to nature and too little to politics. That, however, is the only alliance by which present-day philosophy can become truth.'* Marx's 11th thesis on Feuerbach is a formulation of philosophy's new task, which is not only to interpret the world but also to promote its revolutionary transformation. Through its connection with revolutionary politics, through the spread of philosophical cognition to society, and through the conjunction of philosophical materialism and dialectics, philosophy ceased to be contemplative and became an effective, active, creative and transformative force.

This tradition of connecting philosophy and politics was continued by Lenin. The whole of his

*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Coll. Works*, Vol 1, p. 400.

theoretical work was closely bound up with revolutionary practice. He always regarded the unity of Marxist theory and revolutionary practice as the supreme law. He closely connected his elaboration of theory, and of scientific policy on its basis, with the practical tasks in the struggle of classes, in the ideological struggle. But he was also a master of theoretically summing up the practical experience of revolutionary struggle. He gave an in-depth philosophical analysis of the new elements produced by world revolutionary practice, notably, the October Revolution, and gave answers to the new questions in the light of consistent revolutionary Marxism.

In view of the sharp changes in historical reality itself, Lenin had to review a number of obsolete theoretical propositions which no longer accorded with the new conditions of the working-class struggle. On the strength of that, Lenin's enemies accused him of departing from 'orthodox' Marxism, and of 'revisionism.' However, Lenin's review of some obsolete propositions was entirely in the spirit of Marxism as a viable revolutionary doctrine, and of the new tasks and requirements of the revolutionary struggle which sprang from the changing objective conditions.

Lenin brought out and analyzed a number of new social phenomena constituting the distinctive features of our epoch, and gave theoretical solutions for a number of important problems. His discovery of the law of uneven economic and political development in the epoch of imperialism and his new theory of socialist revolution, his doctrine that initially socialism could win out in one, individual country, all of these and other outstanding theoretical conclusions were made possible by his application of the propositions and principles of materialist dialectics as a method of understanding and transforming changing reality, and for working out the strategy and tactics of the class struggle. The same part was played by Lenin's creative use and development of propositions and categories of historical materialism, which are an application of the universal principles of dialectical materialism to the specific conditions of social life. Finally, Lenin's development of a key component part of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine — the theory of scientific socialism — was also subordinate to practical tasks.

The whole of Lenin's legacy is characterized by this twofold approach: the development of theory and the search for answers to the vital problems of practice. Every one of his works not only contains a profound analysis and summing up of new facts, new social phenomena, and processes going forward in science and philosophy, but also sets out

the perspectives, trends and lines of society's further development, and forthcoming political events, setting out the right slogans for struggle and providing effective guidance to action.

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie in the 20th century have repeatedly declared Marxism to be obsolete, deliberately obscuring the fact that every aspect of Marxism was developed by Lenin. Critics of Leninism claim that it, too, is out of touch with the present because over a half-century has elapsed since Lenin wrote his works.

Indeed, many great events have occurred over the past several decades. The world has changed and continues to change. But this change is governed by the objective laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism. Leninism continues to develop and enrich itself by reflecting and analyzing the new phenomena over the past few decades and summing up the historical experience of our revolutionary epoch.

Leninism cannot become obsolete because the conditions and problems which produced it are still there. It cannot become obsolete also because it does not stand still but is constantly developed and enriched with new experience. Revolutionary materialist dialectics has been and remains the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It insistently requires ceaseless development of revolutionary theory. Dogmatism has been and continues to be an enemy of Leninism, like revisionism. Lenin's legacy of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action is an ever vibrant phenomenon in the spiritual and political life of our day, and an inexhaustible source of progressive ideas.

The creative character of Lenin's doctrine is now expressed in the communists' theoretical and practical political work.

In a report on the centenary of Lenin's birth, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'Leninism is the most advanced and influential ideology of the modern world, the invincible ideology of those who have the future with them. The works of no other man have been so widely read as Lenin's are. They have been published in 117 languages of the world. Lenin's books have been printed in hundreds of millions of copies. They are being read by people in all countries and in all continents, helping them to live and struggle.' The whole course of social progress and the trend of the ideological struggle in the world today show the inexorable power of Leninism, and the triumph of Lenin's ideas which in our day are being creatively developed by the CPSU and the other communist and workers' parties.



How to end the crisis

Nicolas Chaoui

Chairman, Lebanese Communist Party

The results of the Fourth National Congress of the Lebanese Communist Party were announced by the newly-elected Central Committee at a press conference, a notable political event in itself, for it was attended not only by scores of journalists representing domestic and foreign news agencies but also by leaders of all the patriotic and progressive parties of Lebanon and a number of other public figures. Its significance was enhanced by the presence of leaders of different organizations of the Palestinian Resistance, primarily Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive Committee.

The interest aroused by the Congress is an unmistakable indication of the party's prestige among Lebanese and Palestinian patriots. It is evidence of their appreciation and approval of the LCP's general policy line both in Lebanon and the Arab national-liberation movement.

Principled yet flexible political guidelines, the use of various forms of struggle, including armed struggle, participation in repulsing Israel's encroachments on Lebanese territory, resistance to the conspiracy of the domestic fascists, and the sacrifices it has made in defending the country, promoting the Palestinian cause, and resolving other Arab national problems have turned the LCP into a vanguard force. Its role and prestige are growing in Lebanese politics. It operates as a member of a broad patriotic coalition and an advanced contingent of the Arab national-liberation movement. This has been demonstrated again by our Fourth Congress.

The communists responded to the LCP Central Committee decision to convene the Congress with a high sense of personal responsibility and tremendous enthusiasm. Seven and a half years passed since the Third Congress (January 1972). The war in Lebanon and continuing Israeli aggression prevented the Fourth Congress from being convened on schedule. But while the complicated domestic political situation and the constant threat to national security raised obstacles to the convening of the Congress they also made it imperative. In the face of new developments and processes, the communists had to specify and carry forward their policy line.

In the past seven-odd years, Lebanon's communists, guided by the decisions of the Third Congress and the CC, have passed two difficult tests. To begin with, they gained experience in the general democratic struggle in the years preceding the Lebanese war. That was a period of powerful upsurge in the party's political activity among the

masses. Previously, this activity had consisted chiefly in the organization of actions by urban and rural working people in support of demands for better working and living conditions (these actions grew in scope and intensity due to the socio-economic crisis), but during the period in question it transcended this framework. The party joined in the struggle, then at its height, to safeguard democratic freedoms and carry out a democratic reform of the Lebanese political system. In common with all other patriotic forces it took up the defense of the Palestinian Resistance and countered recurrent attempts by Lebanese reaction to suppress the movement.

The second test passed by the communists was the war imposed on them and the Lebanese people as a whole by the local reactionaries, resistance to Israel's encroachments, and struggle for the liberation of the southern areas occupied by Israel directly or through its agent, Saad Haddad. Massive armed struggle has always been a school for our party and each of its members, who have proved their ideological and political staunchness in the most difficult sectors.

Having passed these tests, the communists became a force maintaining the closest links with the people and responding sensitively to their requirements and thoughts. All party members displayed high morale and an ability to assume responsibility and take the initiative in the most challenging situations. More deeply than ever, they realized the importance of alliances with other forces and contingents and learned to find ways of improving relations and coordinating actions with them. The communists became leaders in their areas and at their work places; they spared neither effort, nor their very lives, thereby building up the leverage and prestige of the LCP as the party of all working people of Lebanon, of all its patriots and democrats. Hundreds of militant and enlightened young people joined its ranks. Collective activity and inner-party democracy developed with the growth of the numerical strength and political consciousness of our cadres.

All this had its effect on the preparations for the Fourth Congress. Never in the previous 55-year history of the LCP had a discussion of basic documents been so detailed and profound (it involved all party members). The results of the discussion were summed up in the CC report submitted to the Congress by Georges Haoui. The discussion was a valuable contribution to the education of the party member-

ship, for it reflected a collective will and the conviction that the communists had to play a larger role in the struggle, and stressed their special responsibility to the Lebanese and other Arab peoples. It was also valuable in that it helped establish living, direct contact with the experience of communists at local level, study and appraise initiatives and other measures they had put into effect in various areas of their work, and use all this for drawing political conclusions.

The preparations for the Congress and its deliberations and results demonstrated the party's ideological, political and organizational unity based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It is with pride that I repeat what I said after the Congress approved the documents submitted to it and in connection with the election of the party's leading bodies. 'The Communist Party,' I said, 'has always owed its strength to unity. How much stronger is our party today, when it is more united than ever in the 46 years since I joined its ranks! How remarkable is this unity as embodied by our Congress today!'

The Fourth Congress confirmed emphatically and with deep conviction that the main condition for achieving the goals set by it is the existence of a militant mass Communist party firmly committed to the creative principles of Marxism-Leninism, holding strong political positions, unthreatened by decline or isolation, vigilant toward revisionism from the right or 'left,' and prepared to resist every right-wing nationalist trend. The communists of Lebanon are proud of fighting in the ranks of a party whose principles are Leninist and of being able to contribute to its future and grow in step with it.

A detailed analysis of the situation in the world and the Middle East by the Congress made it possible to define the party's tasks at international and regional level. Without repeating our estimations, stated in *World Marxist Review*,¹ I wish to stress that the Fourth Congress sharply condemned the right-wing and reactionary forces in the Arab world which misrepresent the realities of our epoch, primarily the attitude and role of the Soviet Union in the world revolutionary process, on the false plea that détente 'shackles' the struggle of peoples. In this way these forces would like to justify their retreat before imperialism and their compromising deals to the detriment of the interests of their peoples, and to loosen Arab-Soviet friendship instead of promoting it as a vital factor to the victory of the Arabs' just cause.

It was only natural that the Congress concentrated on the situation in the Arab world. Imperialism is carrying on an offensive there to nullify the gains of the Arab national-liberation movement, especially those made in the 1960s and 1970s, and to shape the subsequent development of the whole region in conformity with the interests of oil monopolies and other transnationals, with the regional and global strategic interests of imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular.

This scheme materialized at Camp David, where it took the form of a virtual military pact between

Carter, Begin and Sadat. To go on to further steps, its makers need rifts in the united Arab front opposed to the pact, that is, new adherents to the dangerous U.S.-Israeli-Egyptian bloc. Without this the Camp David line is bound to fail.

Accordingly, the Congress defined the LCP line as follows: the main blow must be aimed at the Camp David policy; it is necessary to act in common with all other forces opposed to it, irrespective of their overt or covert motivations, or whether they are prompted by anti-imperialism, religious considerations, or political reasons arising from the situation in the region and the alignment of forces in any given country, or by the disgraceful terms of Egypt's collusion with the United States and Israel, which prevent even well-known sections of Arab reaction from backing Sadat openly, let alone take the road chosen by him.

Exceptional efforts are needed to preserve today's favorable alignment of political forces if the imperialist offensive embodied by the Camp David conspiracy is to be beaten off. This means, the Congress stressed, rejecting and overcoming every manifestation of arrogance and every attempt at discrimination or at choosing allies according to qualitatively higher, strategic criteria, which would narrow the range of the forces that could be mobilized in the decisive sector of the front at the moment.

The Congress noted that resistance to Camp David has yet to attain a level corresponding to the dangerous nature of the conspiracy, to the seriousness and treacherous purpose of the plans laid by the U.S. administration, Israel and Sadat. Our party considers that a comprehensive and effective resistance program should be based, above all, on a precise and resolute attitude to U.S. imperialism, the chief enemy of the Arab peoples and their national cause, and an equally precise and resolute effort for closer friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, who are our natural allies against imperialism and its policy of aggression. The program must envisage full support for the struggle of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, a component of the Arabs' common national struggle. Steps must also be taken to organize more widespread popular resistance to reactionary plans through a pan-Arab national front based on democratic principles and uniting all anti-imperialist classes, social strata and political forces.

The effect of this resistance will depend on the evolution of the overall situation in the Arab national-liberation movement. The Congress stressed that the movement has entered a new stage characterized by a sharper class struggle and, as a result, by an increased differentiation among the social forces of the present class alliance as well as within each of them.

The period of a definite balance of class and political forces in the anti-imperialist alliances led by petty-bourgeois elements is drawing to a close. However, this does not detract from its historic importance or the role of the social strata and elements adhering to a progressive position that have

contributed to the leadership of these alliances and registered important political, economic and social gains and victories.

On the other hand, while the changes in this or that country varied in depth, the policy of these strata and elements as a whole never conflicted with the laws governing capitalist development. It was marked by vacillation and a narrow outlook, fettered by idealist illusions and metaphysical concepts, and influenced by religious fanaticism and anti-democratic and anti-communist sentiments. There were contentions about the 'disappearance' of the class struggle or the need to 'control' it, and about the possibility of a 'third road.' These ideas and notions developed often into hostility for the working class, its party and ideology. The preservation of the old state apparatus strengthened the hand of conservatives and counter-revolutionaries, who, in turn, raised obstacles to the relatively progressive measures carried out in the country. Forming within the national state was a military and civilian bureaucracy whose interests and privileges coincided objectively with those of the bourgeoisie.

The Third Congress pointed out that a right wing was growing inside progressive regimes and throughout the Arab national-liberation movement under the impact of the objective trend of the revolutionary process and increasing class differentiation and class struggle. In the 1970s, when imperialism and Zionism became more active, this phenomenon developed into a crisis of the movement described by the Fourth Congress as a leadership crisis. At the present stage, this crisis poses a serious threat to the anti-imperialist regimes we support. Its development shows regularities, which in Egypt earlier led to a change in the situation in favor of the class and political forces whose interests are expressed by Sadat.

As the LCP sees it, the current leadership crisis can be overcome if an end is put to manifestations of a monopolization of power and if the chief alternative at the new stage of the Arab national-liberation movement, that is, the formation of a new type of alliance, is defined. Underlying it would be the realization that the participants' common interests can be met only if they follow a new line based on democracy and mutual confidence, on organizing the masses, releasing their energy, raising their political consciousness, and increasing their participation in political decision-making. In an alliance of this kind there will be no predetermined leading force and its strength and efficiency will be built up in step with the growing role played in it by the working class and in proportion to the extent the policy and activity of the alliance reflect the real interests of the proletariat, as well as the interests of the social strata making common cause with it.

In each Arab country, the Fourth Congress stressed, such an alliance would become the main factor for the successful accomplishment of its internal tasks and the mobilization of all its potentialities for the common struggle of the Arab nation. At the pan-Arab level, such an alliance would enable the Arab national-liberation movement to counter the

policy of betrayal and achieve complete liberation, social progress and unity.

The Congress' definition of the situation in the Middle East and in the Arab liberation movement served as the starting point for an examination of developments in Lebanon.

Ever since 1969 Lebanon has been the main arena of struggle and confrontation in U.S. imperialism's overall strategy in the region aimed at regaining control of the Arab world. There are several reasons for this. One is that ever since the signing of the Cairo agreement between the Lebanese government and the PLO, and since the 1970 events in Jordan,² the Palestinian Resistance has been based chiefly on Lebanese soil. It is common knowledge that the main objective of the imperialist-Zionist conspiracy has been to eliminate this base as an independent force and undermine its mobilizing impact on the entire anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist Arab movement. Another reason is the existence of the Lebanese patriotic movement, which has formed a fighting alliance with the Palestinian Resistance and is ready to join forces with it in the armed struggle, as recent years have shown. A third reason is the geographical situation of Lebanon, from where direct or indirect military political pressure can be exerted on Syria. This is why, the Congress stressed, imperialism and Zionism to this day regard Lebanon as the central sector which must be pierced to ensure the success of the Camp David policy.

The aims and designs of imperialism and Zionism at regional level, primarily in our country, intertwined temporarily with those of the Lebanese big bourgeoisie. By 1975 it was clear that through a general democratic struggle over a number of years the communists and their allies — patriots and democrats — had jointly achieved important successes in its every field, whereas the big reactionary bourgeoisie had been losing its political influence and leverage. Sizable groups of petty and middle bourgeois, increasingly affected by the growing social and economic crisis, had begun to dissociate themselves from the reactionary bourgeoisie. The loss of support from these groups, the upsurge in the struggle of the working class and the people, and the alliance between Lebanon's patriotic forces and the Palestinian Resistance prompted the reactionary big bourgeoisie, which feared for its power, to use force and impose a bloody civil war.

Our party described the aims pursued by the armed action of Lebanon's reactionaries in alliance with Israel as a fascist isolationist scheme with a Zionist slant. This scheme is part of the general conspiracy of imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction, whose purpose is to impose a compromise capitulationist settlement of the Middle East crisis and split the region into warring communal and racial entities controlled by imperialism and Zionism. It provides for the following: one, dismembering Lebanon territorially and confessionally;³ two, ending the country's national independence; three, isolating Lebanon from the rest of the Arab world; four, setting up a fascist regime in

Lebanon, to which end bloodshed is provoked between members of the various communities, and spiritual and physical terror is unleashed; five, a class attack by monopoly capital on the interests of the manual, professional and clerical workers, peasants, artisans and other small producers, urban and rural middle strata, intellectuals, youth, students and women.

The Fourth LCP Congress stressed that the defeat of the fascist isolationist scheme is not only possible but inevitable. However, the fascists will not renounce armed struggle for as long as they can use arms. To defeat them militarily means laying the groundwork for their political defeat, which would make it possible to return the struggle into a peaceful democratic channel. This is what the whole effort of our party is geared to. However, the LCP would take a favorable view of any other way of achieving a political settlement.

Today, the Congress pointed out, those behind the fascist isolationist scheme find themselves in an impasse as a result of the steadfast defensive struggle of the patriotic movement which is led by our party, and which has a strong following among the people. Increasingly large sections of the bourgeoisie, including some segments of the finance oligarchy, realize the danger of pressing the scheme, which has got out of hand and come to exist independently, as part of the imperialist-Zionist plan for the whole region. They are fearful of the likely consequences of a 'free market economy' should fascism take over the country. The Lebanese bourgeoisie is alarmed by the weakening of the most important instrument of its domination — the state — and by the division in its own ranks, due to the fact that the fascist scheme manifests itself in confessional form, with the resultant threat to its interests in the Arab world.

The present government, the Congress pointed out, wants to restore the unity of the Lebanese bourgeoisie on the basis of its class interests. It is working on an alternative to establish a strong authority leaning on covert or overt military dictatorship. It would expect to be backed by the same imperialist, Zionist and reactionary forces that supported the fascist scheme and contributed to its realization from the outset. In planning this, the ruling circles exploit the aspirations of the masses, who want an end to the protracted crisis, which is bringing them enormous hardships. But as the big bourgeoisie is weak, the establishment of direct military rule would inevitably clash again with its interests.

The ruling circles' plan to end the impasse into which they have pushed themselves by carrying out the scheme for fascist rule bears the imprint of the state's prewar socio-economic policy. Far from indicating a way out, it is a further crisis factor aggravating all political and social contradictions. This is why, the Congress stressed, the forces which have resisted plans for fascist rule and prevented their implementation will also resist the authorities' alternative, military dictatorship. And as the dissociation of more groups of petty and middle

bourgeois from the finance clique gains momentum with the increasing concentration and centralization of capital and the development of monopoly trends, the socio-political spectrum of champions of a democratic end to the crisis will become wider.

The Fourth Congress supported the Central Committee's conclusion that resistance to the fascist isolationist scheme has made the Lebanese problem one of struggle for national independence and liberation. Therefore it pointed to the need to transform the party ideologically, politically and practically into the vanguard force of the patriotic national front. We are convinced that the present stage of the anti-imperialist Arab national-liberation movement demands that the working-class party should assume concrete responsibility for the national cause.

Bourgeois ideologists have always tried to keep the communists out of this struggle. Their invariable argument is the allegation that the communists are only interested in the class struggle. Yet Marxism-Leninism maintains that every program for the solution of national problems is a class program. Consequently, the working class needs to work out its own policy in this sphere. By linking national with social liberation, this policy will show infinitely greater efficiency in meeting the people's national aspirations than the program of any bourgeois section. The whole record of the Arab national movement, led as a rule by this or that section of the bourgeoisie, proves this to be the case.

It is through the national problem, the Fourth Congress stated, that the main contradiction of the present-day Arab world — the contradiction between the national-liberation movement and imperialism — manifests itself today. The CC report to the Congress says: 'The national problem, which is to liberate every Arab country, materialize the legitimate rights of the Arab Palestinian people, achieve Arab unity and recover national values and resources, is therefore central to the class struggle.' The party works out its position on the above tasks, whose fulfillment is a key objective of the anti-imperialist struggle as a whole. The Congress, putting forward a general national program to counter the fascist isolationist scheme, formulated these key points:

1. Preserve the civilian and territorial unity of Lebanon and combat all attempts at division.
2. Defend the national independence of Lebanon. Rid it of Israeli domination or pressure in any form.
3. Incorporate Lebanon in the Arab world. This should express itself primarily in a determined anti-Israeli position and in condemning anyone who collaborated with Israel as a traitor to the great national cause; in offering asylum and protection to Palestinian patriots, and in helping and supporting them in establishing their own national state on the Palestinian territory to be freed; and in promoting cooperation with Arab countries, above all fraternal Syria, in every field.
4. Bring a democratic Lebanon into being:
 - (a) through fighting against any form of fascist

dictatorship; defending democratic freedoms and granting them to all classes and strata of the Lebanese people, all political forces and their press, and all mass organizations;

(b) through reorganizing the political system of Lebanese society by implementing a minimum program of democratic reforms providing for, among other things, the erasure of religious and communal distinctions, which prevent the granting of equality of rights and duties to all citizens; ensuring a normal distribution of authority between legislative and executive bodies and between the President of the Republic and the government, and putting an end to the unlawful monopolization of power by the President of the Republic; setting up military and civilian administrative bodies on democratic lines, without discrimination on religious, communal, social or political grounds; purging these bodies of Israeli agents.

The Fourth Congress noted that at this stage the program of national resistance to plans for fascist rule, to the imposition of a military dictatorship, and to Israeli encroachments is a minimum program for the unity of all national democratic and progressive forces. It is an advance toward accomplishing the strategic task formulated by the Second and Third LCP congresses — establishing national democratic rule in Lebanon that will pave the way for the transition to socialism.

The national resistance program implies that the people's forces must unite as closely as possible for the successful conduct of a difficult and protracted struggle in defense of their rights and the security, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. A priority task to be carried out without delay is to defend the areas controlled by the patriotic movement and prevent subversion in these areas as well as all political or military encroachments on them by hostile forces. A further task is to mobilize the masses for struggle to free South Lebanon from Israeli occupation and sweep away the puppet 'state' proclaimed by the traitor Haddad. Lastly, it is necessary to suppress and isolate all fascists in the country and in this way to prepare for their complete defeat when the alignment of forces at national level and throughout the Arab world is more favorable.

In pressing for these goals, the party will do its best to enhance its role in the Lebanese patriotic movement, and will seek closer unity of the movement. It advocates the formation of a broad national front comprising all parties, forces, and politicians opposed to fascist rule and military dictatorship irrespective of their class affiliation, ideology or religion. The party will continue seeking a stronger alliance between the Lebanese patriotic movement and the Palestinian Resistance, and greater cooperation and coordination with all Arab forces opposed to the alliance between the United States, Israel and Sadat. The Congress declared that to assure the success of the national resistance program, maximum support will be needed from world democratic opinion, the socialist community, and its vanguard, the Soviet Union.

To accomplish these tasks, we must steadfastly build up the efficiency and organizational unity of our mass party. 'Our party,' says a policy statement published after the Fourth LCP Congress, 'has become steeled in struggle at the price of the blood and lives of hundreds of its members. It educates new generations of heroic fighters, who are now in the forefront of the country's defenders in South Lebanon. . . The party has grown in strength since its Third Congress. It now has in its ranks the finest, most advanced workers, peasants, young people, students, women and revolutionary intellectuals. Its influence extends to every area, city and village of Lebanon. Nothing can stop its advance. Thanks to its structure and composition, it embodies the real national unity of the masses and is a radiant prototype of the democratic, Arab, independent, and united Lebanon of the future.'

Lebanon's communists have carried out the decisions of the Second and Third congresses of their party with distinction and are full of optimism, being confident that they will show the same perseverance and consistency in accomplishing the historic tasks set by their Fourth Congress.

1. See articles by Nicolas Chaoui and Georges Haoui in WMR, June and September 1979.

2. In 1970, Jordanian government troops struck at bases of the Palestinian Resistance in that country, where their main forces were concentrated. — Ed.

3. Lebanon's reactionaries did their utmost to give the civil conflict provoked by them a confessional form, playing up antagonisms and fomenting disunity among the religious communities that belong to different denominations of Islam and Christianity. — Ed.

Recent History of the Labor Movement in the United States

Editor: B.Y. Mikhailov D.Sc

Volume One: 1918-1939. 553 pages.

Cloth \$9.50

Volume Two: 1939-1965. 616 pages.

Cloth \$10.95

Two volume set \$18.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

**71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M5V 2P6**

The USA at a crossroads in the 1980s

John Pittman

CC Political Bureau member, CPUSA,
WMR Editorial Board member

Where is the United States of America headed in the 1980s? What is the outlook for the working people, the approximately 100 million members of the U.S. labor force? And, in connection with this outlook, how do U.S. communists view their responsibilities and tasks?

U.S. communists offered answers to these questions last August 23-26 in Detroit, Michigan, at the party's joint 22nd National Convention and celebration of its 60th anniversary. The 369 voting delegates adopted unanimously the main political report of Gus Hall, the party's General Secretary. The report was read in his absence as illness prevented him from attending the Convention. They also adopted a number of resolutions, including the Main Political Resolution and a Resolution on the Afro-American Struggle for Equality, and approved the draft of a new Party Program. Unanimity was achieved on all accepted resolutions through debate during a three-month pre-convention discussion.

In sum, these documents set forth the party's position on the foregoing questions and proposed activities for the party and its members in all spheres of mass struggle. The documents also elaborated salient new features of development under U.S. state-monopoly capitalism which the delegates substantiated with experience in their shops, plants, offices and residential localities, and took into account in the formulation of their action programs. The new features include:

(1) The new level of exploitation of the working people, of class polarization and of parasitism of the capitalist system;

(2) The heightened role of the state in the subjugation and exploitation of the working people in the interests of the topmost monopolies and banks;

(3) The accelerated movement of the radicalization process, and growing evidence of an intensification of class conflict and a coming new wave of mass struggle;

(4) A new characterization of the U.S. working class based on its new and rising level of ideological, political and cultural organic class unity;

(5) The new level of objective and subjective forces in the struggle for equality of the nationally and racially oppressed components of the population;

(6) New trends toward political independence from the two monopoly parties and the formation of a new mass political party;

(7) A reassessment of the problem of war or peace in the light of new developments in the international arena and the growth of internationalist consciousness among the working people;

(8) New prospects for the growth of the CPUSA into a mass Marxist-Leninist party.

The present moment

Gus Hall characterized the present moment in the USA, that is, on the eve of the 1980s, as 'tremendously important . . . one of those major crossroads . . . when the majority are dissatisfied and are not willing to go along with the way things are, but are not yet clear how things should be . . . a phase where the masses are angry and ready for action, but are not yet quite clear as to how and where to direct their anger.'

The crossroads, he cautioned, 'presents both a great potential for progress' and 'the potential danger of setbacks, the danger of the misuse and manipulation of the anger and militancy by reactionary right-wing forces.' However, he assured the delegates that 'we can make the difference. We can be the key factor in deciding what direction our country will take from this crossroads.'

Other party leaders and numerous delegates who took the floor during the four-day convention expressed the substance of this characterization, thereby confirming Hall's assessment that 'the party continues to be ideologically strong and politically united.'

Henry Winston, the party's national chairperson, said that 'because we have a fighting working class . . . a fighting posture,' the party is on the eve of rapid growth.² Angela Davis, Central Committee member, co-chairperson of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, and recent recipient of the Lenin Peace Prize, saw the Convention as 'the advent of an enormous campaign to "put people before profits" . . . the beginning of an era which will surely culminate with workers' victories.'³

Unprecedented event

Unquestionably, the major source of the delegates' high spirits, which at times amounted to jubilation, was the presence of 47 representatives of Communist, Socialist and Workers' parties and national-liberation movements from more than 30 countries, an unprecedented event in the 60-year history of the CPUSA. For the first time in their own homeland,

U.S. communists were able to greet their comrades from other countries. In a tape-recorded message of welcome addressed to these delegates, Gus Hall expressed the party's gratitude for their contribution toward breaking a 60-year ban, a contribution, which, he said, assisted the CPUSA's struggle for full legality and demonstrated proletarian internationalism which, by providing the opportunity for a collective exchange of experience and views, would enrich the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Henry Winston also hailed their participation and praised their activities and their role in their own countries. 'It gives hope to the people of the United States and to the world,' he said.

An 'International Night' was devoted to honoring the fraternal delegates, who addressed the Convention with greetings from their parties and peoples. Moreover, messages from fraternal parties and national-liberation movements were still arriving when the Convention adjourned. They will be combined with the fraternal delegates' speeches and published for use in the educational work of the party's districts and clubs. Helen Winter, CC Political Bureau member and chairperson of the CPUSA CC's International Affairs Department, told the audience, 'In all the 60 years of the CPUSA, there has never been a night like this.'

The internationalist tone of the Convention also found concrete expression in several related actions of the delegates. One was their unanimous adoption of a resolution on solidarity with all peoples fighting against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. A second was their acceptance of the challenge to turn U.S. foreign policy around as a primary task of these times. And a third was their enthusiastic affirmative response to Henry Winston's call for a crusade to win ratification of SALT-II. 'Our people need SALT-II just as much if not more than any other people in the world,' Winston said. 'Remember, there is no more important task. It is the way to SALT-III, to SALT-IV, on the way to complete and total disarmament.'⁴

The delegates' swift approval of proposals on international questions also reflected their earlier study of the world relations of the United States and the problems of war and peace. The report of Gus Hall laid special stress on designs of a 'new cold-war ultra-right gang' which 'have now thrown their full weight toward a total mobilization against the ratification of SALT-II.' Hall considered these foes of limiting strategic arms are afflicted with a 'Jonestown mentality'⁵ and prefer that all humankind should better be dead than that détente should be consolidated in the military sphere. They intend, he said, 'to end détente, create a new cold war, fuel the arms race and create a nuclear first-strike capability.'

Hall defined the aim of the foreign-policy line of U.S. state-monopoly capitalism as unchanged in its overall direction — 'that is, to mobilize the maximum forces against all sectors of the world revolutionary process.' As evidence of the basic aggressive intent of this foreign policy, he cited 'plans and steps to increase the "U.S. military pres-

ence," especially around the oil fields; playing the China card 'on cue from the Pentagon' against the world revolutionary process; trying to create on the African continent a long-term reserve of strategic and other raw materials for itself. A logical conclusion of this evidence of U.S. state-monopoly capital's foreign-policy aims is that unless this foreign policy is turned around, the danger of war and nuclear catastrophe will persist, the guns instead-of-butter budgets, extortionate taxation of the working people and the spiralling price inflation will all continue to escalate. As Gus Hall said, 'This "stop the world" process of U.S. foreign policy is the most costly to the people of the United States.'

A new mainstream

However, as many delegates remarked, the masses are linking this costly and perilous foreign policy to other issues. They are connecting the struggle for peace with struggles around inflation, wages, taxes, unemployment, the dollar crisis and the energy rip-off, the crisis of the cities, health care, education, racism and male supremacist practices. The process of linkage has made the fight for peace a vital economic, political and moral issue.

Gus Hall reported that 'as never before, the overwhelming sentiment is for world peace. A majority is against the huge military budget. . . . A majority is now convinced we cannot have both guns and butter — and the people want butter.' He said the objective situation is now ripe for the formation of a majority peace front.

The crystallization of a majority sentiment and the objective conditions for a majority movement for peace has carried over into other areas. There is a majority sentiment for political independence, a majority sentiment for an end to inflation and the tax robbery, a majority sentiment against racism. Despite the present massive effort of monopoly capital to erase from the people's memories the lessons they have drawn from recent developments — from the U.S. imperialist debacle in Vietnam, from Watergate and the exposure of the flagrant FBI and CIA violations of the people's rights — the process of radicalization continues to turn ever growing numbers against the corporations and the government. 'The mood,' said Hall, 'is now overwhelmingly and solidly anti-corporate, anti-monopoly and anti-state.'

Contrary to the view widely disseminated by the monopoly-controlled mass media that the U.S. working people either are passive spectators and philistine captives of consumerism, or are moving to middle-class, conservative and even right-wing positions, the Convention produced incontrovertible evidence, given by delegate after delegate, of an opposite trend among the people. On the basis of such evidence accumulated weeks and months before the Convention, Gus Hall reported that 'in their broadest sense, the mass currents, the mass sentiments, including the ones in their embryonic stage, represent majority viewpoints. Because of these shifts in mass patterns of thought the mainstream has changed. It is no more the passive and conserva-

tive majority sector. Its political makeup has changed. . . . There is anger and disillusionment in this new mainstream of American life.'

The radicalization process

Because of the potential for progressive change created by the radicalization process, the Convention subjected it to in-depth analysis. Its heart, of course, or rather 'the cardinal essence of today's reality,' as Gus Hall characterized it, is the radicalization of the working class. And the delegates, of whom 134 were trade unionists from every major trade union in the country, 82 workers in basic industries, and 71 in other industries and agriculture, had no difficulty in singling out the basic cause of the process. It is a result of the gigantic brutal robbery of the working people by the monopolies in collusion with the state. Furthermore, the scale of the robbery gives a new dimension to the well-known reality of life under capitalism; the rich become richer, the poor, poorer. Gus Hall cited the facts:

- Annual after-tax profits are now reaching the \$150 billion mark.

- Corporate profits have more than tripled in the last 10 years . . . during a period when the rate of growth of production has been almost stagnant.

- . . . workers' take-home pay . . . has been on a downward slide since 1965. In fact, the real wages of workers are the same in 1979 as they were 15 years ago. In the first four months of this year workers lost 3.5 per cent in real wages.

- When measured by the yardstick of food, clothing, housing, transportation and medical care, the inflation rate is now 18.5 per cent.

- The continuing absolute decline in real wages is a new phenomenon in our times. The high rate of exploitation of our working class and the resulting surplus value continue to increase at a fast clip. And the high rate of inflation adds but another element to this system of exploitation.

- The tripling of profits is possible because of the role of the state: strike-breaking injunctions and police brutality; government subsidies to monopolies; systematic shifting of the tax burden from corporate profits to workers' wages; 'income policies' that limit wages and insure the increase in the rate of surplus value.

These facts, said Hall reflect 'the objective setting for the class struggle for this period of time.' And as the economy enters the 1980s in an economic recession that can — and most likely will — develop into a full-blown economic crisis, the class confrontation will sharpen, the radicalization process will pick up momentum, and certain consequences of this process will continue to develop.

A changing labor force

Sharing the enthusiasm of the delegates for the manifestations of internationalist solidarity at the Convention, some speakers stressed the importance of the international character of the U.S. labor force. Indeed, the national and racial composition of the delegates typified the multinational and multiracial

character of the working class (including alternate delegates, there were 385 people, including 96 Afro-America, 15 Chicano, 77 Jewish, nine Native American Indians, and delegates of many Asian and European ethnic origins). Moreover, in consequence of the radicalization process, the growth of class consciousness, and the breaking down of regional differentials, the working class has attained a new level of ideological and political unity. 'These developments have prepared the working class for organizing the unorganized, for a new level of affirmative action programs, a new level of class consciousness, for class political independence and for a new working-class offensive,' said Gus Hall.

Taking this new situation into account, the delegates adopted measures to assist the workers in these activities. Emphasis was given to a new impetus in industrial concentration, to the struggle for left-center unity, for industry-wide rank-and-file forms of organization, for developing a grass-roots base for mass movements. The party's work along these lines was considered a necessary ingredient for enabling the working class to wage successful struggles against the monopolies' offensive, against racism and the reactionary moves of the ultra-right forces.

Prospects for the struggle against racism, for concrete affirmative action measures to advance the fight for equality, were stressed by James Jackson, CC Political Bureau member, who introduced the resolution on the Afro-American struggle for equality. Strengthening the unity of the working class is essential for successfully waging this struggle, Jackson said, because 'the working class is the wheel that moves the destiny of all nationally oppressed peoples.'⁶

The delegates demonstrated their understanding of the importance of raising the unity of the working class to higher levels. They adopted resolutions on defending the rights of immigrant workers, on protecting young workers subjected to special harsh forms of exploitation, on formulating a policy vis-a-vis workers of the Asian and Pacific regions, and on the struggles of the Native American Indians.

The strengthening of working-class unity and the development of its fighting potentials were also viewed as essential for the realization of efforts to develop independent political action. With the presidential elections scheduled in November 1980, the Convention decided to concentrate on building a structure of political independence, regardless of whether President Carter or Senator Kennedy may be nominated by the Democratic Party. 'The two-party system remains a blind alley for the majority of the people,' said Gus Hall, who pointed to the formation of an Afro-American and Hispanic Political Caucus, involving members of the Congress, and the appearance of a 'Citizens' Party' as indicative of the growing majority sentiment for political independence.

However, Hall urged the Convention to plan the party's electoral work not only as a means of mass agitation and propaganda, but also as a way of ac-

quiring political power and getting the right people elected. 'We encourage and help to build independent anti-monopoly movements in the political arena, particularly those that arise in the ranks of labor, and we press for unity on grass-roots and national levels,' he said. But he added: 'We must take our concept of a working class in alliances with the people of oppressed nationalities, women and youth, and turn it into a concrete electoral plan for political power in states and cities . . . We must run serious campaigns.'

The struggle for free elections

Yet, the task of running serious campaigns is linked with the task of winning full legality, and the delegates were given fresh evidence of how unfree U.S. elections have become. Even the modest goal of obtaining ballot rights in only 30 of the 50 states is a huge undertaking for the CPUSA. A maze of anti-democratic restrictions (29 states have enacted laws to bar the Communist Party and its candidates from the ballot) and action by the federal government is directed against the party. Moreover, harassment of the party by the political police continues at a high level, with 26 million pages of files in the FBI's national headquarters alone compiled from 1936 to date. What is more, 90,000 pages date from 1976 — the year of Carter's election to the Presidency — all of which have been produced during an ongoing investigation.

But the CPUSA will enter the electoral battle, the Convention decided, since communist participation is a vital cog in the drive for independent political action. 'The many-sided struggle for legality which the party has been compelled to wage since the moment of its birth 60 years ago continues,' said Hall. 'We conduct it not as a matter of narrow self-interest, but as an essential ingredient of the ongoing struggle to preserve and extend the democratic liberties of all.'

Throughout the Convention sessions speakers gave reports of episodes on the party's 60 years of struggle and achievements since its founding in September 1919. It was made clear that the party had either participated in or led struggles on every important issue since its founding. Dramatizing the significance of the occasion and demonstrating the continuity of the party's struggles, 32 charter and founding members received special honors and flowers from members of the Young Workers Liberation League.

The delegates elected a Central Committee and a National Council, and the Central Committee unanimously re-elected the party's national officers, Henry Winston as national chairperson, Gus Hall as general secretary. A summary report by Winston concluded the Convention.

The next day a rally in Cobo Hall, the second largest convention center in the USA, drew 8,000 people from all sections of the country to hear Hall and Angela Davis. Hall's speech was read in his absence. Both focussed attention on the plight of 6,000 families whose breadwinners were scheduled to become jobless because of a decision of the

Chrysler Corporation management to shut down its Dodge auto plant in Detroit. The situation was typical of a growing pattern of corporate irresponsibility and callousness throughout the country, as the now permanent army of unemployed workers makes evident.

Angela Davis, noting that virtually all the women workers, Arab workers and Afro-American workers had already been discharged, declared: 'We are going to do everything in our power to prevent the shutdown.'⁷ Gus Hall, outlining measures which Michigan legislators could take to prevent the shutdown, said: 'The time has come for a radical change.' He called for the rally to initiate a mass campaign to establish a network of People's Committees throughout the country 'that will initiate protests and demonstrations against high prices, taxes and rents . . . and would become active in the electoral arena.'⁸

The rally was the actual end of the 22nd National Convention and 60th anniversary celebration. Delegates departed on a note of confidence that the objective conditions had matured for building the CPUSA into a mass party.

1. Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA. *Main Political Report to the 22nd National Convention of the CPUSA*. August 23-26, 1979, Cobo Hall, Detroit. All further quotations of Gus Hall's report are from this publication.

2. *Daily World*, August 30, 1979.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Daily World*, August 28, 1979.

5. 'Jonestown mentality' refers to the behavior of U.S. religious cult leader Jim Jones, who led large numbers of his followers to a site northwest of Guyana's capital city, and on November 18, 1978, fearing exposure and probable prosecution, killed himself and more than 900 of his followers.

6. *Daily World*, August 30, 1979.

7. *Ibid.*

8. *Ibid.*

Just published:

The Ukrainian Socialist Movement in Canada 1907-1918

Peter Krawchuk

Paper, 112 pages, \$2.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Consistent patriots and internationalists

David Khenin

Member, Political Bureau, Secretary, Central Committee,
Communist Party of Israel

The Communist Party of Israel is celebrating its 60th anniversary this year. In the course of decades, generations of Jewish and Arab communists have been educated by the Communist Party in hard struggles under illegal and legal conditions against British imperialist rule and its Zionist and Arab reactionary stooges. During the 31 years since the proclamation of the State of Israel, the Communist Party of Israel has been struggling to reorient official Israeli policy toward peace, against dependence on U.S. imperialism, for democracy and social progress.

In this anniversary year I would like to recall some stages of our party's history. In 1919 a group of revolutionaries in Palestine founded the Socialist Workers' Party. In 1921 its name was changed to Communist Party of Palestine. With the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 the party became the Communist Party of Israel.¹

The Communist Party of Palestine came into being in the new epoch of world history. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and the teachings of Lenin, who developed Marxism, opened up new horizons for the working class in capitalist countries and for colonial peoples fighting for national and social liberation. This was a powerful factor in the formation of Marxist-Leninist parties in various countries, Palestine among them. In spite of a certain lack of ideological clarity and the absence of consistency at the beginning, the new party in Palestine dissociated itself at the very outset from the Second International, sided firmly with the October Revolution, and considered Lenin's party — the Party of Bolsheviks — the model for a revolutionary workers' party.

The Fifth Congress of the CPP in July 1923 demonstrated that Marxist-Leninist ideology had been consolidated in the party. The Congress clearly defined the party's aims and tasks. It saw its central task in fighting for Palestine's independence, for its liberation from British colonial rule. British imperialism conducted a policy of 'divide and rule,' with the assistance of the Zionist movement and reactionary Arab circles. From time to time this led to bloodshed between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. The Fifth Congress defined the party's attitude toward the Arab liberation movement and toward Zionism. The resolution said: 'In the Arab national movement we see one of the principal factors of the struggle against British imperialism. Therefore, we consider it our duty to do everything

to support this movement, insofar as it fights imperialism.' And with regard to Zionism: 'Zionism is a movement in which the aspirations of the Jewish bourgeoisie are being realized ... Politically, Zionism has sided with British imperialism, tying its destiny to the imperialist occupants.' The Zionist movement with all its parties, it will be recalled, supported the British Mandate, actively siding with British rule against the struggle for national independence conducted by the anti-imperialist Arab national movement in Palestine.

The Communist Party of Palestine was the only political organization with a clear program of struggle for national independence, while ensuring the rights of the Jewish national minority. After its Fifth Congress, it became the only party in the country uniting Jews and Arabs.

In February 1924 the Communist Party of Palestine was admitted to the Communist International.

The Communist Party of Palestine dedicated itself to the common struggle of the Jewish and Arab working people against British rule and its colonialist policy of 'divide and rule,' against the ideology and practice of Zionism, against the eviction of the Arab fellahin (peasants) from their land, and the expulsion of the Arab laborers from their places of work. At the same time, the party stood up against Arab reaction which, too, contributed to the policy of 'divide and rule' pursued by British imperialism in Palestine, conciliated itself to foreign domination, and presented no democratic plan to ensure equality of rights for the Jewish population. Zionist reaction charged that the Jewish communists were 'Arab agents,' while Arab reaction accused the Arab communists of being 'Zionist agents.'

For many years, from 1921 until 1942, the party operated under difficult underground conditions. The British authorities and their supporters persecuted the communists, subjecting them to imprisonment, torture, murder, and deportation. In April 1924 the Zionist leaders passed a decision at the Histadrut Conference to expel the communist bloc from the trade unions. This decision was revoked, after a consistent struggle, only in the year 1944.

More than 2,000 communists were deported from the country; many fell directly into the hands of the secret police in the fascist countries to which they were deported. This was the most cruel and dangerous means taken by the British rulers to hit the party and its leading cadres, to weaken it and

prevent the growth of its strength and influence.

In the face of cruel terror and in a chauvinist atmosphere, the party had, more than once, to conduct an ideological and political struggle against Jewish and Arab nationalist deviations and against opportunist trends in its ranks. These deviations were designed to undermine the Marxist-Leninist foundations of the party, its internationalist essence, its Jewish-Arab unity, its solidarity with the Soviet Union, with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with the forces of national and social liberation in the Middle East and the world. They were also designed to hit the Leninist principles of party organization, especially democratic centralism. Trials of this kind befell us also in the subsequent period when, in 1965, a group of nationalist renegades attempted to divert the party from its correct path, but suffered complete failure.²

The historical experience of our party teaches that only a Marxist-Leninist approach, only a working-class approach to the solution of the national question makes it possible to overcome the antagonism between various peoples, create a basis for their common struggle, and establish relations of dignity and mutual respect of rights.

Our party was always alert to the national question. This was required by the situation. In 1922, the Jewish population constituted 13 per cent and in 1931, 18 per cent of the total population of Palestine. With the coming of nazism to power emigration from Germany grew, and a part of it arrived in this country. After the Second World War the Jewish population in Palestine numbered 650,000 persons (1948). It constituted one-third of the total population and stood at the center of industrial capitalist development, at the center of the development of the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and of the industrial proletariat; on the other. In this situation, the country, once mononational, became binational. A Jewish nation has developed alongside the Arab nation in Palestine.

True to the Leninist principles in the national question, the Communist Party implemented them in the new conditions, which were created in Palestine and turned it into a country of two peoples. In the struggle for the liquidation of the British Mandate and the evacuation of the British army, it elaborated a new program for the solution of the national question in Palestine, after liberation, based upon recognition of the right of both peoples to self-determination.

The new situation created in the world in consequence of the victory over fascism, the strengthening of the international position of the Soviet Union, the emergence of a world socialist system, the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, the intensification of the peoples' struggle for national liberation in the Middle East and in other regions, and the general weakening of imperialism in the world — All these factors led also to the weakening of British imperialism in our country, to the strengthening of the demand of the Jewish and Arab masses for an end to foreign, British rule and for national independence. And indeed, the UN Gen-

eral Assembly decided on November 29, 1947 to abolish the British Mandate, to evacuate the British army, and to divide Palestine into two independent, democratic states — Jewish and Arab. At the basis of this decision lay the recognition of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people and of the Jewish people.

The Israeli people realized this right and established their state, while the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination and national independence was not realized, and a considerable part of it became refugees, in consequence of the 1948-1949 war unleashed by imperialism and its henchmen.

The Communist Party expressed its support for the UN resolution, sided with the struggle to implement this resolution, supported the establishment of the State of Israel, and came out for the establishment of the Palestinian Arab state, in accordance with the resolution of the UN General Assembly. At the same time, the Communist Party opposed the Zionist tendencies toward expansion, which were intended to prevent the establishment of the Palestinian Arab state. The party denounced the Ben-Gurion-Abdallah agreement to divide the Arab part of Palestine Between Israel and Jordan.

The Palestinian problem is still central in the Israeli-Arab conflict. Without the realization of the Palestinian Arab people's right to self-determination, including their right to establish their own independent state — the communists said and are saying — no solution to the conflict in the Middle East can be found, no peace will be established, and there will be no end to wars.

Without the realization of the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, security will not be ensured to the people of Israel and the integration of Israel as a state with equal rights in the family of the peoples of the region will not be ensured either. Peace will benefit all the peoples of the region; it will consolidate their national independence and contribute to the struggle for social progress.

The continuation of the Israeli-Arab conflict and the prevention of a comprehensive and just solution benefits imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, which strives to ensure the interests of its oil and arms monopolies, who rake in many billions at the expense of the independence, natural wealth, and blood of the peoples of the region. U.S. imperialism strives to harness the states of the region to its strategical plans.

True to the cause of struggle for peace, national independence and social progress, our Communist Party is the only party in Israel that condemned the triple aggression (Britain-France-Israel) against Egypt in 1956 and the aggressive war which the Israeli government unleashed against Egypt, Syria and Jordan in 1967. The aim of that war was to topple the anti-imperialist regimes in Egypt and Syria, to deal a blow to the anti-imperialist national-liberation movements of the Arab peoples, and to eradicate the Palestinian problem. The war was aimed at serving the predatory interests of U.S. imperialism, from which it had total support and

which up to this day encourages the annexationist policy of the ruling circles in Israel.

The Israeli occupation of Arab territories, over a period of more than 12 years, the oppression in the occupied lands, and the Israeli colonialist settlements in these territories have hit and are hitting the Israeli people itself. They led to the October 1973 war, to loss of life among the Israeli people, to an intolerable burden of military spending (two-thirds of the total budget), to the growth of foreign debts, which this year amount to more than \$14 billion (more than \$3,500 per capita, including new-born babies), to soaring prices, to galloping inflation which in 1979 will reach a rate of 100 per cent, to an unprecedented political, economic and moral crisis.

The Camp David agreement, which is a separate deal between Israel and Egypt under U.S. aegis, is intended to block the path to a comprehensive and just solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict. It is designed to serve the aims of U.S. imperialist strategy, of establishing a military bloc and U.S. military, naval and air bases in Israel and Egypt against the national-liberation movement of the peoples in the region, the Persian Gulf and Africa. It is directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

In exchange for the return of the Sinai peninsula, within three years, and that with certain limitations on Egyptian sovereignty, Sadat has given his support to the continuation of the Israeli occupation in the form of 'Beginist autonomy,' to the denial of the Palestinian Arab people's right to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state in the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. Under the cover of the Camp David agreement, an aggressive policy is being carried out against Lebanon: Palestinian refugee camps and South-Lebanese villages and towns are bombed from the air and shelled from sea and land. South Lebanon is, in fact, under Israeli occupation. The Begin government strives to eliminate the Palestinian movement, the PLO.

The Begin government, just as and even more than the Labor government, regards the strengthening of a realistic attitude in the Palestinian movement and in the Arab world as a threat to its policy and aims.

On the other hand, chauvinist declarations, which deny Israel's right to existence and actions which hit the civil population in Israel have helped the anti-Arab, chauvinist policy of the ruling circles in Israel and of the leadership of the world Zionist movement. The consent of all of Israel's neighbors and of the dominant forces in the PLO leadership to the establishment of a just and stable peace, which will ensure the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people as well as those of Israel, helps foil official Israeli policy in the international arena and in Israel itself.

The Soviet Union put its whole weight on the scales in order to secure an end to British rule in Palestine and the withdrawal of the British army from the country. The Soviet Union played a major

role in the adoption of the 1947 UN resolution granting independence to both peoples of the country, Jewish and Arab, and providing for the establishment of two independent states: a Jewish state — Israel — and a Palestinian Arab state. The Soviet Union demanded a halt to the war in Palestine and the complete implementation of the UN resolution.

It was the Soviet Union which acted to prevent an Anglo-American trusteeship over Palestine, which the U.S. government proposed in early 1948 in an attempt to abort the UN resolution of 1947 on the Palestinian question. In its support for the formation of the State of Israel in 1948 and in establishing diplomatic relations with it, the Soviet Union did not pursue an 'anti-Arab policy,' as the pro-imperialist reaction in the Arab world claimed. Similarly, in its present support for the Arab peoples' struggle against the Israel occupation of the Arab territories occupied in June 1967, and for the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination and to the establishment of their sovereign and independent state, the Soviet Union does not pursue an 'anti-Israeli policy.' It pursues, today as in the past, a principled Leninist policy toward the Middle East, as toward any other problem on the international scene.

The Soviet policy of peace, which demands a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict and of the Palestinian problem on the basis of recognition of the legitimate national rights of all sides involved, including the Palestinian Arab people and the State of Israel, evokes the fury of the ruling Israeli circles. They consider this position of the Soviet Union an obstacle to their lust for territorial expansion and annexation of the occupied Arab territories. This is one of the main reasons for the anti-Soviet campaigns of the Israeli governments and the leadership of the Zionist movement, which has been intensified since the June 1967 war.

An improvement of relations and friendship with the Soviet Union are vital to the national interest of all the peoples of the region, including the Israeli people, for it would serve the cause of peace, security, and national independence of all the peoples of the Middle East. Therefore, the Communist Party of Israel considers the struggle against all forms of anti-Sovietism an internationalist as well as a patriotic task. This struggle is part and parcel of the general struggle of our party for a different Israel, one that champions peace, national independence and social progress.

The Communist Party of Israel considers that it is its internationalist duty to help strengthen the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and advance the cause of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Our party fights every stripe of opportunism, right and 'left.' Our party considers the policy of the present Chinese leadership anti-socialist, for it assists the most extreme and reactionary imperialist forces in the world, including the Middle East. The severest

expression of this policy has been the aggression against socialist Vietnam.

The Communist Party of Israel expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the communist and workers' parties and of all the anti-imperialist and progressive forces, and acts for tightening and expanding the bonds of friendship with them.

The Israeli communists stand in the forefront of the struggle for defense of the rights of workers and the inhabitants of slum areas, for equality of national and civil rights for the Arab population, against discrimination and land expropriation, in defense of democratic freedoms and against the fascization of political life in Israel, for equal rights for women, and the defense of the rights of young people.

By stating that the struggle for a just and comprehensive peace is the strategic aim facing the party at this stage, by its devotion to the interests of the workers and other working masses, Jews and Arabs alike, the party rallies all realistically-minded forces, irrespective of ideological differences, in order to establish fronts in the struggle for peace, democracy, and the interests of the working people.

Subsequent upon the initiative taken by the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, which took place in December 1976, the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (DFPE) was established in March 1977, in which besides the Communist Party, various Jewish and Arab progressive circles participate. In the elections to the Knesset in May 1977, the Front polled 4.6 per cent of all the votes (as compared with the party's 3.4 per cent in the 1973 elections). The Front received 5 of the 120 seats in the Knesset.³ An important achievement was also attained by the Front's list in the elections to the Histadrut (Trade Unions) Congress in the same year. It increased its representation in the Executive Committee of the Histadrut from four to six members.

The party and its allies in the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality were extremely successful in the municipal elections at the end of 1978, particularly among the Arab population. Twenty representatives of the Democratic Front were elected to the post of mayors and heads of local councils (as compared with nine in the previous elections) and 112 members were elected to local councils (as against 54 previously) in 37 towns and villages (as against 23 localities previously).⁴ The party acts for broadening the Front and for the crystallization of forces which could be an alternative to the anti-national and anti-worker policy pursued by the Likud government.

In Israel there is a growing number of persons who understand that without the solution of the Palestinian problem, without the recognition of the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination, including their right to establish

their independent state alongside Israel, no peace and security will be achieved, no solution will be found to the sharpening economic and social problems of Israel.

Today an internal crisis is facing the Begin government and all the parties in the government and also those which participated in the previous governments. The lack of confidence in the Begin government is growing; the lack of confidence in the Labor Party leadership, which was in power until 1977, is continuing.

The Likud government, headed by Begin, is the most reactionary government ever to rule in Israel. The continuation of its rule is liable to pose an even greater danger than before to peace, democracy and workers' rights. The July 1979 plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel published a statement which called for rallying all the forces in the struggle to bring down the Likud government and for holding new elections. The formation of a broad democratic front of all the Jewish and Arab circles and personalities aspiring for peace and possessing political realism, irrespective of party affiliation, is the alternative to the role of the Likud and the policy of the present leadership of the Labor Party, which, too, is after annexations, and which denies national rights to the Palestinian Arab people.

The strength of the Communist Party of Israel lies in the fact that it is guided by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism and applies it to the specific conditions of Israel. Its strength lies in the fact that it unites Jewish and Arab communists in its ranks. Its strength lies in its internationalist and patriotic policy.

Its strength lies in its bonds of solidarity with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, with the international communist and workers' movement, with the anti-imperialist national-liberation movement in the Middle East and the world.

While they celebrate the 60th anniversary of their party, the Israeli communists are making an effort to intensify the struggle for a just peace in the Middle East, a new set of relations between the peoples of the region based on cooperation and friendship, and for a socialist future for the people of Israel.

1. The communists of the Palestinian territories, joined to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, established, in common with Jordanian communist elements there, the Jordanian Communist Party.

2. This is a reference to the Mikunis-Sneh pro-Zionist group, which split away from our party and later dissolved itself by joining a new small Zionist party (SHELLI).

3. For details, see Emile Touma, 'The ultra-right in power: causes and consequences,' *WMR*, August 1977. — Ed.

4. See Tawfiq Toubi, 'Political lessons of the latest local elections in Israel,' *WMR*, February 1979 — Ed.

New experience

OUR INTERVIEWS

ORIENTED UPON PRACTICE

Josef Schleifstein

Director, Institute of Marxist Studies, (Frankfurt-on-Main, FRG)

Your Institute needs no introduction to our readers. A well-known and authoritative center of Marxist studies, it has marked its tenth anniversary. Would you characterize the institute's most important studies over the past few years and the main lines of its current research?

J. Schleifstein. Our Institute's work over a period of more than ten years could be characterized briefly as follows: our research associates have concentrated on the FRG's economic development and on the social and economic condition of the workers and other sections of the working people. We have carried out a number of important studies in the development of the consciousness of the working class in the contest between the ideologies. All of this is reflected in publications of the Institute itself, and also in many popular scientific works written by its various associates. An indication of the size of our readership is the fact that the works of the Institute are being distributed by over 700 booksellers in the FRG and abroad.

But, of course, what is most important is how the results of our studies and of the whole activity of the Institute are reflected in the practice of the trade union and working-class movement in our country. This is much more difficult to assess, but that is the most important aspect of our work. We seek most closely to tie it in with the working people's daily needs, and with the concrete and most burning problems of the working-class movement.

Among the works we have published in the recent period is a three-volume study of the FRG's class and social structure in the 1950s-1970s; studies of the FRG's economic condition, an analysis of the cyclical crisis of overproduction. In many books there is an examination of various aspects of the social confrontation in the country, the strike struggle in the first place. The Institute has published works analyzing the advance of the anti-imperialist movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. *

Quarterly analyses of the FRG's economic condition have a place apart among our publications. These examine the movement of wages, the correlation between wages and prices, changes in labor productivity and its correlation with wages, the taxation system, and other matters which party and trade union functionaries have to deal with in their practical work every day. We have issued the *Worker's and Employee's Handbook* containing an at-

tempt to explain to the working people in industry the most important concepts which bear directly on their production and trade union activity. This handbook has already had many editions. This year we are putting out a new, completely revised edition.

From the outset the Institute oriented itself on making the results of its studies available to the largest possible number of people, above all those directly working in industry. We believe that in our country there is a substantial gap between Marxism's potential capability of showing the way to social progress, on the one hand, and the still inadequate actual impact of Marxist ideas on the daily life of our compatriots, on the other. Our task is to help reduce this gap.

Conferences with an attendance between scores and a thousand and more people are a main form for acquainting practitioners in the working-class movement with our studies, a form which simultaneously helps us to verify our conclusions in the light of the experience of the day-to-day struggle. We have held conferences on questions of vital importance to the working-class movement in our country like the 'The Frankfurt School in the Light of Marxism,' 'Economic Theory, Political Strategy, and the Trade Unions,' 'Class Structure and Class Self-Awareness in the FRG,' 'Working-Class Youth: Self-Awareness and Activity,' 'Monopolies, the Economic Core of Present-Day Capitalism,' 'The Cultural Requirements of the Working Class in the FRG,' and 'Crisis Development and the Workers' Self-Awareness.'

The last conference of this kind was held in March on the subject: 'Rationalization. Jobs. Struggle for Wage Rates.' It was attended by over 500 people virtually from every area of the Federal Republic (we had many more applications to attend than we could accommodate). Interest in this problem is quite natural, because the working people of the FRG increasingly feel the negative consequences of the monopolies' use of scientific and technical progress for their self-seeking purposes.

I should like to note that our studies bear on the interests not only of the working class but also other sections of the working people. The Institute seeks to deepen the study of the prerequisites for setting up a united anti-monopoly front and ensuring unity of action by all the anti-monopoly forces in the country. One could say that basic research and analysis of the concrete socio-economic and political situation in the FRG help to create the basis for such unity of action.

What are the main lines of your research today?

J. Schleifstein. We continue to concentrate on the analysis of contemporary state-monopoly

capitalism and the further elaboration of theory in this sphere, and in the sphere of the state-political superstructure. We have been studying the problem of manpower reproduction, the development of the political consciousness of the working class, the young people in the first place, social movements, and the theory and practice of the trade union movement. An important line of our present work is to research the impact of scientific and technical progress on the socio-economic condition of factory and office workers in the FRG. We intend to make a deeper study of the social and economic consequences of the arms race. Our task is to present possible alternatives to the militarization of the economy. Thus, we want to analyze the impact of disarmament on the labor market: we believe that a slowdown of, to say nothing of a halt to, the arms race, far from reducing the number of jobs (as some claim), will, in fact, increase it.

How is the Institute's work organized? Who are the people involved in your studies?

J. Schleifstein. We only have a small permanent staff, six or seven people, the same number as we had ten years ago. We cannot afford more. Our receipts come from the sale of our publications and as donations from persons with an interest in Marxist studies. We manage to cope with our fairly large tasks by working collectively. The Institute has gradually become a center attracting a large group of Marxist scientists, chiefly among young scientists working at universities, and also senior students, trade union functionaries, journalists, party functionaries, and factory and office workers. We have estimated that nearly a thousand persons have contributed to the work of the Institute in one form or another.

We also have extensive international contacts, attaching much importance to exchanges of information on Marxist studies and participation in discussions. The Institute maintains constant ties with roughly 30 research organizations in socialist and capitalist countries.

The Institute's scientific work is, apart from everything else, a good platform for cooperation between the communists and other Marxist thinkers. Many left-wing social democrats and non-party people had been working on our publications, for they have an interest in such cooperation and also seek to carry on their activity — on the theoretical and methodological level — in the light of Marxism.

CIRCLE OF WMR FRIENDS

Jeronimo Carrera
CC member, CP Venezuela

We have learned that a circle of 'WMR' readers has been set up in Caracas on the initiative of the CP Venezuela. Could you tell us about its purposes and work?

J. Carrera. This is one of the party's undertakings designed to intensify our ideological work both among communists and among all the other revolutionary and democratic forces. We believe that

WMR can do a great deal to help us. The assimilation of the ideas of scientific socialism and communism can be really profound and meet the practical requirements of the struggle only when it is linked to a study of the present-day quest by Marxist-Leninist thought giving an idea of the important problems now facing the communists and all the other revolutionary and democratic forces. We think that this theoretical question is broadly reflected on the pages of WMR. That was one of the main reasons for setting up the circle of WMR friends.

We also had other motives. Some of our party members think that theory is the business of arm-chair scientists. We want the circle to help us refute this narrow view and to convince those who think so that practical revolutionary struggle cannot be effective without a sound knowledge of revolutionary theory. We intend to step up our propaganda of Marxism-Leninism among young workers and intellectuals, and to involve them in the work of the circle. Finally, a collective study of the journal will help to strengthen the communists' positions in their ideological struggle against diverse opponents of scientific communism.

How is the work of the circle organized?

J. Carrera. After a preliminary reading of an issue of WMR, we present for discussion one of its articles that interests us in theoretical and practical terms. Thus, the first meeting of the circle analyzed 'Marxism-Leninism and the Cuban Revolution,' an article by Fidel Castro, First Secretary, CC CP Cuba.

What we have is an actual study, and not merely political enlightenment. This means that in the course of a collective discussion of some article we seek not only to know more about the questions raised in it, but also to understand their social roots, content, and place and role in the revolutionary struggle, to understand the methodological approach to them, etc. We believe that debate and discussion are the most productive form of our work. We make a special effort to tie in the study of every article in WMR with our country's realities so as to have a better understanding of the goals of the Venezuelan communists.

Besides our theoretical work, we devote much attention to the extensive information on the fraternal parties' experience appearing in every issue of the journal, for it contains many facts that are of value for the communists' internationalist education. We hope that this first circle will be successful and that it will help to organize similar circles of WMR friends in other towns in Venezuela.

DOCUMENTS

AFGHANISTAN

Focus on work among intellectuals

The Political Bureau of the PDPA Central Committee has published a decision under the heading 'Work Among Intellectuals by Party Organizations.' This decision notes that an important aspect of this

work is to draw economic experts and creative workers into the building of a new life.

Much is being done to wipe out illiteracy and improve the public education system. This effort involves over 15,000 people. However, some intellectuals are still inactive both in their own field and in public life; they keep aloof from the working people's expanding activity in labor and in politics and succumb to the influence of imperialist propaganda. Party committees and branches are not doing enough to explain party policy to intellectuals; they draw few engineers, technicians, teachers, and other specialists into production and public life, into work among the population and the effort to expose the intrigues of internal counter-revolution and imperialism.

The decision instructs party committees everywhere to organize educational work among intellectuals in order to bring every specialist and every creative worker into vigorous activity for the good of the revolution and the people.

In their work, the decision stresses, party organizations should take the peculiarities of each group of intellectuals into account; they should draw them into implementation of the country's economic and social development program, create an atmosphere of comradely good will, encourage advanced intellectuals, and firmly curb manifestations of superciliousness toward non-party comrades.

Attention is called to the need to draw more intellectuals into cultural and political work in the countryside and in work collectives, and to present the people's achievements more fully in literature, the arts, and the press. National newspapers, radio, and television should give readers and audiences more information on the life and work of the finest intellectuals.

POLAND

Prestige of local government bodies

The Political Bureau of the PUWP Central Committee has examined the work of gmina (rural commune) councils, or the lowest echelon of people's power. Its relevant decision points out that these bodies have become an important component of the administrative system working productively for the social and economic advancement of their areas and the nation as a whole.

The 1973-1975 territorial administration reform (establishing 49 provinces, 2,070 gminas, and 537 cities with gmina status) extended the powers of local government bodies and helped them enhance their efficiency and establish closer links with the population. Today the head of a gmina or city has the right to decide on virtually every vital problem of his area (local executive bodies adopt about nine million decisions annually). This is a further step toward democratizing government.

The local authorities have adequate material means to implement party guidelines and government decisions on various aspects of socialist construction. Their budget this year exceeds 219,000

million zlotys, which is earmarked for the building of homes, schools, hospitals, and cultural institutions and for the advancement of agriculture and local industries.

The PUWP Central Committee and provincial party committees do much in the way of selecting, placing, and educating cadres. Over 20 per cent of the gmina officials have received a higher education; the rest have a secondary education. Gmina staffs improve their professional qualifications at 28 provincial educational centers.

The organizing work of gmina councils in anticipation of the Eighth Party Congress and their close bonds with the electorate have the approval of the people. This heightens the prestige of local government bodies among the population. However, the Political Bureau decision points to the shortcomings in the functioning of gmina councils and formulates the key tasks that must be carried out to strengthen these important bodies.

IN THE MIRROR OF THE PRESS

PRAVDA

The cause of the entire party

Pravda published the materials of the All-Union Meeting of Ideological Workers, held in Moscow, which discussed the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee's resolution 'On the Further Improvement of Ideological Work and Political Education.' The meeting, which was opened by Mikhail Zimyanin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, summed up the results achieved so far in implementing the measures envisaged by the Central Committee, brought out the strong and weak points in the ideological work of the party organizations, and set priority tasks requiring special attention.

The newspaper also published the report, 'The Cause of the Entire Party,' delivered at the meeting by Mikhail Suslov, Political Bureau member and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Present-day ideological work, he said, should take into account the fact that the positive shifts in world politics and détente create, as was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, favorable opportunities for a wide dissemination of socialist ideas. On the other hand, the ideological confrontation of the two systems is growing more active and imperialist propaganda is becoming more subtle. Ideological workers should step up the struggle against bourgeois ideology and all manifestations of right and 'left' opportunism on the basis of a creative study of the problems of social development today.

The main distinctive feature of the CPSU's activity as a party of scientific communism, Suslov said, is that the theory of Marxism-Leninism is brought into organic unity with the revolutionary practice of the working class, with the creative work of the masses as the makers of history. Consideration for new social experience and a thorough analysis of the urgent needs of society's material and spiritual progress make up the basis of the extensive ideologico-theoretical and practical work which

the party and its Central Committee have been tirelessly carrying on. A scientific approach to ideological work, he noted, makes that work effective and lends it vitality.

A good deal remains to be done to make propaganda more efficient, specific and effective and to tie it in closer with life and with economic and political tasks. Special stress is laid on the strictest observance of Lenin's principle that there must be no discrepancy between words and deeds. This unity of word and deed, agitation by deeds, Suslov stressed, is decisive as a means of effectively influencing people's hearts and minds.

To implement the CPSU Central Committee's resolution is no easy matter; it is creative work. And we communists, he said, should not for a moment forget Lenin's precept that one must always advance to greater achievements, always go over from easier to more difficult tasks.

The participants in the meeting, *Pravda* writes, displayed a constructive approach and commitment as they discussed the Suslov report and the progress that has been made in fulfilling the Central Committee's resolution. The meeting was addressed also by leaders of party bodies, propagandists, members of work collectives, scientists and men of culture and art.

Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, characterized the present-day situation and summarized the main orientations of the CPSU's ideological work on the international scene, among them the upholding of the interests of existing socialism and the propagation of Marxism-Leninism; unflagging dissemination of the idea that peace and socialism are indivisible; simultaneous exposure of the mainsprings of militarism, the arms race, and the threat of war, which are implicit in imperialism; exposure of anti-communism, the utmost promotion of the cohesion of communist parties, and the strengthening of fraternal internationalist relations in the communist movement; explanation of the principled character of Soviet policy vis-à-vis the national-liberation movement and the struggle of nations against racism and colonialism; promotion of mutually beneficial cooperation among nations on the basis of peaceful coexistence; vigorous opposition to NATO's military plans and U.S. imperialism's military and political diktat, and the struggle for the maintenance and extension of détente.

Pyotr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau, CPSU Central Committee, and USSR Minister of Culture, spoke of problems of the all-round and harmonious development of the individual, of broadening cultural development, raising the ideological and artistic level in art, and improving cultural and educational work.

The participants in the meeting, *Pravda* writes, noted that the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee had done much to facilitate the further improvement of the quality and effectiveness of ideological and politico-educational work, and bring

political, labor, and moral education into closer unity in keeping with the specifics of the different groups of the people.

AKAHATA

Communist success

The Japanese communists' newspaper has summed up the results of the recent elections to the Lower House of the Diet.

The 511 seats, Akahata writes, were contended by about 900 candidates nominated in 130 electoral districts by seven political parties and also by small groups and independents. The Communist Party put forward 128 candidates. In three districts it supported the joint candidate of the democratic forces.

The CPJ won more than twice as many seats as before; it now holds 39. Also elected were two democratic candidates backed by it. The communists polled over 5.8 million of the 54 million votes cast. In some districts voters supported the communists for the first time since the war.

Komeito and the Democratic Socialism Party won somewhat more seats than previously. They now hold 57 and 35 respectively against 55 and 28 in the previous chamber. The Socialist Party lost seats. It now holds 107 against 123 in 1976.

Akahata notes the failure of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party (LDP) to regain monopoly control of the nation's highest legislative assembly. A considerable loss was also sustained by another conservative party, the New Liberal Club, which is allied with the LDP. The elections showed, Akahata comments, that the Japanese public's confidence in the policy of the parties of big capital is waning and that appreciable changes are taking place in the political orientation of Japanese society.

The newspaper carried a statement of the Standing Bureau of the CPJ Central Committee Presidium on the outcome of the elections. The Bureau notes that the CPJ gains are a sign of widespread support for its policy of championing the people's interests, democracy, peace and neutrality and its resistance to the anti-popular line of the ruling LDP. Writing highly of these gains, the Bureau stresses their importance as a factor in shaping Japan's policy for the 1980s.

In response to voter support, the statement says, the Communist Party will do everything to keep its promises and fight with still greater determination for changes in Japan's policy and for the formation of a united front of progressive forces and a democratic coalition government.

LIBERTAD

Initiative helps

In the closing months of every year, the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica launches fund-raising campaigns to support the revolutionary struggle in the country. During these campaigns party organizations take numerous initiatives to secure more funds.

Libertad, the communist weekly, reported a recent initiative of this nature. In San José the Regional Party Committee sponsored a fair as part of its annual fund-raising campaign. On sale at the fair were pottery, embroidered, knitted and leather articles, furniture, toys, and Christmas and other decorations. Besides, there were exhibitions of paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs and flowers. The cultural program comprised concerts and stage productions. *Libertad* feels certain that this communist initiative will yield tangible financial results.

HABLAN LOS COMUNISTAS

In the national interest

Hablan los Comunistas, newspaper of the Dominican Communist Party, carried the following report:

An economic committee of the party has revealed facts showing that foreign, primarily U.S., investments have become one of the principal means of exporting hard currency from the Dominican Republic. This conclusion has been drawn on the basis of a survey of the activities of 50 foreign enterprises with an aggregate capital in excess of \$300 million. In 1977 they netted a profit of roughly \$83 million. The greater part of declared revenues was made by reinvesting profits, which had reached proportions that could not be concealed any longer.

Hablan los Comunistas cites statistical data on the economic situation of these 50 enterprises. The list is headed by a subsidiary of Rosario Resources, a U.S. company (capital — \$35 million) whose net profit totalled \$30,976,304, or 88 per cent of the aggregate capital.

The newspaper writes that although scandalous cases of profits being taken out of the country have been disclosed, MPs from the ruling Dominican Revolutionary Party and some spokesmen of the Reformist Party, now in opposition, oppose a draft law on curbing the company's profits after a new world price of gold is fixed. In view of the acute scarcity of hard currency, the government, backed by parliament, has asked several foreign banks for a \$185 million credit. The onerous legal terms of the credit agreement are a threat to national sovereignty, the newspaper says. The Communist Party sees a different solution to serious economic problems, namely, the nationalization of foreign enterprises, which it demands through its press and leadership.

QUESTION — ANSWER

REACHING THE MASSES THROUGH SPORTS

Dear Editor,

It has been reported in the press that the Workers' Sports Union of Finland marked its 60th anniversary. As a reader of your journal, I would like to ask Finnish comrades to describe in *WMR* the activity of this organization and the extent to which workers' parties, above all communists, participate in it.

Otto Schmitz,
Salzburg

Reply by Ossi Sjöman,
General Secretary,
Workers' Sports Union,
CC member, Communist Party of Finland

The Workers' Sports Union was founded in Finland in 1919 in response to the expulsion of all workers and their sports associations from the bourgeois-dominated national sports organization for taking part in the 1918 Civil War on the side of the Red Guards.

At the very beginning the Union openly identified itself as being an inalienable part of the working-class movement. This was seen, among other things, in its desire to cooperate with workers' sports organizations in other countries, notably our neighbor, the Soviet Union. The first such contact was established in 1922, when a WSU football team played in the USSR. Later the Union took part in workers' olympics in Frankfurt on Main, Vienna and Antwerp, and in the 1928 Moscow Spartakiad.

Our sports union today has direct links with the organized working class and in its program documents it states its determination to help attain its goals, the goals of socialism. This stand, however, does not prevent the WSU from taking part in organizing sports events together with the State Sports Union of Finland, the central bourgeois sports organization. This cooperation is based on a written agreement (though, despite this agreement, the WSU and sportsmen from among workers are often pushed aside).

The WSU's significance to the country's working-class movement is many-sided. Of special importance is, as experience has shown, that this independent organization allows the working class to attain its goals most effectively in the massive sports movement. There is a very significant organizational factor: the WSU has 450,000 members from over 1,350 workers' sports associations. Most of the WSU members are young people, of course, which makes it the country's largest youth organization. This explains why other contingents of the working-class movement — the trade unions and political parties — highly appreciate its work and give it growing moral and material support. This is all the more important because it is at the WSU that many of us had our first contact with the organized working-class movement. Due to this contact, thousands of people have maintained firm ties with the movement over the past six decades. And it is through the sports union that many leading personalities in the working-class movement, both communists and social democrats, first joined that movement.

Though the WSU is a sports organization and is known in the sports world as a voluntary organization of the working-class movement, educational work is one of its major goals. It uses its own means to spread socialist ideals among the people, above all among young people. The WSU seeks to step up its activities to a nationwide scale, laying stress not solely on physical training, but also on the spiritual and cultural education of young people, who, in their practical work and studies, are guided by the

basic ideals of the working-class movement.

The WSU has been instrumental in promoting cooperation between communists and social democrats. It played an important part in the 1920s, when it served as the main public forum of the left-wing working-class movement. At the turn of the 1950s, when the cold war was at its height and anti-communism had extended its positions, the right-wing social-democratic leadership attempted to disband the WSU by including it into the bourgeois sports movement. This resulted in a serious split. The right-wing social democrats set up a sports union of their own, but, nevertheless, a considerable segment of the social democrats remained in the WSU. The Union began to create conditions for extending cooperation, which expanded steadily and ultimately led to the signing last year of an

agreement between the Social-Democratic and Communist Parties on reuniting the workers' sports movement. The sports union, set up earlier by the Social-Democratic Party, ceased to exist. All the sportsmen of the working-class movement have reunited.

The Workers' Sports Union of Finland has marked its 60th anniversary. The celebrations in Helsinki were attended by over 40,000 union members and friends and more than 400 official delegations and sportsmen from 20 countries. This was more than a convincing demonstration of the sports movement's unity. It proved once again that the masses can be reached also through sports. All of us believe that the work of an organization like the WSU helps achieve the goals of the entire working-class movement.



The way to security: deterrence or disarmament

This question was considered by a round-table held by *World Marxist Review* and the International Institute of Peace in Vienna. It was attended by Professor Georg Fuchs, President of the International Institute of Peace; Walter Hollitscher, Chancellor of the International Institute of Peace; Professor Rudolf Weiler, Dean of the Institute of Peace Studies at Vienna University; Professor Thomas Schönfeld of the Department of Natural Sciences at Vienna University; A.S. Belyakov, scientific consultant at the International Institute of Peace (USSR), and Asst. Professor Pavel Auersperg, WMR Executive Editor (Czechoslovakia).

Below is a summary of the round-table.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PRESENT THREAT AND THE MEANING OF SALT-II

Auersperg. For three decades now the arms race, and the development and buildup of new types of death-dealing weapons have been justified by the West's peculiar military-political 'balance of terror' conception, according to which mankind's life and peace is guaranteed by 'global deterrence' within the framework of the bipolar NATO-Warsaw Treaty system. There is good reason, therefore, why disarmament, notably SALT-II, has now become the touchstone for bringing out the actual positions of statesmen, politicians, military men and scientists. Some welcome the Treaty, regarding it as a good basis for further advances in eliminating the threat of war, while others fiercely oppose it in an effort to

convince their own and other nations that the only way to guarantee peace and security is to build up a credible deterrent.

I suggest that we consider the following range of questions:

— What, in our opinion, is the new element in the scale and character of the arms race? What is the risk it poses today and over the long term? What is the importance of SALT-II in this context?

— Who hampers effective disarmament and how? Which forces and what kind of mental stereotypes?

— Where is the answer to the emergent problems to be found — in the military, political or ethical sphere?

— What are the tasks facing the peace fighters in this sphere?

Fuchs. I think that these questions are interesting and meaningful, although, of course, the number of problems in the struggle against the arms race is very much larger. The world is over-saturated with weapons. Military expenditures have already reached the astronomical figure of roughly \$400 billion and are still growing. The common nuclear potential of the leading powers has been estimated at roughly one million bombs like the one dropped on Hiroshima.

In this context, the signing of SALT-II, I think, is a highly important step which can change the atmosphere in the world. Following the earlier attempts to set minimal limitations on the development of strategic weapons in SALT-I, the two world powers

seek, in the new Treaty, to lay down mandatory limitations for all types of strategic weapons on such a scale for the first time ever. Let us note that the interests of both parties have been scrupulously observed and weighed, while the whole construct of the Treaty enjoins the partners to strengthen international security. In short, the Treaty increases mankind's hope for peaceful development.

Schönfeld. I think it is necessary to point out that the Treaty bears on two aspects — the quantitative and the qualitative — of the arms race. It limits the boundaries for the qualitative development and modernization of offensive weapons. That is very important. After all, the leaders of NATO have decided that up until the middle of the next decade each member of this military alliance is to increase its appropriations for armaments by 3 per cent a year.

It is not enough to calculate, in retrospect, how many hundreds of billions of dollars a year will be spent on weapons as a result. The important thing is to ask what these weapons will be like, and what is the threat posed by the new quality of the arms race. Here, it is not only a question of the neutron bomb. In many military-technical fields new types and new systems of weapons are now being developed, like Cruise missiles, MX mobile missiles, etc. Those who are responsible for this development seem deliberately to want to cast doubt on the very possibility of reaching strategic-arms limitation agreements. One should note that SALT-II deals a heavy blow at such intentions. It shows, I think, that given good will, the conclusion of an agreement on a total repudiation of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction can become a realistic and feasible goal.

Auersperg. I should like to emphasize that the modernization of nuclear and conventional weapons tends to lower the 'threshold of responsibility' and increases the danger of war. If a neutron warhead is placed at the disposal of an ordinary officer, no one can guarantee that a world nuclear conflict will not break out over some trivial accident. Besides, it could also happen that as soon as the monitoring stations discover anything that looks like enemy missiles coming in the direction of the other country, the politician with the right to press the 'nuclear button' will have only a few minutes in which to decide on a response that could lead to the destruction of mankind.

Once the button has been pressed, nothing can be done to revoke the decision. This paradox arises: as more and more money is spent, mankind has less and less security. That is an absurd state of things. No wonder then that politicians seeking to prevent the spiral of war escalation from becoming a reality beyond mankind's control have spared no effort in trying to overcome this present situation in the world on a level other than the technical level. SALT-II provides a good example of such action.

Belyakov. I also think that the trends in the qualitative development of weapons, their miniaturization and automation present a danger not only

from the purely military standpoint, but also in political terms. The peculiarity of the situation consists in that it is necessary to put an end to the old stereotypes and to refute some of the new propaganda inventions of the forces which have a stake in war.

What do I have in mind? Some in the West assert that nuclear war is not terrible at all, because, as Brzezinski has said, it will kill only 10 per cent of the population. The total absurdity and cynicism of this assertion are obvious. Even a special U.S. Congressional Bureau had to admit that almost 80 per cent of the population of the United States would die in the event of a war. But the mass media owned by the monopolies have been doing their job. They seek to calm the population and to habituate it to the idea that a thermonuclear war is something that is possible and acceptable.

Second, a concerted effort is being made to implant the idea that political problems can be solved by means of war. Thus, we still hear assertions that U.S. oil interests in the Middle East need to be defended by means of arms. I think it is an important task of the peace fighters, scientists in particular, to release the thinking of men from such false notions.

How valid are the arguments of the arms race advocates? Who wants it and why?

Hollitscher. It would evidently also be useful to make a critical analysis of some other arguments of the arms race advocates. I should like in particular, to consider the relatively widespread use of the 'scientific' thesis that any struggle for peaceful development is futile because wars are rooted in man's innate aggressiveness inherited from his primitive ancestors.

Nothing is more misconceived than this assertion. Our primitive ancestors were not aggressive. They were peaceful, friendly, affable and cooperative. They were not averse to expressions of tenderness. Mankind developed without wars for five million years: at the sites of primitive men, archaeologists have found artifacts in the form of implements of labor and hunting, but not of weapons. Wars started to break out only with the disintegration of primitive society. In the slave-owning world they were in the nature of a hunt for slaves, and in the protofeudal and feudal society of a drive for lands and vassals. The bourgeoisie had no need of slaves or serfs, it fought for sources of raw materials, marketing outlets, and spheres of capital investment.

But a new situation has now taken shape. Until fairly recently, politicians had a relatively free choice between war and peace. At that time, military superiority had tremendous political meaning. But now that potential adversaries have built up fantastic stockpiles of nuclear weapons, any 'force' superiority tends to lose its earlier meaning.

Why then has the arms race continued, despite the clear understanding that it does not guarantee security either at home, or for mankind as a whole?

Who stands to gain from it? Where does the chief source of the danger lie?

I think that the main threat comes from the very existence of imperialism, and within the imperialist system from the military-industrial complex, a powerful conglomerate of the military, big capital and politicians who regard the arms race as a source of profit and a means of maintaining their power, a conglomerate which has a tremendous apparatus for influencing the masses and which uses this apparatus to camouflage both the dimensions and the sources of danger.

That is why the struggle against the power of the military-industrial complex must become the main line of the struggle for peace. There are opportunities for investing capital other than the arms race. There are spheres in which new investments will serve man and not his destruction. There is the war on hunger, protection of the environment and solution of the energy problem.

Auersperg. I agree that the military-industrial complex has a stake in the manufacture of weapons, but I think that the reasons for the imperialist arms-race policy are somewhat more complex.

Imperialism has a stake in super-militarism, because it believes that the mechanism of deterrence can safeguard the capitalist system against unacceptable social shifts and changes. Within the framework of the contest with socialism, the escalation of militarism serves imperialism both as a form of global class 'intimidation' and as a method for imposing ideological stereotypes and a means of economic challenge.

But because militarization requires external motivations, the capitalist world produced and developed a new sphere of myth-making, myths about a 'Soviet menace' and about 'total aggressive socialism,' which is allegedly prepared to start a thermonuclear world war at any time.

Hollitscher. I think it is not right to say that capitalism as a whole is prepared to risk self-destruction in its effort at self-preservation — and this factor needs to be taken into account. Indeed, the bourgeoisie has a stake in profits, but it would not want to destroy both profits and itself.

Let us recall that when Engels wrote about the condition of the working class in Britain he gave a horrifying picture of the living conditions in working-class neighborhoods, where mainly the proletarians and their children suffered from the dirt, garbage, industrial waste and unhygienic conditions. That did not worry the capitalists. But since then, industrial development has produced a situation in which the notorious London smog stifles not only the poor but also the rich. And the capitalists, the capitalist authorities were forced, in their own interest, to allocate part of their profits for rehabilitating and protecting the environment.

There is only one real danger today, and it is the danger of war, for it threatens the existence of the whole of mankind, including the exploited and the exploiters. And the exploiters, at any rate those of them who have not lost the capacity to think realistically, have to reckon with this as well. That is why

it is possible to have a broad front of people, representatives of all countries, of all social classes, who are prepared to fight for peace.

New approach necessary

Weiler. I suppose that the military will always seek to guarantee their country's security by trying to achieve at least parity, and possibly superiority in military terms. But political considerations, the will for war or peace, also have a certain role to play. My assumption is that man is a being who must and can be responsible for his acts. He is a being who has produced moral criteria of good and evil, a being who makes his own history. Consequently, the problem of the question of war and peace also consists in whether man behaves with human dignity or whether he departs from human dignity, refuses to recognize human beings in others, wants to kill others, and by establishing his domination to attain goals which are inhuman because they violate the rights and dignity of other men.

The situation is now such that man's vital interests require the preservation of peace. From the global historical standpoint, peace is the condition in which future humanity can survive. After all, the military potential has attained a quality which prevents it from being used for the resolution of conflicts. But it is still being used, as others have said here, as a potential for intimidation.

That is why, I think, the state in which we now find ourselves could in a sense be called transitional: it has already become possible and imperative to resolve international conflicts without war, but the danger of war still exists. War can be excluded only when nations repudiate the political threat of war. I am not so optimistic as to declare that in the future mankind will rule out this danger altogether. It is hard to say when there will be a single world system that would eliminate war once and for all and determine development throughout the world. Various notions about shaping social life will exist. They will have to coexist.

The question for me essentially consists in not letting technical processes make us forget but enhance and foster man's moral responsibility for his own vital interests, for the interests of his survival. This moral responsibility must be based on a rational understanding that we will either survive together or go down together. Man is capable of solving the emergent problems regardless of his ideological stand; man is being intended for social cooperation, and not for aggression. The nature of the current arms race is such that it has become a prerequisite for the start of a qualitatively new stage in international relations, when the need for peaceful development becomes a visual necessity even in the presence of systems with conflicting ideologies.

Schönfeld. Today there is ever wider recognition of the fact that a definite equilibrium of armed force has been established, and that transition to disarmament can be ensured only if this equilibrium is maintained, if neither side tries to upset it to obtain strategic advantages. That is not only a moral issue.

There is now a struggle of two lines in international politics. On the one hand, there is the line of the arms race and the urge to secure military superiority by cobbling together new military-political alliances. On the other, there is the line oriented on the conclusion of agreements limiting armaments, on disarmament and détente. The second line has already yielded tangible successes. The results of the Helsinki Conference and SALT-II already contain in embryo that of which Professor Weiler spoke, namely, a switch to new ethical principles in international politics. These agreements need to be elaborated and extended so as to secure realization of the principles which we believe to be necessary for the maintenance of world peace.

Belyakov. There are old stereotypes in politics, among them the dangerous one of suggesting that ideological differences can be settled by means of arms. Disputes in ideology cannot be settled by means of arms. Here I fully agree with Professor Weiler. These disputes can be settled only in peaceful competition between the two systems, and it is practice that must show which system of ideas is superior, which has the future on its side. We must put our trust in the course of history, in the laws of historical development and human reason. It is necessary to convince people that the attainment of military superiority is an unfeasible, unrealizable goal. The arms race leads mankind into a dead end. There is another way, and it is the way of disarmament, peaceful competition and cooperation.

We need to concentrate our efforts on showing the prospects for peaceful cooperation and peaceful competition between the two systems, and to present a broad picture of how the two systems can live alongside each other. After all, no one can say how long this period will last. We reject the idea of forcible implantation of socialism and communism. But our ideological adversaries, those who disagree with us, must also abandon the idea of destroying socialism by force. Socialism has been solidly established in the world. It cannot be destroyed by means of arms. One has to recognize this objective truth and to learn to live together with socialism, whether one likes it or not.

Socialism and peace: indivisible concepts

Auersperg. Now that we have touched on the question of where the actual threat of war comes from, I should like to add that the policy of existing socialism is not subject to the operation of the laws which govern imperialism's military policy. It is not the socialist countries which initiate the arms race. They have to respond to the acts of the capitalist countries. There is not a single political task which socialism intends to solve by force. We regard our armed forces not as a factor of conquest, intimidation or suppression, but as a means of defense, which is adequate in character to the dimension of the potential threat.

Let me add that in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries, the idea of national defense is highly developed above all in virtue of our own historical experience.

The socialist countries have to reckon with the fact that the equilibrium of military forces has become an important condition of international stability and a necessary basis for negotiations. But having accepted that, you must agree that it is necessary to go forward, and gradually reduce the present level of military balance.

Fuchs. The opponents of disarmament claim that this may upset the existing equilibrium and reduce security.

Auersperg. Indeed, one frequently hears such statements. But if the military potential is reduced by everyone on the basis of parity, there will be no reduction of security.

Socialism's goal is general and complete disarmament. Of course, it is a goal which today is still a long way off. The Warsaw Treaty countries' strategic position, the length and nature of their borders make the socialist-community countries keep forces adequate to the threat. Suffice it to say, for instance, that the borders of the USSR alone are over 60,000 kilometres long. But even in these conditions the socialist community's military lexicon does not have terms like 'first strike,' 'first use of nuclear weapons,' 'limited nuclear war,' 'pre-emptive strike,' and so on — all of which will be found in NATO's military lexicon. Socialism has radically changed the approach to the solution of the problems of war. It has worked out a conception for ensuring peace and international security which is not based on the threat of force, but on peaceful cooperation of states for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the world's population.

Weiler. Everything that has been said here about socialist policy and its motivations and goals is very useful, because Western propaganda has been trying very hard to spread mistrust over this issue on the basis of primitive anti-communism, which claims that the Marxist-Leninist ideology has no ethics. On the other hand, I believe, vulgar interpretations of Marxism also explain why we have given so little thought to introducing ethics into politics.

From the standpoint of real politics, the world is in a very difficult situation: it is necessary to move on from the political manipulation of armaments to a coordination of security policies, so that one could say: security exists only when it implies the security of the other alliance or partner, with whom one wants to cooperate on an international scale. I should say that the security policy should be divested of its nationalistic garb, and that there is a need to understand that it can be conducted only on the principles of partnership, in the sense that your security is ensured only if the security of others is also ensured.

Auersperg. We in the socialist countries say this: any threat to one is a threat to all, and we propose on that basis to build a system of collective security.

Weiler. The perspective I have in mind is definite cooperation in the sphere of security, elements of which we find, for instance, in SALT-II. But such cooperation implies greater cooperation on various levels. Of course, a policy of force will always be

countered with a policy of force. I think that trust in politics can grow only as a result of the interlacing and integration of various interests.

That is, of course, a very intricate process. It will be very hard, for instance, to include the Third World, the developing countries and China in any global strategy. But it would be a great mistake if anyone in this world would rejoice at the difficulties of the other. From the standpoint of real politics, the West must be concerned with a peaceful settlement of the tensions in the Far East and the Middle East, because any attempt to resolve tensions by military means ultimately clash with its own interests.

Politics is not a private business, and interference in the sovereignty of others is inadmissible, but there is a policy of the whole of mankind, and it is the policy of peace. This policy needs to be shaped in such a way that one could count on the prudence and will of the other. Our problem also consists in that we have to act in the light of internationalism, and to have faith in the international of the forces of peace, in human reason, in the human community, which is based on prudence and mutual respect. Man is a complex being, but continues to be man.

The way out: adoption of political decisions

Hollitscher. Some time ago UNESCO invited me to present a paper in Paris on the psychological aspects of the struggle for peace. I accepted, but I tried to show that it would be wrong to psychologize this. The struggle for peace is mainly a socio-political problem. And I want to say to my esteemed friend Professor Weiler that we — he from the positions of Catholicism, and I from the positions of Marxism — are possibly at one in that each moral issue is simultaneously a political issue. Any undialectical separation of morals from politics is unacceptable from the standpoint of both ideologies.

In this connection, I think, a problem like including China in the sphere of global interests depends above all on the Chinese leadership itself. We expect it to abandon its aggressive policy and acts, its bellicose statements and preparations for war. And I have no doubt that in the event of such a political (and also moral) swing, the peace-loving peoples will gladly welcome China's return to their family.

Others have already said here that the way to peace and security lies in the adoption of political decisions, and not in the arms race, political decisions like SALT-II. I think that one of the crucial political issues is to show people that this Treaty and history and future generally are not only a Soviet-American affair. It is the business of all the peoples. People can make history. And if we are all prepared to combat the correctly conceived causes of war, which, we believe, do not lie in psychology and biology, but in concrete historical processes, we shall be able to eliminate these causes.

As a Marxist, I know that so long as the parasitic system of extracting capitalist profits continues to exist, the threat of war will remain. But that does not prevent me from being an optimist. After all, if anyone had told me that within six decades after the

liberation of Russia by the Great October Socialist Revolution, within a third of a century after the Second World War I shall see the flight of the shah from Iran, the liberation of Ethiopia from the emperor who was regarded as the demigod, and the liberation of Angola, Algeria and Mozambique, I would have perhaps had my doubts. I must say that a great deal has changed within our short lifespan. And I am quite sure that we can convey to people the courage and the moral resolve which are necessary to preserve peace.

Fuchs. I fully agree with Professor Hollitscher. *There is a need to combat the sense of impotence in face of the danger of war*, which imperialism seeks to spread among people. Such, I think, is the first important conclusion which we could draw on the basis of our discussion despite the fact that we belong to different ideological persuasions. At the same time, I should like to emphasize that more and more people and nations understand that mankind as a whole, every nation and every individual get nothing from the arms race whether it is forced upon them or deliberately chosen, but have a great deal to lose from it. Intensive armament slows down economic development, produces unemployment, carries losses to most small enterprises, burdens the tax-payers and slows down the solution of vital social problems on a national, regional and global scale. The arms race has already caused and continues to cause grave imbalances in the economies of many countries.

I think that in winding up our discussion we could formulate a number of other important conclusions.

Does the 'growth of terror' and the buildup of the military potential increase security?

No, it merely increases the risk of conflict. There is only one way to security, and it is disarmament.

In that case, does not disarmament upset the existing equilibrium of armed forces?

No, if it is carried out on a parity basis, with observance of the principle of equal security of parties, with an eye to the requirements of national defense and if disarmament is attended by joint political understandings among the participants on the basis of which aggression against one is regarded as an attack on all.

The WMR Commission on Peace and Democratic Movements notes that since the round-table, the Soviet Union has come out with new important initiatives. In a speech in Berlin to mark the 30th anniversary of the GDR, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, declared the Soviet Union's readiness to reduce, as compared with the present level, the number of medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in the USSR's western regions, provided there is no additional deployment of such weapons in Western Europe. In addition, after consultations with the other socialist-community countries, the Soviet Union has decided unilaterally to reduce the nu-

merical strength of the Soviet troops in Central Europe, and in this connection to withdraw from the territory of the GDR over the next 12 months up to 20,000 Soviet troops, 1,000 tanks and a definite quantity of other military hardware. A number of other practical steps are also to be taken so as further to extend the confidence-building measures in Europe.

In this way, the Soviet Union has provided a visual example of moving from words to deeds. It is

now up to the NATO countries, up to the United States. How will they respond to this new manifestation of the peaceableness and good will of the USSR and other socialist countries? Will SALT-II finally be ratified by the U.S. Senate, and will the NATO strategists abandon the idea of deploying new U.S. nuclear-tipped missiles targeted on the USSR? The Western countries' reply to all these questions will show whether they are prepared to reckon with the peoples' vital interests.

Modernization of economic dependence

Severo Romero

CC member, Paraguayan CP

Anatoli Glinkin

Doctor of Historical Sciences (USSR)

The acuteness of the debates, including the debates between non-Marxists, about the level of capitalist development reached by Latin American states is evidence that this is a key to understanding the region's political and socio-economic problems. Also important is the fact that the conclusions to be drawn on this basis affect an essential aspect of the Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism. Lenin noted that the beginning of the epoch of imperialism saw the emergence of a sort of watershed between a handful of countries that had forged ahead in their development and shaped into a group of imperialist vultures and the remaining conglomerate of politically sovereign but economically dependent nations. He differentiated clearly between exploiting and exploited nations, stressing that the exploitation of other countries and peoples by the imperialist powers was one of the factors predetermining the latter's more rapid growth. His writings make it clear that imperialist oppression deprives dependent and colonial countries of any real prospects for surmounting economic backwardness, and that only revolutionary transformations can break the vicious circle (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 194; Vol. 39, pp. 301-03).

Thus, if some researchers draw the conclusion that a large group of Latin American states (instead of one, as an exception) has, as a result of long and 'peaceful' capitalist evolution, managed to transcend underdevelopment and move on to the next stage of development ('medium level' or 'intermediate stage'), the need consequently arises merely for a more thorough analysis of this new

phenomenon and not for a revision of a time-tested approach.

As we see it, the acuteness of the debate is in many respects due to the fact that some of its participants do not run a sufficiently clear-cut line between two aspects — the external and the internal — of one and the same problem: Latin America's capitalist development. These are closely interrelated aspects, but each also is independently significant. Hence, a scientific analysis requires that each should be considered separately.

A study of the first aspect shows that the region's place in the capitalist world system and the disparity in the levels of development with the imperialist powers have not undergone any noteworthy changes. This will be seen if we compare the corresponding growth rates of the gross domestic product, industrial and agricultural output, and foreign trade. This is evidenced also by some other indicators. If we consider the basic trends of the movement of financial-monetary resources in the capitalist world we shall see that the Latin American countries are debtors, not creditors; if we take, for example, statistics on the level of scientific and technical knowledge and technology, it will be clear that the countries of this region are consumers, not producers of this knowledge and technology.

Naturally, Latin America has not been marking time since the onset of the epoch of imperialism, but the basic parameters determining the model of its capitalist development have not changed qualitatively. This model is unquestionably neither a stereotype nor a set pattern, nor is it unaltered in all the countries of the region. This size of a country and the specifics of its geographical location, distinctions in manpower and economic potentials, in levels of economic development, forms of class and national consciousness of the working masses and the level of their organization, the specific nature of participation in the capitalist world division of

We continue our coverage of the international exchange of views held in Prague on the level of the productive forces and relations of production in Latin America and the specific features of the capitalist society that has taken shape on that continent (see *WMR*, June, August and November 1979).

labor and the orientation of trade and economic links, the degree of dependence on imperialism as a whole and on any individual imperialist power — these and many other factors have given and give rise to a diversity of concrete variants. It is also evident that the content of the concepts 'economic dependence' and 'economic independence' does not remain unchanged at different stages of historical development and, consequently, the struggle is not confined solely to the aims of yesteryear.

As regards the second (internal) aspect, we find significant changes and the picture today is much more complex than it was a quarter of a century ago.

The economic potential of the Latin American continent has grown dramatically during the past few decades. Whereas relatively recently only rich, unique deposits of minerals were developed, today practically all commercially viable deposits are being worked. Uninhabited inland territories, for instance, the Amazon basin in Brazil and the Peruvian selva, are being developed. The manufacturing industries, particularly branches of the heavy industry, are growing rapidly. There have been noteworthy changes also in agriculture as a result of the agrarian reforms in some countries, the building of agrarian-industrial complexes in the most developed regions, the organization of large-scale production of new crops within the framework of the green revolution (Mexico) or a favorable situation in the world market (Brazil).

In the output of steel, cement, electric power, and other key industrial products Latin America reached the aggregate 1960 level of the FRG, France, and Italy in 1978.¹ These processes of growth and diversification of the economy, accompanied by the emergence of modern enterprises and the use of the most up-to-date technologies and scientific and technological achievements, have changed the mono-crop character of the Latin American economy and given a new dimension both to individual countries and to the region as a whole.

This is what prompted Enrique V. Iglesias, Executive Secretary of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America, to declare that the past three decades have witnessed far-reaching socio-economic changes in the region with the result that there has been a growth of its 'ability to defend itself against the vicissitudes of the international economic situation.'² Views of this nature have become quite widespread on the continent. For instance, a research group at the Mexican journal *Historia y Sociedad* holds that for nations like Mexico the factor of dependence is giving way to contradictions implicit in all capitalist countries. Some researchers believe that the dependence phenomenon has, generally speaking, been 'mythified.'³

In order to study this problem it is of special significance to analyse the new forms of dependence springing from the growing influence of transnational corporations in the Latin American economy and policy.

In the 1970s the transnationals expanded in Latin

America on a larger scale than ever before. In the period from 1970 to the close of 1977 the investments only of the U.S. cartels grew from \$14,800 million to \$27,700 million. West German and Japanese corporations have begun a veritable invasion of the continent. In Brazil alone the West German concerns increased their assets from \$253 million in 1970 to \$2,300 million in September 1978. In 1978 the growth rate of investments from the FRG was 30 per cent as against only 17 per cent from the USA. Japanese private investments on the continent, which did not exceed \$500 million in 1969, had jumped to \$3,800 million by April 1978. In 1978 the inflow of foreign capital reached \$20,000 million compared with \$12,000 million in 1977.⁴

It is important to note that these are direct long-term investments, which accelerate the growth of the network of foreign affiliates and subsidiaries, and also all sorts of mixed enterprises subordinated to international capital. This is precisely how the foreign monopolies entrench themselves in the economic structure of the Latin American states with the resultant larger control by them of key areas of the economy, chiefly its most modern and promising branches.

Lenin wrote: 'Monopoly hews a path for itself everywhere without scruple as to the means from paying a "modest" sum to buy off competitors to the American device of employing dynamite against them' (Coll. Works, Vol. 22, p. 208). The activities of the transnationals in Latin America covers the entire spectrum of these 'devices.' In order to kill national companies they have recourse to bribery, the cornering of shares, credit blockades, the dumping of analogous products, cartel agreements on the partitioning of markets and spheres of influence, and so on.

On the other hand, by setting up a network of mixed enterprises the transnationals enlarge the participation of individual segments of the Latin American bourgeoisie in international business. Hugo Fazio and A. Hernandez Fortuna have justifiably noted that it would be dangerous to underestimate the role of local monopoly groups that are rapidly taking shape in the region's large countries with vigorous state support and operations in the most dynamic industries.⁵ By associating and merging with transnationals they are losing their national character, becoming the 'peripheral motor' of international monopoly capital, aggravating the already strained contradictions, piling up economic difficulties, and creating the social basis for dependent state-monopoly capitalism.

By virtue of this the local bourgeoisie (often called the 'bourgeoisie of subsidiaries'), integrated in this process as a junior partner, 'has become so intertwined with imperialism and dependent on it for its own growth and invigoration that it has, in fact, developed into a component of the imperialist mechanism of domination in their own countries.'⁶

The transnationals promote close relations also with other 'higher' strata of Latin American society: government officials, the military élite, managers of industrial companies, and a section of the scientific

intelligentsia. The enlistment of members of the local ruling circles into the management of subsidiaries has become widespread practice. In Latin America there is now a special category of people that alternate the receipt of government posts with the occupation of high positions in foreign enterprises.

As imperialist expansion gains ground an ever larger number of Latin Americans are exploited at foreign-run factories and agrarian-industrial complexes. Available statistics do not give a full picture of employment at the Latin American subsidiaries of the transnationals. However, it has been estimated that investments per wage-earner average from \$8,000 to \$10,000 and in the same terms sales average from \$20,000 to \$30,000. Thus, if we know the total investments of the transnationals and the total sales of their subsidiaries we can assume that at present foreign capital is in control of nearly five million people — an impressive figure for Latin America.

Consisting, as a rule, of the most skilled section of the working class, the 'proletariat of the subsidiaries' is concentrated at large, modern factories and subjected to refined and intensive exploitation. This gives it considerable possibilities for becoming one of the most advanced and militant contingents of the working class. However, the transnationals go to all lengths to isolate it, to tear it away from the bulk of the working people. To this end they make use of the competition between workers which objectively exists under capitalism (Frederick Engels regarded this as 'the sharpest weapon against the proletariat in the hands of the bourgeoisie') and of the distinctions artificially created in working conditions, pay, and so forth. Also, they have wide recourse to diverse forms of ideological and psychological pressure.

Thus, all the indications are that the transnationals have become a component element of the economic structure of the Latin American states and are in a position to influence their socio-economic and political development not only from without but also from within.

The rapid expansion of the industrial corporations in Latin America has made them the biggest exploiters of the Latin American states and pushed the 'raw materials' monopolies into the background. Dozens of subsidiaries of 'raw materials' multinationals with assets, according to the estimates of representatives of the corporations themselves, totalling \$10,000 million were nationalized in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s. Even if this is an exaggerated figure, it is still unquestionable that in the extracting industries foreign capital has lost considerable ground.

An important element of the struggle of the Latin American states against domination by the transnationals, for economic independence, is that they have begun to participate in commodity associations of developing nations (raw materials anti-cartels). Today there are 26 such associations with a membership consisting of 30 African, 24 Asian, and 27 Latin American states exporting minerals and

farm produce.⁸ For example, Venezuela and Ecuador are members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, while Brazil is a member of the Association of Cocoa-Bean Producers and one of the initiators of the conference of 11 Latin American states that in 1977 approved a program for setting up an organization to maintain coffee prices. Peru and Chile joined Zaire and Zambia in setting up an Inter-Governmental Council of Copper Exporting Countries. Peru and Mexico have joined the Association of Mercury Producing Countries. Bolivia is a member of the International Tin Agreement. Five of the 11 members of the International Association of Bauxite Producing Countries are Latin American states (Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Guyana, Haiti and Surinam). Chile, Peru and Venezuela, are members of the Association of Iron-Ore Exporting Countries; Bolivia, Brazil, Mexico and Peru have joined the Organization of Tungsten Producing Countries. Moreover, 'purely' Latin American raw materials anti-cartels sprang up in the 1970s: the Association of Banana Exporting Countries, that includes Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama; the Latin American Association of Meat Exporters, and also the Latin American and Caribbean Sugar Exporting Group. The latter association is one of the largest on the continent. One of its 22 members is socialist Cuba, which accounts for an extremely large share of the world's sugar trade.

Today practically all Latin American states are members of trade associations. Most of them regard the formation of anti-cartels as a major element in the struggle for a new international economic order and for restricting the predominance of the 'raw materials' transnationals. *Pensamiento Politico*, a well-informed Mexican journal, writes that 'the possibility for forming unions of exporters of raw materials has dramatically reshaped the relations of Third World countries with the capitalist powers.'⁹ In this context the trend toward forming raw materials anti-cartels is evidently long-term.

However, the changes taking place on the continent are not evidence that the 'raw materials' monopolies are in retreat all along the line. While losing positions in one country, they step up their assault in others. U.S., Japanese, West German and other 'raw materials' consortiums have stepped up their activities in Brazil. The Pinochet junta, which gave transnationals access to copper, the nation's principal wealth, opened the door to the pillaging of Chile's natural resources. A point to be noted is that the U.S. Exxon oil corporation is investing heavily in the Chilean copper industry. Anschultz Corporation, another U.S. company, has obtained a 20-year concession for up to 40 per cent of Paraguayan territory for the development of minerals. It is now surveying for uranium and, in the event of success, may be in control of this extremely valuable strategic raw material.

In the armory of neo-colonialist means a special place is held by the transnationals' monopoly over the technology of extracting and processing raw materials and also over managerial expertise. An

example of this is the agreement that Exxon signed with Petroven, the Venezuelan state oil company, after its property in Venezuela was nationalized on January 1, 1976. Under the terms of that agreement, Exxon is committed to providing Petroven with technological and managerial consultations and help in training personnel, programming computers, and purchasing foreign technology and equipment worth \$100 million annually. In exchange, Exxon received the right to buy in Venezuela nearly a million barrels of crude oil and oil-products per day and sell them in the world market through its own international marketing network.

While by no means denying the expediency and sometimes the necessity for maintaining business contacts with the transnationals, one cannot fail to see the serious threat harbored in such 'cooperation' for developing nations.

Nationalization of the subsidiaries of 'raw materials' monopolies does not cut short their influence on Latin America's economic development. The example of Venezuela shows that Exxon 'went in order to stay' in a new and — in view of the scientific and technological revolution — exceedingly profitable capacity. Progressive forces, chiefly the communists, draw attention to this danger. It cannot be ignored by the ruling circles, either. 'Attention must be drawn to the circumstance,' Venezuelan President Carlos Andres Perez acknowledged, 'that by itself the nationalization of oil did not make us independent. Dependence remains and, if you like, poses us with a greater danger than before.'¹⁰

The fact that in the 1970s the transnationals concentrated investments in the manufacturing industry does not mean a diminution of their interest in the region's natural resources. A sort of regrouping of forces is taking place, and the mechanism of exploitation is growing more intricate and subtle. In this context the industrial transnationals are acting with more diversity and 'imagination' than their 'raw materials colleagues,' making still wider use of their monopoly over technological expertise. Taking advantage of the scientific and technological lag of the Latin American states, on account of their dependent status in the capitalist world, the transnationals are raising prices on patents, licenses, and trade marks, and increasing their tariffs for managerial services.

The Latin American states (even the most developed of them) spend incomparably less on research and development than the industrialized capitalist countries. This situation is due not only to objective conditions, chiefly the shortage of funds, but also to the policy of the subsidiaries of the transnationals, which prefer to use the technology developed by the parent concerns than to conduct their own research. This borrowed technology substitutes, as it were, for the development of national science and technology. It is indicative that in Mexico, for instance, some 2,500 million pesos, or five times more than is invested in science, are spent on the purchase of technology and technical services. 'Thus,' notes the Mexican sociologist Luis

Vasquez Campos, 'we are subsidizing research abroad more than at home.'¹¹

This is accompanied by an accelerated brain drain to the industrialized capitalist countries, which likewise is largely due to the policies of the transnationals. In only two decades — from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s — the region lost 160,000 scientists and other experts, whose training had cost \$3,200 million.¹²

Enormous sums of money have been spent in recent years on the purchase of technologies from parent companies. M. Jalti Carrera and some other experts of the Organization of American States estimate that Latin America imports roughly 95 per cent of the industrial technology used by it. This is, essentially, a concealed form of remitting profits. Many experts include the payments for technology in the total revenues transmitted abroad by the subsidiaries. Indeed, the managers of these subsidiaries themselves call this 'the simplest legal way of exporting profits.' Little wonder, therefore, that the share of payments for the transfer of technology is growing in the total volume of remitted profits.

Further, the transnationals make the transfer of technology conditional on the acceptance of terms infringing on the interests of recipient countries. Experts who have studied 409 contracts with subsidiaries operating in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru have found that 80 per cent of them ban the use of received technology for the manufacture of goods for export.¹³ This practice restricts the potentialities for economic growth and evokes the discontent of business and government circles.

In their struggle against 'technological colonialism' the developing nations are acting in concert more and more vigorously, using the rostrum of international organizations and conferences. This may be illustrated with the example of the UN conference on technical cooperation between developing nations that was held in Buenos Aires in the autumn of 1978. This conference was attended by representatives of 140 states and some national-liberation movements. Its results confirmed that the methods of 'technological colonialism' are being used to a growing extent by the Western powers and their transnationals for the exploitation of the developing world.

The fact that Western capital has seized command positions in the Latin American economy, particularly in its most up-to-date branches, enables the transnationals to rake in enormous profits. According to UN statistics, in the latter half of the 1960s the U.S. monopolies pumped out of Latin America an average annual profit of 12.1 per cent on invested capital, while in the industrialized capitalist states their profit rate was 7.9 per cent.¹⁴ The U.S. experts John M. Connor and Willard F. Mueller estimate the annual profit rate of the transnationals in Latin America at an even higher figure — 17 per cent.¹⁵

However, it should be borne in mind that these figures are from official sources and do not show the actual profits of the transnationals. There are in-

numerable indications that in Latin American states their profit rate is 25-30 per cent and even higher. For example, in some branches of the manufacturing industry in Brazil and Mexico the initial investments are paid back within two or three years.

Another acute problem for Latin America is the export of monopoly profits to base countries. During the early 1970s the U.S. transnationals remitted from Latin America nearly 80 per cent of their total profits (94 per cent in the oil and mining industries), as compared with 62 per cent from Western Europe and 57 per cent from Canada.¹⁶

The transnationals are depleting the continent's financial resources, obstructing any enlargement of credits to local companies and the financing of national projects. They conduct many of their operations not with new investments from abroad but by making intensive use of the financial resources of the Latin American states themselves. For instance, bourgeois economists have computed that only 9 per cent of the new investments come from the base countries; the rest are from local sources.

This shortage of internal resources compels the Latin American governments to borrow more and more money, and this inevitably leads to a growth of the external debt. In recent years the size of this debt has been increasing at an unparalleled rate: \$7,200 million in 1960, \$21,000 million in 1970, \$58,000 million in 1975, and \$100,000 million in 1978. Payments on these debts have grown accordingly: \$1,400 million in 1960, \$2,500 million in 1970, \$6,300 million in 1975, and \$9,700 million in 1978.¹⁷

Facts show that the foreign debt has become an essentially new form of exploitation and plunder of the Latin American states, which by themselves — with the preservation of the existing model of development — cannot break out of the vicious circle. The shortage of financial resources, due largely to the activities of the transnationals, forces a quest for new loans, and these in turn lead to a drain of capital from Latin America.

The situation is compounded also by the circumstance that there lately has been a deterioration of the terms on which credits are granted. Whereas in the first half of the 1960s the interest rate averaged 3.6 per cent, in 1975 it rose to 6.8 per cent, in other words, it almost doubled. Moreover, the interest rates charged by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank of the United States (two of Latin America's most important sources of credits) rose to 8.4 and 8.1 per cent respectively. The time-limit for the repayment of debts has diminished simultaneously, on the average, from 19.2 to 17.4 years (the U.S. Export-Import Bank has reduced the time-limit from 9.2 to 4.6 years).¹⁸

As a result of all this, the capitalist finance organizations are able to impose their terms on the Latin American governments, with serious social consequences in that the condition of the working masses deteriorates markedly.

Present realities in Latin America indicate that the methods and forms of imperialist expansion

have undergone a substantial modification in that region. A sort of partial departure is to be observed from the most odious forms of exploitation in the sphere of foreign trade, the division of labor, specialization, in production, and the use of national resources. The 'system of binding' the Latin American and Caribbean states to the main centers of imperialism is growing more subtle and refined. The Soviet economist V. Tyagunenko has noted that the threads of 'modernized' dependence are getting 'ever harder to snap by purely a political act.'¹⁹ But the depth and dimensions of dependence come to light most fully at critical moments when efforts are made to smash some of its links (as was the case in, for example, Peru) or to abolish the system entirely (as was the case in Cuba after the overthrow of Batista or in Chile when the Popular Unity government was in power).

A tendency toward economic liberation operates at the same time. It finds expression in the nationalization of many sources of raw materials, the enlargement of the public sector, the formation of organizations not controlled by imperialism (the Andes group, the Latin American Economic System and so forth), and joint actions aimed at reshaping unfair international economic relations. Support and the utmost assistance for this tendency from the progressive forces are consonant with the objective of attaining complete economic and political independence pursued by the countries of that region.

Development along the path of a dependent capitalism (the Brazilian, Mexican, Paraguayan and other national-specific models) is increasingly demonstrating the unsuitability of capitalist methods of running the economy for the fulfillment of the key tasks, namely, the surmounting of backwardness and a basic restructuring of the economy on a modern scientific and technological foundation. With the continued expansion of the transnationals and the rise of the region's exploitation level, this development acquires the character of 'economic growth,' for its fruits are enjoyed solely by a small section of exploiters. The increasingly glaring contrast between the living standards of the élite and the masses is fanning social tension and bringing the working people round to an awareness of their class interests.

The Cuban revolution eloquently proved that Latin American society has matured for the advance toward socialism. However, this should not be taken to imply that the present stage of the Latin American revolutionary process is socialist. The liberative anti-imperialist struggle, as Antonio Maidana, First Secretary of the General Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party noted, should be spearheaded against the alliance between imperialism and the local oligarchy. 'Attempts to skip this or that stage in the revolutionary process,' he said, 'may push the national bourgeoisie, and even a part of the middle strata, into the arms of reaction.'²⁰

The communist and workers' parties hold that some theoretical and practical problems have to be

further researched before the democratic alternative can be advanced and put into effect. The chief of these are account of the interests of the different classes and sections of the population forming the foundation of anti-imperialist, democratic fronts and coalitions and their possible contribution to the struggle for liberation; a realistic assessment of the impact of international factors on the revolutionary process (*détente*, the role of the transnationals in the national economy, economic integration, possible action by neighboring pro-imperialist regimes); the elucidation of ways of combining the implementation of anti-imperialist and social reforms with the effective functioning of economic systems; the charting of concrete ways of safeguarding anti-imperialist and democratic gains against concerted attacks by internal and external reaction.

A profound study of all these problems will clear the way to success in the struggle against modern neo-colonialism, for genuine independence and progress.

1. CEPAL, *Informe del Secretario Ejecutivo al decimotavo periodo de sesiones de la comision*, La Paz, April 18 and 26, 1979, p. 46.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 60.

3. Enrique Semo, *La crisis actual del capitalismo*, Mexico, 1975, p. 38.
4. WMR, June, 1979.
5. WMR, August, 1979.
6. *Information Bulletin*, 12/1975, p. 40.
7. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 376.
8. BIKI, Moscow, 1979, Supplement No. 1, pp. 50-51.
9. *Pensamiento Politico*, No. 88, 1976, p. 440.
10. *El Nacional*, March 4, 1976.
11. *Latinskaya Amerika*, No. 2, 1977, p. 132.
12. *Pravda*, January 30, 1976.
13. UN. *Multinational Corporations in World Development*, New York, 1973, p. 190.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
15. John M. Connor, Willard F. Mueller, *Market Power and Profitability of Multinational Corporations in Brazil and Mexico*, Washington, 1977, p. 49.
16. CEPAL, *Estudio economico de America Latina*, New York, 1971, p. 311.
17. Computed from: World Bank, *Annual Report*, 1973, Washington, 1974, p. 84; *Statistical Abstract of Latin America*, Los Angeles, 1978, Vol. 19, pp. 354, 356; *Latin America Economic Report*, January 26, 1979, p. 32.
18. *Statistical Abstract of Latin America*, p. 365.
19. V. Tyagunencko, *The International Division of Labor and the Developing Nations*, Moscow, 1976, p. 227 (in Russian).
20. WMR, July, 1979.

Theatre in the changing world

Tadeusz Lomnicki

CC member, PUWP, rector, Higher State Theatrical School, director, Na Woli Theatre of Warsaw

A letter to WMR from Mr. Robert Vernon of Toronto, Canada, touches on many aspects of present-day world culture, in particular, the question of the 'interaction of different art forms.' 'Some of these forms,' Mr. Vernon writes, 'continue to develop while others, on the contrary, seem to be doomed. For instance, in many capitalist countries television is increasingly replacing books and, especially, the theatre. To what extent is this trend general and irreversible?' Moreover, the letter touches on the conditions for the development of literature and art in socialist countries: 'Our newspapers frequently contend that in socialist societies culture and art are rigidly controlled.'

Below we publish an article by the well-known Polish actor and producer Tadeusz Lomnicki, in which he considers some of the questions raised in the letter.

As an actor, producer, and mentor associated with the stage since 1945, I have often pondered the problems of the position held by the theatre today, the ways of its development (especially over the past few decades), and particularly, as far as one can judge, the irreversible changes of the theatre's place and functions in cultural life. I mean the changes

springing from the overall evolution of art and culture in our epoch and the changes that have taken and continue to take place in the Polish socialist theatre with which I have been personally associated for more than 30 years.

Our age has been given a wide spectrum of definitions. But, apart from everything else, it is also an age of reproduction, an age of the multiplication of art and all sorts of other works in millions of copies. This is where the first 'fundamental' question arises: What, properly speaking, is the modern theatre against the background of this universal flow of films, recordings, television programs, and reproductions of fine art? The briefest answer is that the theatre remains practically the only place in modern world art culture where the living person can and does talk with another living person.

There is more to this, of course. Solely the fascination of immediate emotional response and sympathy produced by the theatre is not enough to characterize the persisting strength and impact of this form of art. Despite all the changes, the theatre remains the masses' favorite art. The curious paradox is that although it has been infinitely increasing its audience (under socialism), and has been turned from an art accessible exclusively to a

small group of connoisseurs into a truly popular art, the theatre has abided — and I feel that this is of exceptional importance — by the principle of active choice, of individual selectivity as the point of departure of the public's attitude to it. People say: I want to see this particular play (not just any play), and that's why I go to the theatre.

This is highly important. The deluge of television programs neither commands the concentrated attention of a theatre nor has a choice of content comparable to it. Moreover, when we talk of one television program or another and ask about impressions, we frequently encounter an avoidance of communication — in reply we hear: I did not see that program. Usually, we cannot know if this was actually the case, because the essence of television lies in an intimate (despite its mass character) communication with the viewer. However, the reply I have mentioned is often motivated by a reluctance to discuss the subject of art.

Where the theatre is concerned the picture is entirely different. Apart from everything else, there are intermissions during which people ask one another how they liked to play, what they thought of it, and what their impressions were. In reply one gets an affirmative or negative answer, a definite opinion, and an expression of feeling. This public expression of feeling, of exchange of thoughts is, I believe, one of the most effective elements enabling people — by means of theatrical art — to articulate their attitude to art and to life generally. Even the intermission, and not only the action unfolding on the stage, contributes to the education and the moulding of the thoughts and feelings of the mass viewer.

There is yet another thing that distinguishes the theatre from other forms of modern art. I mean the act of creativity in the presence of the audience, directly linked with the actions of a living person, the actor.

Stefan Jaracz, the great Polish actor, once said in an argument about primogeniture in art: 'Before music, painting, architecture, and sculpture there was the human face expressing pain, joy, sadness or happiness.' I always recalled these incisive words of the brilliant actor when I think of the theatre's place in modern culture. Time and again, when we wish to describe a play or some particularly memorable episode in it we indeed say: 'I can't describe it. You'll have to go and see it for yourself.' By this means we express the inimitable emotional experience of a show, a live contact from the audience hall with the people on the stage — that which governs the art of the theatre throughout the world regardless of the functions a specific national theatre performs (or tries to perform), regardless of the content it conveys and also of where the boundary between the stage and the audience hall passes (or, on the contrary, is erased).

The socialist theatre, which I now want to speak of, is (as indeed any other) by no means an abstract concept. Its essence consists of *how* and *what* each artist is able to tell the viewer with his own voice. This 'how' and 'what' is determined equally by the

requirements of the day, the traditions of a people, literature, and the arts, by the talent of the artists themselves, and their ability to understand the times they live in and have to create.

When an artist in the socialist theatre encounters these fundamental questions he has to find his own answers, that cannot be prompted by anybody else. Here the point is not in some exclusive status of creative workers, not in their (imagined) independence of society, ideology, politics, economics, and the cultural policy pursued in the given society. The point is in something quite different. I am quite convinced that the artist discharges his professional and social duty only if his art is an individual expression and not a borrowed declaration, if it is his own creative act and not an illustration of one or another topical thesis. It must be remembered that socialist art is not some simple standard formula but consists of a diversity of individual creative quests.

I am emphasizing this thesis because to my mind it defines the main source of the modern Polish theatre's vigor and accounts for the worldwide recognition of its vivid palette of colors. I should like to single out four elements that have played a special role in creating a favorable climate for the development of the socialist theatre in Poland.

The first is the talent of the artists — of the galaxy of actors, producers, scenographers, of creative representatives of different generations, of people of different interests and different artistic styles — whose creative passion and capabilities find expression and are developed under socialism.

The second is the impressionable and devoted audience that each evening fills the theatre with an atmosphere of expectation, an exacting audience which remains open to quests, to new forms, an audience that is sometimes unpredictable but more frequently fair.

The third is the work of the leading institutions of socialist society in the field of culture, which understand that the building of socialism is not confined to material relations but includes the broad development of the entire range of spiritual factors. This is the policy of the Polish United Workers' Party ensuring the freedom of creation and the national character and humanism of art.

The fourth is the historical tradition, daily present and solicitously cultivated, which in the Polish theatre is in no sense solely a museum exhibit. The history of the national theatre, including the example of the civil theatre of Wojciech Boguslawski,* the great Polish romantic drama, the theatre and plays of Stanislaw Wyspianski, and lastly the work of Leon Schiller, and also the memory of the art of Juliusz Osterwa, Stefan Jaracz, and Edmund Wiercinski, with whom many of us had the opportunity of working — all this is not simply history but the living content of our theatrical life today.

It is impossible to create in a vacuum. If one wants

*Wojciech Boguslawski (1775-1829) — playwright, actor, producer and founder of the Polish professional theatre.

to dispute or, on the contrary, support something, one must know history. I am speaking of something bigger than theatrical traditions (although they do 'govern' the theatre — by virtue of its pronounced specific — more than any other field of art), namely, national traditions generally, the history of the people. We learn this history from childhood, and from our earliest years we grow up in a definite climate of culture so as later, at a mature age, whether we want it or not, to use our acquired knowledge and values. In this context, I cannot imagine a creative artist, be he a Hungarian, a German, a Frenchman, or a Czech, who does not in his mature years recall the songs his mother taught him, the books his teacher gave him, and his own reminiscences of the past. This past is indelibly reflected in the art of the people reproducing faces and images of yesteryear, describing bygone conditions of life and past feelings — art recording rebellion and strength, more frequently pain, and sometimes the triumph of justice.

In the Polish theatre this national tradition, which is most eloquently expressed in Polish romanticism, is of special significance. It exercises a direct influence on us when today we create for contemporaries. From it we draw and shall continue to draw our feelings and the strength of our fantasy.

When we look back over the road traversed by the Polish theatre since the proclamation of the Polish People's Republic we feel not only a sense of stability but also a legitimate sense of pride in what has been accomplished and, to a similar extent, in what is taking place — the productivity of quests, the wealth and diversity of the projected orientations of development.

Today the balance is unquestionably in our favor. This applies chiefly to the material means now at the disposal of the Polish theatre (it will be remembered that we began in a postwar desert, in tattered shoes, in threadbare and bullet-ridden jackets): handsome buildings, sophisticated equipment, state subsidies, guaranteed employment and salaries, legal protection, organizational provision of conditions for creative work — all of which are a natural and obvious result of the fact that society and the state have undertaken all concern for the theatre, the entire burden of financial responsibility for its work.

This applies also to cadres: four-fifths of the people working in the theatre got their education and upbringing in postwar Poland. This applies to public recognition: people in the theatrical world who had once been discriminated against for their profession have become esteemed members of society. Lastly, this applies to the accepted repertory: alongside national classics, which have always been the daily bread of the Polish stage, we acquaint our audience with world classics, with modern Soviet drama, with the plays of our neighbors, with the European drama of the 20th century and, lastly, with modern Polish drama.

Such is the general balance of the development of the Polish socialist theatre in the context of facts.

However, this does not mean that we have no problems: those linked to the general tendencies of the theatre's development in the world and those that are limited entirely to Polish reality; those that are felt painfully but in the long run prove to be transient, and those that arise more or less regularly; those that can be classified as imaginary, as representing rather the function of changing fashion (in the world and in Poland), and those that affect the very foundations of artistic activity under the people's power.

In this context it is significant whether what has been considered a success for many years does not contain the embryo of future setbacks. Indeed, even when you follow a straight, well-beaten path you may lose yourself if you do not keep your eyes open.

The world is in constant flux. Societies change. People change. The content of art, too, changes: it is being filled with ever new, revolutionary ideas reflecting the meaning and the spirit of the changes going on in the world. And changes are taking place in art forms. For instance, the stage in the theatre now looks different: more often than not it does not have the traditional form of a box with three walls. We talk differently with the audience and often depart from the strict canons of the classical drama, and allow several genres to intertwine in our work. The style of presentation is changing, as is the status of the theatre itself: in our conditions without competing antagonistically with films and television (as it has to do in other societies), the theatre must nonetheless be always aware that it has long ceased to be the only source of information with a message to the modern audience.

Is there the possibility that after the fine and noble campaign we have been conducting for many years to establish a universally accessible, democratic mass theatre (accompanied by the striving to reach virtually every person and to appeal to everybody) the theatre will increasingly address itself to a void, to an abstract static instead of the living viewer?

Will not the fact that creative workers have been delivered from financial problems and box-office concerns generate the frivolous sense that they are free of care?

Will the struggle for a highly artistic repertory and the attendant preference for masterpieces not lead to the obscuring of the viewers' vital — earthly, prosaic, day-to-day — requirements?

By giving the viewer maximum access to the theatre (almost carrying him into the hall on our hands) do we not alienate him from the awareness that contact with art always demands a certain effort that is always rewarded by a special sense of gratification of having transcended a barrier or difficulty?

Lastly, by constantly enlarging the network of theatres in the country (in accordance with the self-same conception of the democratization of art) will we not ruinously fragment our forces, will we not create inferior, second-rate or third-rate theatres, so to speak, from the standpoint of their artistic potential?

I do not know if there can be a simple answer to

all these and other similar questions. Perhaps some of the alternatives I have offered here are not very much categorical. For instance, should the increasingly mass character of the theatre inevitably cause anonymity of perception in the hall? But such problems do exist and objectively, with a varying degree of acuteness, they confront society in its cultural development, which means that we must study and discuss them and find appropriate solutions.

Take, for instance, the problem of cadres, which is today one of the most acute in the Polish theatre. The substance of the problem is that, first, there is a constantly growing scarcity of actors (in the light of society's present requirements) and, second, there are glaring imbalances in the distribution and employment of available actors: for instance, there are theatres which are short of actors and there are actors who get no part for years on end; or there are actors who are up to their necks in work (including films and television) and actors who in Poland are ironically called 'expensive extras.'

Even on this point we already encounter different approaches to resolving the problem we are discussing. Of course, the fact that every actor, artist and producer is guaranteed remuneration for work (as well as a definite social status) is unquestionably a major achievement of the new system. This guarantee gives creative workers not only the necessary stability but also the possibility for professional development, for working out their own style, for constantly looking for ways and means of improvement. On the other hand, this is the circumstance that sometimes leads to loss of the sense of artistic responsibility, to an aberration from the principles governing art and creativity, to indolence and indifference.

The influence of cinema and television on actors is similarly diversified.

The theatre has been and remains the cradle and foundation of spectacle art and hence the place where the actor matures as an artist. But today the actor has less and less time for work in his own theatre. The intoxicating popularity brought by television and films (sometimes with almost no effort by the actor) inevitably leads to hack-work, venality and a cheap desire to show off. On the other hand, it is obvious that the element of universality of action and perception of art linked to the existence and development of radio, television and film-making is an important driving force of creativity. I mean not only the character of jointly preached aesthetic principles but also the mass audience to which the 'rules of the game' are addressed, the possibility for an actor to comment on a work of art for the benefit of many people.

In speaking of the Polish socialist theatre, of its achievements and problems, I am aware, of course, of the specific character — national and social — of this phenomenon. Hardly anywhere in the world is the theatre so strongly linked to the concept of patriotism, to the cultivation of national traditions, as in Poland. Not everywhere has it been so consistently asserting the ideas of freedom, civil rights and duties, and assumed responsibility for shaping

the national and social consciousness. These specific features of the Polish theatre have been unquestionably influenced by our history: the spoken word uttered by the Polish artist from the open stage or deep in the underground has time and again inspired people, given them hope, or made them conscious that Poland, being erased from the map of Europe, 'is still alive.'

Still, much of what I have said is evidently universal, mirrors the laws and tendencies of the theatre's development generally.

As any other field of art, the theatre is governed by some common laws of the perfection of its means and forms of expression, and also by common laws of historical development. All these laws are connected with genuine creativity and are realized in qualitative changes.

This problem of new quality has a direct bearing on the existence in the world of a large number of unofficial, frequently unprofessional theatres that seek to produce something original, hitherto non-existent, and use a more adequate language to express a new content. Those seeking — in the broadest (artistic, political and social) sense of the word — theatres and troupes that uphold or even produce their own values, in many cases strongly influence the image of the 'official,' professional theatre, and convincingly demonstrate that theatrical art continues to live, that a great future opens up before it even if that future seems vague and doubtful to some of us today.

The question of the 'most important' personage in the theatre was one of the imaginery problems that only recently agitated the theatrical world and caused considerable confusion in people's minds. In this context many countries went through first the 'epoch of scenographers' (the period of plastic fairy-plays), then the 'epoch of producers' (a period of the formulation of the principles underlying chiefly the national repertory, and also of art discoveries and solutions in modern dramaturgy). Today, it seems to be time to return to the 'epoch of actors,' to the period when the repertory gave the actor the possibility of asserting himself and when we observed a heightened artistic and social interest in the personality of the actor.

Apart from everything else, this latest turn is due to the fact that the audience itself has now become a serious and important 'producer.' That very same audience that matured and developed together with the theatre, an audience that wants to see something perfect but simple, something that is more true to life rather than extravagantly sophisticated.

Moreover, the circumstance that a new generation has come to the theatre today, as a result of which the theatre has found itself at a stage of reorganization, the restructuring of motives, creative change, and a reshuffling of forces, is giving actors enormous opportunities.

As I have already noted, the theatre's present is largely determined by its past — not only the immediate but also the remote past. Similarly, the orientations for the theatre's future development must be sought in the present, in how the theatre of

today resolves the artistic and social problems confronting it.

While noting general tendencies and phenomena in the development of the modern theatre, we can speak of national theatres engaged primarily in cultivating traditions and seeking, more or less successfully, to give a modern ring to ideas pronounced in the past, and so-called academic theatres that pass definite styles of acting, producing, and playwriting from one generation to another, and perfecting the stage's means of expression, ability to establish contact with the viewer, to excite him, to reach his intelligence, emotions and, sometimes, conscience.

Also, alongside other theatres, there is everywhere the political theatre, developing, attacking, and putting pressure, a theatre that operates with sharp, frequently simplified, but always passionate means of expression. Making equally skillful use of documented facts and poetic metaphors, this theatre analyzes the world's modern history, defines its attitude to the revolution, and declares its opposition to all sorts of threats to freedom, to human rights and the rights of classes and nations. In parallel we find avant garde theatres looking for new means of stage expression, new forms of spectacles, new sources of human expression which can save the opportunity, now being lost, of promoting adequate mutual understanding between people.

Needless to say, our classification, like many others, is in some respects artificial and possibly even far removed from reality, where different types of theatres do not always exist in pure form. The very definitions of 'national' and 'academic' do not entirely rule each other out. Much less can one counterpose the 'political' and the 'avant garde' theatres to each other. It sometimes happens that content and form complement each other, that a new content is accompanied by new forms, while new forms contain a new content.

A question frequently asked is: Has the political theatre not grown obsolete? This is indeed a naive question. Contrary to what aesthetics once proclaimed, history has proved long ago that art cannot be independent of politics. Consequently, the political commitment of art, of the theatre in particular, cannot grow obsolete in our day, just as politics itself and human activity aimed at abolishing injustice and evil cannot grow obsolete. The political theatre is one of the most important and vital indicators of modern culture irrespective of whether it is addressed to the audience from a professional or an amateur stage, whether it stigmatizes nuclear annihilation or conventional war, corruption in social life, or the threat to man's natural environment.

The progressive theatre now relies heavily on the work of its predecessors in revolutionizing the drama: on Meyerhold, a martyr to form, a St. Sebastian of unfinished, often unrealized visions inspired by the brilliant dramaturgy of Mayakovsky and Gogol; on Brecht's theatre of the German tragedy with its smell of beer and the tinkling of Chinese opera instruments.

At the same time, there are in the modern pro-

gressive theatre many troupes maturing on the basis of other traditions, including traditions unknown to us. Among them are theatres that are being or have been founded on the continents embraced by the social revolution, by epoch-making social and political transformations. They are ceasing to be silent witnesses of their own history, are beginning to be articulate in defense of innocently spilt blood, in defense of justice and equality. Today we know of their theatrical art from, for instance, the work of Georges Schehade of Lebanon.

Indeed, whatever name we give the various theatres, whatever the orientation of general development we attribute to them, we will always be delighted with troupes that demonstrate a startling perfection of form, daring and innovatory solutions, and — this is perhaps most important — an ability to tell the story of a human life vividly, to speak of man and his place in history. There are now many such theatres in the world and all of them are united by what is perhaps the foundation of their art — the corresponding measure of tradition and innovation. Among them are the theatres of Georgi Tovstonogov and Oleg Yefremov of the Soviet Union or the Burian Theatre in Czechoslovakia, the theatres of the Americans Peter Schumann and Peter Stein, the Italian Giorgio Strehler, the Englishman Robert Wilson, the Mexican Victor Garcia, the Rumanian Andrei Serban, and many others.

The performance of touring troupes in our country makes one ponder, evokes either admiration or a desire to argue, and stirs or stuns us with originality. Similarly, I am sure that our theatres with their vast experience, fidelity to tradition, and proneness for innovation leave a trace in the feelings of audiences and theatrical workers of other countries. In this connection, I should like to underscore the importance of cultural (and other) exchanges between different countries and continents, and their impact on the development of art as a whole.

However, there are things that bring with them the burden of serious thought and doubt. For instance, I and, apparently, many other theatrical workers, who assess the development trends of the modern theatre, have long been worried by the image of a theatre ever more florid, colorful and spectacular but having nothing or practically nothing to say, a theatre that is becoming increasingly colder and isolated from man, from the pressing problems of the day, a theatre which, like Narcissus, is enamored of its own art.

We should like to do everything more simply; to call things by their proper names; to convey our message not only through shouts, but also through stillness, and sometimes even through silence; to renounce scores of ancillary devices that the modern stage loves so much and concentrate on the actor and on dramaturgy; to find a common idiom with the modern viewer who is mature while being amazingly naive. In short, we should like to see a theatre, which to be good does not need to put on opera buskins, and to be understandable does not need to descend to primitivism.

Capitalist regulation methods in crisis

Ben Fine

Economic Committee member, Executive,
Communist Party of Great Britain

What has perhaps astonished the monopoly bourgeoisie and their representatives in governments even more than the severity of the current upheavals in the advanced capitalist countries is their persistence. The governments of states whether cooperating within or subordinated to supranational organizations, such as the IMF, OECD, GATT and EEC, are powerless against the effects of the recession. Indeed, the traditional objectives of growth and full employment have been abandoned, to be replaced by the struggle to control inflation. (At any rate, their overriding goal continues to be the creation of conditions helping the monopolies to maximize profits.)

There has been no more success in anti-inflation policy-making than in the efforts to ensure normal economic performance. The leaders of the capitalist countries now seek to transfer the blame for the recession from the planners themselves (and their economic system) to the working class. And with the blame goes the burden — in the form of unemployment, real-wage cuts and the erosion of welfare services.

However, we communists cannot allow the bourgeoisie to impose its view of the economic recession, and make us believe that it boils down to inflation. The present economic situation can be understood only from an analysis of the interconnection between the general law of capitalist accumulation, which Marx discovered, and the specific historical and conjunctural conditions in which that law operates.

Abandonment of the Marxist theory of capitalist accumulation inevitably dooms one to ad hoc investigation of immediate empirical phenomena, a procedure well beloved by bourgeois economists. That is why it is so important to recall its basic propositions.

First, Marxists believe that whatever the rate of accumulation, the development of the capitalist economy can never run a smooth and balanced course. Developed capitalism, they stress, requires that accumulation be dominated by the concentration of the existing means of production as a way of boosting labor productivity and maximizing profits. The small capitalists are eliminated in a growth of capital which is uneven between the various regions and industries, and this eventually strains the economic system, as the working class resists, and all of this together limits the further process of accumulation.

Second, Marxists hold that accumulation is inevitably punctuated by crises, giving rise to a cycle of production. Bourgeois economics has various theories of the cycle, but because of their different approaches, Marxists and their adversaries mean different things by the term 'cycle.' For bourgeois economics, it represents economic fluctuations dictated by aggregate investment decisions, Marx's theory, however, sees the cycle as one of restructuring capital.

According to Marx's theory, a crisis breaks out at the point when the concentration of accumulation, determining a phase of expansion, generates such great conflicts that they become the objective prerequisites for recession. Here, capital at once takes steps to overcome the recession and resume the expansion. At the very least, it involves the intensified destruction of weaker capitals in preparation for their absorption by large-scale capitals.

Any particular period of capitalism should be investigated according to the conditions in which the restructuring of capital takes place and reaches its limits. Let us begin, therefore, with the period of postwar expansion that the capitalist economies enjoyed until the recent world recession. Two characteristics are fundamental to that expansion. The first concerns the new forms of external expansion, and the second, the role of state economic intervention.

In the inter-war period, almost two-thirds of trade was carried on between the advanced capitalist countries and their colonies. Similarly, almost half of foreign investment went to the underdeveloped areas. In other words, the advanced economies were more integrated with their colonies than with each other, a clear reflection of the predominance of inter-imperialist rivalry over cooperation.

In the postwar period, the situation has been reversed. Almost two-thirds of world trade is now carried on between the advanced capitalist economies, and upwards of three-quarters of foreign investment is similarly located. Under the hegemony of U.S. capitalism, the postwar expansion has been characterized by an interpenetration of trade and investment within the advanced capitalist economies.

Despite the sharp inter-imperialist contradictions, the governing trend in relations between capitalist countries at the present stage is the urge for cooperation. This is due not only to the hope of the leaders of the capitalist world that they can

ward off the threat of a socialist revolution by joint action. Of equal importance is the objective need to create conditions favoring the further internationalization of the capitalist economy, notably by lowering barriers to foreign trade and investment.

The postwar economic expansion has not been based merely on a quantitative shift in the orientation of trade and investment. Capitalist production itself has been internationalized, most notably in the formation of multinational corporations.

Nowadays, these do not merely organize independent affiliates in different countries. Increasingly, the 'factory' of the multinational corporation straddles national boundaries. The result is to give the corporations enormous freedom in locating production and marketing in different countries according to profitability.

The increasing freedom that capital has obtained in the world economy in terms of its internationalization of sales, finance and production has been accompanied by another point of departure from the general conditions of earlier periods of capitalism — the qualitative and quantitative extension of state economic intervention. In moderating economic conflict between classes, the state has increasingly become a focus for the location of that conflict.

In general, only by the development of some form of social-democracy have the political implications of these economic struggles been contained, for otherwise the inevitable necessity of the state acting on capital's behalf in these conflicts would expose the class nature of the capitalist state and undermine its ability to maintain social cohesion and stability.

These interventions by the state do not simply reflect a new form of struggle between classes. They have a profound effect upon the competition between the monopolies. In general, the state's interventions have the role of promoting the centralization of capital that is essential to continued accumulation. Whether going to the extreme of nationalization, granting aid or subsidies, or less directly, economic policies favor the formation and interests of large corporations.

It is the interaction of state economic intervention and the internationalization of capital for the purposes of economic expansion that has given the modern period of capitalism its distinctive characteristic. Not surprisingly, this has promoted an enormous expansion of the productive forces, with the reorganization of the international division of labor promoted by state economic intervention and unconstrained by the barriers of inter-imperialist rivalry.

Nevertheless, the increasing integration and mutual dependence of advanced capitalist countries do not create possibilities for the unlimited expansion of individual states. For economic development ultimately intensifies class conflicts within the state. A phase of accumulation strengthens the working class in its demands for economic and social gains, whereas the inter-

nationalization of capital requires that these gains be limited to maintain profitability.

The result is to force deflationary policies¹ upon the state on the plea of retaining or regaining 'economic stability.' Acceptance of such policies by the state precipitates a recession, and lays the basis for reordering economic and social relations within the country concerned.

The above explains the fact that the postwar 'boom' in the advanced capitalist economies as a whole was nevertheless characterized from time to time by recessions in individual economies. These recessions could be resolved by policies adopted at the level of the individual country as long as world capitalism as a whole continued to expand. In these conditions, reorganization of domestic production would be stimulated by a possible growth of exports and further integration into an international division of labor dominated by multinational corporations.

For many bourgeois commentators, observing that a world recession involves a recession in each country and that individual countries have had recessions occasionally, the conclusion is drawn that the world recession is to be explained by 'bad luck,' an accidental coincidence of recessions in a number of countries simultaneously. More sophisticated commentators look to the turn of the terms of trade in favor of primary producers as the stimulus to the coincidence of individual recessions.

These views would have greater plausibility if the recession were accompanied by an intensification of inter-imperialist rivalry, so that a coordination of reflationary policies² could not be adopted through imperialist cooperation. But a remarkable feature of the current recession is that, despite the existence of acute contradictions, the advanced economies have continued to cooperate to minimize further instability. Still, the coordinated attempts at expansion are notable for their failure.

If the recession were simply the sum of the obstacles to accumulation in individual countries, surely the recession has bitten deep enough to have created the need to smash those obstacles? The economic policy-makers in each of these countries have had every possible combination of conditions in which to promote economic expansion at the stages of the highest levels of unemployment and the heaviest cuts in real wages and social spending. But their magic has failed to work.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the recession in each country is not to be resolved by a coordinated series of expansionary policies within its framework, because the recession epitomizes the crisis of the world capitalist system as a whole. Further, even the unprecedented attacks on the working class have been insufficient to resolve the crisis for capitalism, although they have helped it to survive.

With these perspectives, the world recession, its severity and persistence, must be explained in terms of the limits to further internationalization, rather than the mere expansion of capitalist produc-

tion. Despite the enormous levels of unemployment and excess capacity, the multinational corporations of the world have not been sufficiently reorganized.

The reason for their failure to reorganize is to be found precisely in the supranational nature of the reorganization required, and the national implications of it. What for the multinational corporations is a simple reordering among themselves as a 'community of producers' is for a country the destruction of a major part of its industry.

Workers in the advanced capitalist countries have well demonstrated their willingness and ability to resist even the marginal reorganizations of the multinational corporations that have occurred, and have done so directly (through factory occupations) or indirectly (through the struggle for state intervention on their behalf).

The conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is that at the moment there is a balance of class forces in which the working class' economic demands for increasing employment and living standards cannot be provided for by the international bourgeoisie through a coordinated policy of reflation. At some point the bourgeoisie is bound to seek a way out of the stalemate. Otherwise, as its leaders fear, the working class will extend and strengthen its economic demands, as it grows impatient for the promised recovery. To be successful, it will have to transform those economic demands beyond the programs framed by right-wing social-democratic leaders primarily for the benefit of the monopolies. Such a turn of events could pose the threat of economic and political control passing from the capitalists to the working people.

Alternatively, the bourgeoisie will intensify the recession-based forces of restructuring, in particular deepening the level of unemployment, as the international reorganization of production further centralizes capital and consolidates uneven development of the productive forces in the international, national and sectoral plane. Whether justified by the logic of macro-economic management or the pursuit of 'technical efficiency' (in which the micro-processor revolution will allow the worker of the past to be displaced by the machine of the future), the precondition is massive economic and political defeats for the working class.

Meanwhile, the world economy does not stand still. To guarantee a renewed accumulation, the bourgeoisie must not only settle accounts with the working class, it must also settle accounts with itself. The postwar expansion has not witnessed an even development of the productive forces within the advanced capitalist world, and a subsequent reorganization of production will be no less uneven. Before some can win in this process others must lose. In other words, one could speak of the emergence of objective conditions heralding a break in the predominance of inter-imperialist cooperation and a renewal of inter-imperialist rivalry.

What are the likely configurations upon which this rivalry will be organized?

To some extent, an answer can be provided by a study of the uneven development between the ad-

vanced economies during the postwar boom. The two processes of state economic intervention and internationalization of production, which led to economic expansion, have at times coincided, at other times conflicted. They have interacted to produce a specific international division of labor and uneven development of individual economies.

The United States has been at the forefront in internationalizing production. Its penetration into capitalist Europe is well known. British capital has played an identical but junior role. But together, these two countries have dominated the internationalization of capital, being responsible in the 1970s for more than 60 per cent of all multinational corporation foreign affiliates and almost 75 per cent in the developed capitalist economies. The active use by U.S. and British monopolies of the capitalist world as the sphere for investment has itself led to a decline in their domestic economies.

By contrast, Japan and the FRG each experienced an accumulation in the postwar period based upon a domestic concentration of capital and export expansion on the world market. France and Italy have occupied a half-way house, in which at one time or another they have been a breeding-ground for foreign-monopoly affiliates, or a base for state-aided expansion by French and Italian companies of domestic and international production.

The purely national reorganizations of economies, even when promoting internationalization, have reached their limits. It follows that inter-imperialist rivalry will take the form of competition to expand internationalization of production. Indeed, such a competition began in the 1970s with West German and Japanese corporations in particular expanding their overseas operations. The recession has cut these efforts short, although the internationalization of West German capital will be stimulated by the expansion and consolidation of the EEC.

In the capitalist world economy it is not, however, simply a matter of productivity differences created by the relative pace of concentration of capital. Concentration is itself stimulated and governed by differential access to finance. In the world economy, the role of the dollar, and to a lesser extent of sterling, as the international means of payment, gives American (and British) capital a decisive advantage in the competition to concentrate capital internationally. For inevitably, financial flows at some stage are channelled through U.S. and British banks, with all the consequences that this entails.

This is not to suggest that West German and Japanese monopoly capital and currencies cannot be internationalized and even strengthened. Indeed, this is clearly what has happened at the expense of the United States and Britain, leading to international currency crises as early symptoms of the coming recession. But there is a difference between the mark and the yen strengthening within the dollar/sterling system and a break with that system altogether. In this light, the jockeying over international finance, while still enjoying an at-

mosphere of cooperation, could well forebode deep rivalries in which the FRG, in particular, will seek to consolidate an advantage by integrating its role in the EEC with a control of finance through the recently established European Monetary System. The other European capitalist economies will then be torn between support for a West European capital expanding internally and externally under West German domination, and a defense of U.S. multinational corporations on which their economic and social stability depends.

The working class of the capitalist countries can learn an important lesson from the analysis of these processes: the renewal of inter-imperialist rivalry

and the competition to dominate the reorganization of multinational corporations in the internationalization of world capitalist production can only mean more burdens for the proletariat. This can be averted only through alternative organizations of economic and political power in the hands of a broad democratic alliance aiming to establish a socialist society and committed to wrest control from international capital.

1. A policy aimed to slow down economic growth by, say, raising the interest rate on bank credit. — Ed.

2. A set of measures aimed to enliven a stagnant economy. — Ed.



Latin American panorama

ACUTE PROBLEMS OF GUYANA

Cheddi Jagan

General Secretary, People's Progressive Party of Guyana

Growing imperialist pressure has brought the national-liberation process in Guyana to a standstill. The ruling People's National Congress (PNC), being unable to find a way out of the economic and financial crisis that hit the country in 1976, began to give in to the imperialists, who are to blame more than anyone else for our country's backwardness and poverty. Rightists in the PNC favor a policy running counter to the national interest. They oppose unity of the democratic, popular and left-wing forces, which the People's Progressive Party (PPP) seeks with a view to ending the crisis.

The economic situation is still grave, with falls in production, exports and imports, and shortages of foreign exchange, essential commodities and raw materials. Guyana's balance of payments deficit rose from 3 per cent of the gross national product in 1975 to 22 per cent in 1977. At the end of 1977, the gross official reserves of the Central Bank of Guyana dropped to a level equivalent to less than one month of imports.

In 1974, the regime placed the blame for the economic crisis threatening the country on the oil crisis.¹ Today the blame is being put on economic recession and inflation in the capitalist world, rising prices of imports and falling world prices of sugar. There is no denying that the capitalist economic crisis has an adverse effect on developing countries. But in Guyana the government itself is

committed to a policy considerably compounding financial difficulties. It is attempting to resolve these difficulties by conventional methods — resort to more borrowing from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In June 1978, Guyana signed an agreement with the IMF on granting it two loans amounting to G\$20 million and G\$28 million.² The PNC government also gets big loans from the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, the USA, Canada, Britain and West Germany — a total of roughly G\$500 million.

Shortly after the IMF agreement, the government promulgated a New Investment Code with an open door to foreign capital. Mining concessions were granted to a French firm and a West German company for uranium, and to two companies — a Canadian and a United States — for mineral oil.

The Investment Code is a complete somersault of the socio-economic guidelines enunciated in December 1974 to mark the 10th anniversary of the PNC in government.³

According to the Investment Code, the 'strategic activities' which will be reserved for the state are as follows: mining and exportation of bauxite (this does not include the production or smelting of alumina); power generation for general public distribution; public transportation; telecommunication; education (but excluding special training institutions); and importation of specific items for purposes of trading. When this is reviewed with the 1978-1981 Development Plan, which reserves only 3.9 per cent for manufacturing industry and 6.5 per cent for conventional (not hydro) electricity development, it is clear that the regime will pursue its pro-capitalist and pro-

imperialist development strategy. The state will become the provider of cheap raw materials and services as was done in Britain after nationalization in the late 1940s of electricity, coal, steel, road transport and railways. It will operate at the primary (least profitable) level of production of bauxite while the secondary (more profitable) stage — aluminum ingots and fabricated products — will be open to foreign private capital.

Thus the PNC élite is conniving in a junior-partner role with the imperialist scheme to exploit Guyana's natural resources (bauxite, uranium, mineral oil, timber, etc.) and labor power, and at the same time to keep the country as a raw material/primary producer and agricultural appendage.

It is interesting to note that the IMF ascribes the problems of countries like Guyana to the mismanagement of their governments, particularly in fiscal and monetary affairs.

There has been mismanagement as far as Guyana is concerned. But the malaise is more deep-seated. Despite political independence, Guyana's economy has not been diversified. As in colonial times, it is still based on three primary commodities — bauxite, sugar and rice — which account for 87 per cent of the value of all exports. The balance of payments crisis is due not only to falling or stagnant prices in the international market, but primarily to stagnation or fall in production and exports. Whatever foreign exchange is earned is reduced by huge debt and compensation payments.

The balance of payments and budget deficits have been the outcome largely of an incorrect economic planning strategy, which is dictated by imperialism, concentrated on infrastructural, rather than directly-productive industrial and agricultural development. Consequently, with the restriction in the growth of the productive forces production did not increase sufficiently to earn the necessary foreign exchange and to meet the costs of debt and compensation payments. Another heavy burden is salary payments for the burgeoning bureaucratic-administrative apparatus.⁴

The PNC leadership makes the people bear the consequences of the economic crisis. Direct and indirect taxes increased from G\$58 million in 1964 (when our party was in power) to G\$300 million in 1978. In the same period, the social services sector of the current budget expenditure declined from 45 to 29 per cent. From February 15, 1975 to February 15, 1976 the cost of living index figure rose by 9.7 points. But between March 1977 and March 1978, it escalated by 26 points.

In the 1974-1976 period, primarily under pressure from our party, the regime nationalized the foreign-owned sugar and bauxite companies and some sectors of foreign trade. But as the superstructure underwent no positive changes, nationalization did not bring about workers' participation and control in management and decision-making. Many genuine mass organizations are not recognized. The regime creates parallel, bureaucratically-run bodies. For instance, the democratically-elected Rice Producers Association

established by law has not been accorded recognition and has been supplanted by appointed Rice Action Committees, which are bureaucratically managed. A PNC party card is necessary for jobs, promotion, training, scholarships, land and houses. Leading posts are assigned to PNC members irrespective of their professional or other qualifications.

The PPP insists that at the financial level the crisis should be solved at the expense not of the working class but of the capitalist class. It has called for large cuts in the bureaucratic state apparatus, and cuts in expenditure. It has been struggling for the implementation of its 17-point program advanced in June 1976. The program expects the state to take over all key economic positions, carry out an agrarian reform in favor of those who till the land and draw the masses into the implementation of socio-economic changes. Our party sees an important aspect of national development in a planned economy aimed primarily at promoting industry and agriculture, expanding the public and cooperative sectors and establishing durable relations with countries of the socialist community. It stresses the importance of educating the people in a Marxist-Leninist spirit.

The CC PPP considers that imperialism poses a potential threat. In view of growing opposition, it may stage a military coup that would bring reactionary forces to power. It will not be easy to achieve unity but there is no other way. All Guyanese, whatever their race, political convictions or religious beliefs, would have to pay dearly for a fascist regime if it were ever imposed — witness Chile.

To stave off the imperialist threat and lift Guyana out of the social and economic crisis, the CC PPP has resolved to campaign for a political solution to the country's problems. It has proposed forming a national patriotic front of all left and democratic parties and groups, including the ruling party. The front government should have a democratic, anti-imperialist, socialist-oriented program, as the CC PPP pointed out in its political declaration (August 1977).

At the Second Biennial Congress of the PNC (August 1977), Forbes Burnham rejected the idea of a national front government. This stems, in our view, from the fact that the PNC leadership is unwilling to surrender its narrow party interests and wants to stay in power and retain its privileges at all costs.

In July 1978, another Bill was passed, extending the life of the parliament and government from five years to six years and three months. The pretext used was the need to frame a new Constitution. In reality, the PNC plans to rig the new Constitution, create an executive President with unlimited powers and reduce the powers of the National Assembly. As the CC PPP sees it, the problem lies not in a constitutional crisis but in a political crisis. The abortive attempt to solve the political crisis plus the deepening economic and social crisis and the growing dissatisfaction of the democratic forces are leading to a situation fraught with confrontation.

In foreign affairs, the right wing of the PNC tries to impose a policy typical of the 1971-1973 period.

It insists on refraining from exposing imperialism, renouncing an independent, sovereign position in the international arena and the commitment to non-alignment, friendship and cooperation with progressive regimes and the countries of the socialist community, and placing Guyana in the strategic orbit of U.S. imperialism and Brazilian sub-imperialism. This is a dangerous path. The Amazon basin 'development' plan of Brazil, a country which has hegemonic designs on the whole southern hemisphere, including the Caribbean, in the interest of the big foreign and local bourgeoisie, has already been approved.

While there are dangers in the Guyana political situation, new possibilities are opening up for revolutionary advance. Not since 1953 has such a broad-based unity developed in the struggle for democracy, a unity comprising the opposition parties, the most important trade unions in the key sectors of the economy, and the main religious bodies representing Christianity, Hinduism and Islam.

The PPP sees the need for a solution to the political crisis without which there will be no solution to the economic and social crisis. It continues to work for unity with all forces fighting against authoritarian minority rule, for a national patriotic front government of all left and democratic forces with a democratic, anti-imperialist and socialist-oriented program.

1. Actually, long before the oil crisis of 1973-1974, the economy was already showing signs of stagnation. As early as 1971, Dr. Wilfred David, the then Economic Adviser of the PNC government, stated that 'we have had growth without development. The problem has been exemplified by a high level of unemployment and foreign dependence.'

2. G\$2.25 equals U.S. \$1 — Ed.

3. 'As we move to control land in the interest of the nation,' said PNC leader Forbes Burnham, we will also take control over all foreign trade — import and export... We are frequently asked about our policy in relation to foreign private investment... Private investment from abroad is welcome in specific fields in consortium with government and/or cooperatives, provided that in each case government and/or the cooperatives hold majority equity and real control... During the period ahead, our party intends to proceed with the implementation of the policy of ownership and control of natural resources... The government, party and party members must make a united effort to achieve our oft-stated objective during 1975 and bring an end to foreign banks taking and investing local deposits...'

4. Salary payments increased from G\$27 million in 1964 to G\$176 million in 1978, equivalent to 38 per cent of budget expenditure.

A FOREDOOMED STRATEGY

Orlando Millas

Member, CC Political Commission and Secretariat, Communist Party of Chile

All the reactionary regimes that have come to power in Latin America in the past decade, including fascist regimes, are United States clients. The Pinochet

tyranny, the most ominous incarnation of fascism in Latin American countries, is the product of a conspiracy masterminded and financed by the Nixon-Kissinger administration. The Pinochet dictatorship was backed by President Ford and is now backed by President Carter, in manifest contrast to his own statements.

The case of Chile is not unique. The reign of the Somoza dynasty would have been unthinkable without support from the U.S. big stick policy. The heroic fight of the Nicaraguan people against the tyranny was also a fight against the despot's masters and accomplices — the Pentagon, the CIA and Wall Street. This illustrates why unremitting struggle against fascism is inseparable from the struggle against imperialism.

The events in Nicaragua has repercussions throughout Latin America, for instance, the outcome of the OAS (Organization of American States) meeting, which rejected the U.S. plan for intervention to save 'Somozaism.' The majority of the OAS countries, with the Andean Pact states (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela) and Mexico in the lead, took a stand for the right of the Sandino people to self-determination. The impact of the Nicaraguan events will continue, for they revealed the main thing, namely, that the struggle for democracy, freedom, independence and progress implies struggle against imperialist plans and policies.

This is of vital importance not only to Uruguay and Chile, where fascist arbitrary rule is unbridled, but to countries where democratization is gaining ground, where the mass movement confronts fascism with insuperable obstacles day after day, or where reaction is on the offensive. Fascist trends backed by the more aggressive sections of the local finance oligarchy have their origin north of the Rio Grande.

The reactionary offensive launched in the 1970s all over the continent had been carefully planned by U.S. imperialism. The doctrine of national security, which Latin American reactionaries want to impose on their countries as an official strategy, was devised in the USA and applied 'according to circumstances' but always as an instrument of neo-colonial policy. It is part of the aggressive military doctrine advanced by General Maxwell Taylor in his book *The Uncertain Trumpet*. In Latin America this doctrine is known as the West Point Doctrine intended to set limits to control of the armed forces by democratic institutions on the pretext of preventing riots and 'chaos,' and to fill power 'vacuums.' In other words, its fundamental purpose is to counter whatever endangers imperialist domination.

Events of the 1960s in the Dominican Republic, Panama and Peru showed that the crisis in the Latin American countries involved also the armed forces, among which anti-imperialist and patriotic currents had formed. This alarmed Wall Street. The Rockefeller Report on the Americas submitted to the U.S. President in 1969, recommended setting up military-fascist or pro-fascist regimes on the continent. Imperialism attacked, using a wide spec-

trum of conspiratorial methods against the nationalist military who wanted to preserve the professional character of the armed forces and to keep the Constitution and democracy intact. The United States resolved to place power in the hands of the military known for their anti-democratic persuasions.

What happened in Chile is confirmed by documentary evidence.¹

Monstrous as it may seem, some people would like to forget the scenario that brought the Pinochet dictatorship to power. What is particularly dangerous is that we are not in the presence of an isolated fact or a policy that has become history. The fascist coup on September 11, 1973 was part of a policy tailored to circumstances, place, and time in other Latin American countries. Today it finds expression in scandalous aid to Pinochet.

The instrument of interference in the affairs of countries of the region and of spreading fascism in Latin America is the inter-American defense system plus military pacts with the United States. It has been proved that the Chilean coup was directed by the U.S. military mission housed on the sixth floor of the Ministry of National Defense.

In the military sphere, imperialism's policy seeks to turn the armed forces of the Latin American nations into a Pentagon tool and bring them under U.S. control in line with the hypocritical theory of 'interdependence.' In other words, it is aimed at establishing colonial stewardship over them, doing away with national sovereignty and replacing it by the 'sovereignty' of a military caste so as to prevent the armed forces from serving the interests of their peoples and transfer their leadership to such anti-patriotic and venal elements as Pinochet.

A system of bilateral 'mutual military aid pacts' between Latin American nations and the USA was initiated in the early 1950s. These pacts provided for 'training courses' on American territory and in the Panama Canal Zone. The courses give training to all army officers and many NCOs of the signatory countries. The emphasis is on ideology and politics. Trainees are indoctrinated with rabid anti-communism and the ideas of violence and scorn for other nations and for individuals. The U.S. command recruits agents from the trainees. Manuals contain instructions on how to seize power. The Gestapo's methods of destroying people are in no way original, any more than the horrors of the torture system used by DINA-SNI in Chile. These methods have long been taught by the USA in the Canal Zone. While President Carter holds forth about human rights, his subordinates train cold-blooded sadists 'having' the inhuman right to destroy patriots. Many trainees come out against this kind of training.

What has made the trend toward fascism possible? The main factor is the exploitation of Latin America by the U.S. finance oligarchy.² The methods of plundering the national resources, exploiting the working people and controlling the economies of various countries of the continent are being perfected. Preference is given to financial lev-

ers. It is not accidental that Nelson Rockefeller was the author of the report arguing that the USA 'must' help Latin America's armed forces to establish tyrannical rule on the Uruguayan or Chilean model and to perpetuate other dictatorships, such as the one recently overthrown by the Nicaraguan people.

The Pinochet regime's economic policy is characterized by a chronic foreign trade deficit and a mounting debt. Chile's exports barely add up to 90 per cent of its imports. The situation is made worse by the fact that every year the regime is compelled to spend half of the export earnings on repaying a foreign debt equal to the total amount of export revenues for three years, or nearly 70 per cent of the value of the gross national product.

The annual influx of foreign capital is so great that the Chilean economy will be unable to function if the lavish credits which the dictatorship gets at a usurious rate of interest are cut. In 1978, credits amounted to 92 per cent of the total value of exports, or about 21 per cent of the value of the gross national product, and were worth nearly twice as much as domestic investments. Fascism has made the economy entirely dependent on big multinational banks and on their 'good will' as investors. A substantial part of foreign financing is spent on repaying old debts. Thus, the entire tyrannical system is controlled by imperialist bankers. In the final analysis, as a result of Pinochet's crimes, much of the money coming from Chile in payment of its foreign debt or as profit finds its way to the USA, West Germany, and other major imperialist countries. Pinochet is in a position to stick to his criminal economic policy precisely because U.S. bankers give him all the credits he needs, and because the Carter Administration and its partners on the Trilateral Commission readily grant him various guarantees and other facilities.

Chile is dependent in every economic field. One-fourth of its imports comes from the USA and over half, including those from third countries, is handled by subsidiaries of U.S. multinationals. Fascism has not yet brought itself to denationalize the large copper industry, but some mines and the marketing of copper are in the hands of imperialism, with which the relevant contracts have been signed.

Pinochet's chief master is the Rockefeller finance group. On the one hand, the group may be regarded as a senior partner or at least a partner maintaining numerous links with the biggest clans of the local finance oligarchy (Javier Vial, Cruzat-Larrain, Edwards, Matte-Alessandri and others), which control the fascist regime from within. On the other hand, the group's Chase Manhattan Bank and Chemical Bank head the list of the tyranny's creditors. Furthermore, Chile's energy policy has been dealt a staggering blow because the dictatorship has submitted to all instructions from the Rockefeller group and its oil monopoly, Exxon (its Chilean subsidiary is called Esso), ignoring national interests.

The Rockefeller group hated the Allende government. Shortly before the 1970 presidential elections, it imposed a contract on Chile to safeguard itself against eventual anti-imperialist measures.

The contract made the group Chile's oil supplier for five years and specified the price and quality of the oil to be delivered. But then came the conflict with Arab countries, and world oil prices went up. It turned out that the group had set a trap for itself. The Popular Unity government insisted on scrupulous adherence to the terms of the contract, refusing to accept amendments. Thus, we were supplied with crude oil at a price that was ludicrously low in the new conditions. The Rockefeller group said it wanted to suspend the contract, but we declared that we would take the most drastic measures if it did, to the point of putting an embargo on American goods. Forced to give in, the group joined in preparations for the coup.

One of the early steps taken by Pinochet after he seized power was to void that contract. The dictatorship proceeded to purchase oil from the Rockefeller group at a new price, with the result that the group earned hundreds of millions of dollars. Nor was that all. Steps were taken to restrict coal production, and fuel prices were decontrolled. One of the tyranny's most outrageous moves was to transfer La Disputada de Las Condes, a copper mine, to Exxon. The plant of this mine, which extracted high-grade copper (six million tons a year), was estimated at \$220 million. It is conveniently situated, being linked to the major ports by excellent highways. An yet all this was sold for a mere \$175 million. Besides, Exxon was permitted to expand the exploitation of the Andina and El Teniente mines, which had been nationalized by the Popular Unity government.

No matter how hard reactionary analysts and imperialist propaganda try, they cannot conceal the incontrovertible fact that U.S. imperialism is Pinochet's master.

Nevertheless, there are those to whom relations between Carter and Pinochet do not seem clear enough. They often identify the North American people's sincere sentiments and the solidarity and assistance extended to the Chilean people by democratic North Americans with official U.S. policy, or something entirely different.

President Carter, who poses as a champion of human rights, is very anxious to disguise his policy. However, his attempts to back the tyranny of the shah in Iran and of Somoza in Nicaragua betrayed the actual significance of that policy.

In carrying out his ploy with support from gigantic mass media, Carter did his best to spearhead his human rights campaign at the socialist countries. We Chileans have our own opinion of this. Carter and Pinochet are by no means opposites — one has only to think, among other revealing facts, of their friendly meeting in Washington from which the Chilean tyrant profited considerably. By contrast, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community are unequivocally committed to a firm, consistent policy of solidarity with the Chilean people. They have taken an uncompromising stand on fascism, severed diplomatic and other relations with the tyranny, and emphatically condemned it in the UN and other international organizations. The

socialist countries conduct vast campaigns in support of Chile's democrats. The Soviet Union was one of the main sponsors of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights approved by the UN General Assembly on December 16, 1966. An International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was likewise adopted. The Soviet Union abides unfailingly by both. As for the United States, it has refused to sign these documents which give human rights legal force. Upholding the real sovereignty and rights of peoples, the Soviet Union has exposed the criminal activity of imperialist agencies, which came out against the Allende government and yet are talking about human rights now. People in Chile know what CIA interference on the plea of love of freedom means. It is a love nobody believes in.

Of course, our people would have greatly appreciated it if pressure from the democratic forces of the USA and the internal contradictions of that country had put an end to interference by the Pentagon and the U.S. administration in Pinochet's favor, as well as to the activity of U.S. monopolies, which help the tyrant with the direct support of the U.S. fiscal system. But there is no such thing and this makes the illusions spread by Carter dangerous.

Carter's hypocrisy is due to the need to maneuver in the face of the worsening crisis of the dependent social and economic structures of Latin America. The working class of the continent has become a sizable force and joins in social struggles more and more actively. The imperialists meet widespread resistance from the workers, the middle strata, intellectuals and peasants, as well as from large groups of the bourgeoisie, who take a stand against attempts to make the peoples of Latin America shoulder the burden of the capitalist monetary crisis and runaway inflation.

Détente has opened up new prospects for the forces of progress in Latin America. President Carter is wrong if he thinks he can reverse this development with fine gestures while trying to perpetuate the Pinochet, Duvalier and Stroessner dictatorships.

President Carter met with opposition among liberal Congressmen and the U.S. public when he tried to justify the granting of credits to Pinochet and other clients like him. He said it would be unacceptable to him if a Congress resolution limited U.S. bank credits regardless of circumstances. This would conflict with the principles of the very system of free enterprise, he contended.

The present U.S. administration has supported the maneuvers of some AFL-CIO leaders against a boycott of the junta, decided on by international labor organizations demanding the restoration of trade union rights in Chile. In connection with the inquiry into the assassination of Orlando Letelier, Chile's former Minister of Defense, in Washington, Carter and Pinochet signed an agreement that was originally secret. Under that agreement, the U.S. government pledged to conceal the evidence it had on Pinochet's crimes in third countries, specifically facts relating to the assassination of Carlos Prats,

former Vice-President of Chile, and his wife in Buenos Aires, the attempt to murder another former Vice-President of Chile, Bernardo Leighton, and his wife in Rome and other acts of terrorism in Paris and Mexico.

The democratic movement is on the rise in Latin America. Socialist Cuba enjoys considerable prestige. Its achievements are making a growing impact on the minds of our peoples and there is no underrating their significance. The unswerving anti-imperialist policy of the Cuban revolution and its leader, Fidel Castro, is admired throughout the continent.

At the same time, contradictions between imperialism and Latin America are growing. Even in countries where U.S. capital cooperates with its domestic counterpart, there is an increasing antagonism for the finance metropolis. The situation is indeed explosive.

Stirring news comes daily from every part of Latin America. The gains of the Democratic and Popular Unity Front in Bolivia and the successes of the Communist Party clear the way for the difficult democratization process in that country. The Mexican Communist Party achieved a noteworthy advance at the latest elections. In Brazil, the struggle of the working people, students and democratic forces has assumed unprecedented proportions. In Chile headway has been made toward coordinating the efforts of the most diverse opposition forces. One of the more important lessons of Nicaragua is that mutual understanding and concord among democrats and patriots can acquire a great potential. Anti-imperialism and anti-fascism in Latin America are shedding their sectarianism.

The policy proposed by Rockefeller ten years ago is in crisis. It has placed a maximum limit to the social basis of imperialist domination in Latin America. A swing to the left is to be observed. A duty of all democrats, and primarily of all revolutionaries, is to put an end to fascism where it has been established and block the road to it where it has become a threat.

1. Armando Uribe, former ambassador of the Popular Unity government to China, has exposed CIA activities in *Le Livre Noir de l'Intervention Americaine au Chile* (Black Book on U.S. Interference in Chile). There is no questioning the findings of the International Commission for the Investigation of the Crimes of the Military Junta in Chile (Mexico, February 1975), which studied 'U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Chile, the CIA conspiracy, and the multinational corporations.' The Church report to the U.S. Senate admits many of the facts cited by the Commission. The CIA has censored that part of *The CIA and the Cult of Espionage*, a book by Marks and Marchetti, which deals with the aggression against Chile. Ample information is supplied in *Chile and the CIA: A Big Deal* by Fyodor Sergeyev, a Soviet analyst.

2. Tons of paper go into the printing of books, periodicals, and newspapers, whose purpose is to justify in 'moral,' indeed 'humanist' terms the U.S. imperialist presence on the continent while defaming the anti-imperialist forces. The point is that U.S. multinationals and their giant banks use all the means at their disposal to continue plundering our countries.

THE 'BATTLE' OF PUEBLA

Juan Rosales

Argentinian journalist

The Third Conference of the Latin American Episcopal Council (CELAM) in the Mexican town of Puebla was the major event for the Catholic Church in the region. It aroused much interest among the peoples of Latin America as a whole. The opening ceremony, attended by over 300 church leaders of Latin America and other regions, was addressed by Pope John-Paul II. Following a discussion of numerous amendments to the drafts, the Conference adopted a final document entitled 'The Evangelization of Latin America Now and in the Future.'

CELAM President Cardinal Lorscheider declared at the Conference that Puebla must determine 'how to be and remain a Christian with millions of exploited and outcast people around, how to solve the problem of the extreme poverty of millions of Christians on a Christian continent.'

The Conference had great political reverberations precisely because it responded to the aspirations and needs of the Latin American peoples. Had the bishops' meeting dealt only with religious problems, as the reactionary clergy had wanted it to do, it would not have been of interest to anyone. Moreover, it would have carried the Church farther away from the masses, which now no longer wish to accept their hard lot, reject the calls for patience and passiveness, and demand concrete support through their organizations for their struggle to democratize social life. In this context, the Brazilian Archbishop Helder Pessoa Camara admitted that 'the Church is in debt' to Latin America, and 'in a sense we have ourselves confirmed that Marx was right when we offer an opiate to the oppressed.'

Puebla reflected in a specific form the complexity of the class struggle on the continent, which is having an influence on the Christian movement with its contradictory trends that, while professing the same faith, take a different view of the crisis of society and propose the most diverse ways of overcoming the crisis.

Because of their ties with the masses, their awareness of the changes taking place in their minds, because of their contacts with public opinion and because of the ever more realistic historico-religious thinking, a growing number of priests and bishops are coming to realize that the social system in our countries is in the throes of a deep crisis, and that it is not only incapable of solving the peoples' vital problems, but tends, on the country, to compound them, so engendering revolutionary storms. Those who take this view believe that the Church can no longer afford to link its future with that of a society without any future. Back in 1974, Cardinal Pironio said: 'Something new is taking place on the continent, which is why something new must also take place in the Church.' And while every religious trend tends to interpret this 'something new' in its own way, the facts show that the Church is forced to

adapt its language and activity to the social reality of our day.

It is impossible to produce a stereotyped analysis of the intricate process going on in the Christian movement. It is wrong to minimize its importance, especially in view of the sharpening social contradictions and the growing poverty of the masses, whose less conscious strata usually cast about for irrational and mystic ways out of their tragic condition. There is a need to comprehend the depth of this process, to study its characteristic features and roots, which go back into the past history of the continent, and to reckon with the emergence of new forces professing feelings of solidarity and humanism and wholeheartedly desiring to take part in the ongoing events, but lacking a clear picture of them and being guided by utopian ideas. Reaction has sought to use these forces which are under the influence of the Church in order to spread discord within the mass democratic movement. It is the communists' duty to help believers overcome their inconsistency and superstitions, raise their political consciousness and work out their own unitary line of action to enable them actively to join in the anti-imperialist and revolutionary struggle in their countries.

That the Puebla Conference was to be convened was officially announced by the Pope in December 1976. Since then, the moderate rightists, capitalizing on the fact that they had taken over the key posts in CELAM, which was authorized to organize the Conference, worked hard to impose their own decisions on it. Following the resignation in 1972 of Pironio, President of the Council, and a number of progressive bishops (Camara, Proano, Padin and others) and the removal from its commissions of radical theologians and priests, the leadership of the Latin American Church fell into the hands of Colombian Bishop Lopez Trujillo, the new Secretary-General of the Council, and a group of clerical leaders known for their hostility to the 'liberation theology,'² and to the Christian duty with respect to the unitary acts of the masses.³

The Church is going through a difficult period, a fact it has itself admitted. The Puebla document says that religion is incapable of resisting the spread of the spirit of unbelief, atheism and growing secularization among broad social strata, especially the working people, who under industrialization, urbanization, scientific progress and from their own experience in social and political struggle are shedding the Church's tutelage and are increasingly relying on themselves. Speakers at the Conference noted with alarm the continuing crisis of the pastoral movements and the growing number of cases of priests breaking with the Church (over 30,000 priests and over 100,000 nuns have left it only in the past few years). There was special emphasis on the responsibility of the clergy for the existing social situation on the continent, 'which indicates that faith has failed to become a force exerting the necessary influence on decisions taken by responsible circles.'

In these conditions, attempts are being made to

launch a crusade in order to 'Evangelize the new barbarians' who are rising to struggle in Latin America. This does not imply a 'liberative Evangelization' in the spirit of Medellin⁴ or a Christianity allied with the people, but of a totally different kind of Evangelization. It is a call for drawing conclusions from the weakness of political clericalism in Europe, which is incapable of stopping the 'de-Christianization of the masses,' preventing the spread of communist ideas, which are supported by millions of believers, and the participation by Christians in building socialism. Its proponents believe that if our 'Catholic continent' is not to suffer the same fate, there is a need to work for social reconstruction in order to carry out some necessary changes not by means of struggle but by means of 'love.' The idea is to turn the Church into the spiritual leader of the masses, and to carry them along the 'reformist and Christian' way, which in practice leads to divisions and ideological war between sections of the people, and this at a time when the people are especially in need of unity in order to resist reactionary arbitrariness and secure the satisfaction of their demands in the struggle for democracy and freedom. It was said at the Episcopal Synod in Rome that in Latin America 'the Church must become the alternative to Marxism.'

That is the 'new way' of one of the clerical trends, an orientation leading to an alliance between the Church and imperialism, U.S. imperialism in the first place, and encouraging the forces which can split and paralyze the anti-imperialist mass movement.

Let us note that such ideas permeated the first preparatory Puebla text, a consultative document. Although it did speak of the plight of the masses, this was said to be due to the growth of population and inadequate industrial development, the document sharply criticized political parties, especially Marxist parties, while the existence of reactionary military regimes in some countries was justified on the plea that they had allegedly filled a dangerous 'power vacuum.'

But the clergy, including virtually all the bishops, rejected the consultative document.⁵ The need to reckon with reality forced the Church leaders to draw up another working document, containing data on the tremendous and growing gap between the rich and the poor, and within the Church itself. It speaks of social injustice and the people's removal from political activity, and exposes the false doctrine of 'national security' imposed on the Latin American nations, which under the pretext of defending 'Christian values' justifies the suppression of freedoms. That is why the Church must take a stand on the side of the poor and support their urge for structural changes. Although the working document does reaffirm its authors' disagreement with Marxism, it recognizes, nevertheless, that societies guided by that doctrine 'have scored successes in education, public health, provision of food for the population, and eradication of social evils like prostitution, pornography and drug addiction.'

Consequently, the Puebla Conference proceeded

in an atmosphere of acute ideological and political confrontation. Those who supported the conservative trend, the so-called integrists, associations of Catholic entrepreneurs, and the right-wing press mounted a strident propaganda campaign demanding condemnation of 'communist infiltration' of the Church and 'rebellious' bishops and priests. For their part, representatives of the progressive Christian and secular movements, the so-called renewalists, called for emphasis on the Medellin spirit and solidarity with the peoples' struggle.

Tension was also increased by the CELAM Secretariat's selective approach in barring from the Conference many progressive bishops. Even the Latin American Conference of Monks and Nuns (CLAR), which has a membership of 170,000, and which had an important role to play at Medellin, was initially kept away from the Puebla Conference, because according to the CLAR President, it was regarded by CELAM's Secretary-General Lopez Trujillo as a "dangerous movement." Undesirable prelates were struck off the list of participants, and in their stead invitations were sent to some hierarchs of the Roman Curia and Third World specialists like the West German Bishop Schwarz, who warned from the rostrum of the Conference that nothing good would result from the attempts to get down to a too-deep discussion of social and political issues, and referred to the 'lamentable' experience of priests who have 'allowed themselves to be seduced' by communist slogans (i.e., those taking part in their peoples' liberation struggle) in Angola, Mozambique or Vietnam.

The Pope's address at the opening of the Conference reflected the contradictions in the mood of the clergy, while being designed to dampen them and to determine the nature of the Conference proceedings. On the one hand, he urged the Church to safeguard its 'identity,' to prevent any ideological influence on it, and correctly to interpret the Medellin decisions. On the other hand, he urged a step forward as compared with Medellin, resolutely condemned social injustice on the continent, and called on the 'governments, the rich and the powers that be' to help put an end to it. The Pope declared that the Church's special mission is above any social and political polarization, and that Christians must 'hold out their hand without any prejudice to anyone who wants to work for the common good.' The masses of believers booed Pope John-Paul II's speech (after having welcomed his arrival in Mexico with delight) when he urged them to be patient and rest content with the 'simple joys of poor people.' He subsequently tried to adapt to their mood, and while he did not support the renewalists, he did not anathematize them either, as some circles had wanted him to do.

Each of the trends interpreted the Pope's stand in its own way, and when the Conference got down to its work a struggle got under way for the prevalence of this or that line.

The press has designated the events connected with the Third Conference of the Latin American Episcopal Council the 'battle of Puebla.' Despite the

prevalence of moderates and traditionalists in the working commissions, and the Secretariat's moves to prevent a substantive discussion of the questions and to impose its decisions, the agenda proposed by Lopez Trujillo was rejected by a majority after a heated debate. The bishops expressing the views of the progressive wing of the Church called for a solution of vital social and political problems in the interests above all of the poor, defense of human dignity and human rights, which are being trampled over a large part of Latin America, a replacement of the existing unjust structures, and condemnation of the arms race and wars and of the transnationals and their power.

Many of these demands are written into the final document adopted by the Conference. The Church recognized that "it cannot remain inactive in a changing world," when 'the people suffer and demand justice, freedom and respect for basic human rights.' It is not enough, the document says, to identify the evil, for there is a need to expose its 'deep roots.' It is a duty of believers 'to promote the establishment of a fairer, freer and more peaceful society.'

But the document is highly vague and contradictory when it deals with the need to tackle the problems facing believers. Liberation is necessary, it says, but it is not right to resort 'to violence and to refer to the dialectics of the class struggle;' structures need to be changed, but 'from within,' 'by Evangelizing the rich.' The document condemns many repressive regimes, but none of them is identified, although it is admitted that 'fear of Marxism prevents many from denouncing the oppressive reality of liberal capitalism.' The document rejects both social systems — capitalism and socialism — and equates them, claiming that the Latin American Church must follow a 'third way' and offer the world 'something new;' it urges believers to respond to the needs of the disinherited and outcast, but condemns 'the new and alarming phenomenon' of broad participation by clergymen in the people's struggle for their demands and their desire for 'a social analysis with a heavy political connotation.'

Thus, the Conference adopted a relatively mid-way document, which to some extent reckons with the vital demands of the masses, while reflecting the ideas of the centrists and the conservatives, a fact which limits its effectiveness. That is why the long battle between the various Catholic trends ('between the Church which knows the taste of the people's broth, and the Church which looks upon it from afar,' as Bishop Proano aptly put it) will continue even after Puebla. Each of these will interpret the document in its own way.⁶

The document does not suit reaction at all, and it has not stopped its fight. It is especially worried about its positive aspects which 'tend to confuse' the clergy. The imperialists, notably those of the United States and the FRG, seek to use Catholicism to promote their neo-colonialist goals and reject the very possibility of 'the Church siding with the oppressed.' They oppose the reforms demanded by the masses and fear that the 'alternative to Marxism'

could develop into an 'alternative to capitalism' and 'our own road' into 'political and social unity of the people,' as Radomiro Tomich, a prominent leader of Chile's Christian-Democratic Party, quite rightly said.⁷

The ten years since the Medellen Conference have left their mark. Thanks above all to the tireless explanatory work of the communists, broad masses of Christians are beginning to understand who is to blame for the plight of the Latin American peoples, and its causes, and that the real aims of the anti-communism preached from the pulpit is to split the masses by using religion for that purpose. Cardinal Lorscheider admitted that 'Marxism bears no responsibility for the political structures existing on the subcontinent.' The Church is not being persecuted by 'atheistic regimes,' but by 'governments styling themselves Catholic,' Padre Arrupe declared. Cardinal Pironio (and others) stressed at the Puebla Conference that while Marxism and Christianity are incompatible philosophies, 'in practical terms there is a possibility of some cooperation, as, say, in the defense of human rights.'

With the search for a 'third way' in Latin America proving to be futile, Cuba offers experience, which is unprecedented on the continent, of establishing a society free from injustice, discrimination and social inequality, a society made possible by the efforts of a people rallied round its revolutionary vanguard. Christians, who regard socialism not as an obstacle but as a genuine incentive for man's material and spiritual development, are also actively and consciously involved in this creative effort, without giving up their religious persuasion.⁸

Tremendous forces seeking their own way are in a state of ferment within the bosom of the Church, within the broad popular Christian movement. Their radicalization is acquiring unprecedented depth. But this process is not homogeneous, frequently running in isolation from the struggle of the working class, which has a unifying and leading mission in the mass movement, and is not influenced by its revolutionary ideas. Out of touch with the mass movement this process could boil down to a harmless protest, to utopian reformism or to ultra-leftist blindness. Reaction would like to drive a wedge between the working class and its allies. By contrast, the communists seek to involve the supporters of the proletariat in their joint struggle for democratic and anti-imperialist changes.⁹

While carrying on a discussion with the Catholics, the communists bring to the fore the working people's common goals, above all those whose realization promotes the joint construction of life without fear of the future, without poverty, without ignorance, without national oppression and without exploitation of man by man.

1. Press reports said that 1,740 amendments were tabled, in particular, for the draft of the final document. — Ed.

2. 'Liberation theology' implies the need to take part in the liberation struggle by means of theological arguments, references to the Holy Scriptures, papal encyclicals and other religious documents. — Ed.

3. One of them, P.R. Vekemans, a one-time adviser to President Frei in Chile, founded in Colombia, with FRG and U.S. money, a center to study the development and integration of Latin America. In a memorandum presented in Puebla and signed by 100 theologians in the FRG, Vekemans was accused of receiving 'millions of dollars from the CIA to carry on imperialist policy in Latin America.'

4. A reference to the Second Conference of the Latin American Episcopal Council at the Colombian town of Medellen in 1968.

5. 'It does not reflect the Church's immediate historical perspective and fails to analyze the development of the continent over the past several years,' B. Pinera declared on behalf of the episcopate of Chile. The Brazilian clergy said the consultative document was impassive, unrealistic, and not binding on anyone in any way. Other members of the clergy spoke out in a similar vein. On the other hand, the progressive bishops of virtually the whole of Latin America, meeting in Bogota in late 1977, noted that 10 years after the Medellen Conference economic and social coercion has been supplemented by gross violations of basic human rights, and that 'the social injustice existing on the continent can precipitate a real cataclysm as a result of a mass uprising against the privileged classes.'

6. According to Padre Saelman, the text is so couched that 'it can be used both by those who want a concrete approach to economic, political and social problems, and by those who oppose their solution.'

7. 'The need and outlook for united action,' WMR, October 1978, p. 92.

8. Before leaving for Puebla, Archbishop Oves of Havana declared that Cuban Catholics were 'loyally and with a sense of responsibility involved in various types of activity which are a component part of the construction of an ever fairer, more humane and fraternal society.'

9. The Declaration issued by the 1975 Havana Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean said that the upswing in the popular struggle has led to the appearance of three Christian trends on the continent, with the 'reformist and progressive trends constituting an overwhelming majority, so that work among them is possible and necessary everywhere.'

Reference Index to the Collected Works of V.I. Lenin

Part One now available.
**Contains alphabetical index to all
works by Lenin and a name index.**

Cloth, 334 pages, \$2.95

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

The illusion of 'social partnership'

Helmut Rizy

Staff member of Volksstimme

From what the bourgeois media of our country affirm, the world admires and envies Austria. It is said to envy its 'social peace,' the cooperation between the employers and trade unions, and last but not least, the 'social partnership,' which has 'ended the class struggle.' In recent years, assertions of this nature have been widely used to mould public opinion on the 'Island of the Blessed,' as socialist politicians would like the world to call Austria.

Yet the crisis has also hit our country, albeit later than other capitalist nations. Massive layoffs and curbs on the working population's social rights are as common now as in the rest of the capitalist world. One hears no more talk of the 'Island of the Blessed.'

Regrettably, all this has hardly dispelled the illusion of 'social peace,' supposed to have struck strong roots in Austria. Advocates of 'social partnership' exploit the fact that in 1978 the time taken up by strikes in Austria was only 107 seconds per worker. They say nothing about what it cost our country to move to the bottom of international strike statistics. The government, employers and trade union leaders, who have formed a 'social partnership,' assure the workers that wage moderation guarantees employment and that the dismissal of part of the work force guarantees the preservation of the remaining jobs. During last spring's election campaign, candidates of the Socialist Party of Austria said time and again: 'We must admit in all frankness that today most of us are better off than before.'

However, the theory and practice of 'social partnership' no longer seem to be as infallible as they did in the past. More and more frequently, politicians loyal to the idea of 'partnership' emphasize its economic rather than social aspects. At a time when the social condition of labor is under growing pressure, it is increasingly hard to give out as social the 'partnership' in whose name the pressure is exerted, and much easier to describe it as an economic phenomenon, for economics is a more complex concept and workers have greater difficulty in understanding it.

SPA leaders go by the rule that the more skillfully a shopkeeper persuades customers of his honesty, the more effectively he can sell his goods. Last autumn, when the chairman of the union of private industrial employees gave 'warning' at its congress that 'social partnership' should not be regarded as a panacea, and admitted that there were problems it could not help solve, his show of 'honesty' had a definite connotation. He was hinting, as it were, that for all its imperfections, 'social partnership'

made it possible to achieve certain things. As a result of this ploy, the speech delivered at the same congress by the President of the Austrian Federation of Trade unions, who extolled 'social partnership,' sounded as if there were some substance to it.

Whatever the intentions of the chairman of the private employees' union, his admission proved very useful. His criticism of 'social partnership' had a convincing ring. Indeed, a few weeks before the congress he had seen for himself that negotiations based on the ideas of 'partnership' offered few possibilities. As chairman of an AFTU committee on taxes, he never managed to talk the Finance Minister and the employers into agreeing to at least a mild tax reform. Yet the reform was made indispensable by a tax burden growing under the impact of inflation, as he himself had pointed out in recent years.

The 100,000 signatures collected by the Communist Party and the left-wing trade union bloc* during a joint campaign were proof that numerous working people want the tax laws amended. The government and union leaders foresaw that the virtually fruitless outcome of months of talks would anger the working people. This prompted them to attribute everything to economic circumstances, thereby using once again a battered argument of the proponents of 'social partnership.'

In putting the blame for everything on economic circumstances, the employers and their SPA supporters exploit primarily the problem of jobs, which affects the interests of labor in particular. Nowadays, appeals for sacrifice to preserve jobs are made in our country whenever it is a question of rejecting a demand for improving the condition of labor. Union leaders brandish the stick of unemployment in urging the workers to gratefully accept the carrot of 'social partnership.' Regrettably, this approach draws no protest from many of the production councils on which the socialists, bound by party discipline, have a majority.

'What is good for the employer and hence the enterprise is good for the worker.' This is a theme on which the proponents of 'social partnership' have harped for years. But one has only to take a close look at the forms in which 'partnership' is exercised to see that while calling on the workers to accept class 'reconciliation' and work for the 'common good,' the employers seize on every opportunity to curtail their 'partners' social rights.

* A bloc of communists, left-wing socialists, and non-party people. — Ed.

How very far the socialists, who pose as 'spokesmen of labor,' are willing to go as supporters of 'partnership' is exemplified by their stand on the decision adopted by the board of Vereinigte Edelmetallwerke, a nationalized steel company, to discharge two per cent of the work force in the course of rationalization. To make the employees swallow the pill, the management tried to justify the layoffs with the plea that they had 'to part with all employees who still do not appreciate the gravity of the situation.'

The first lists of employees subject to dismissal were made public in mid-January 1979. Where socialists added up to at least two-thirds of the union membership, which conditions the composition of production councils, most of the lists were approved. Under Austrian labor legislation, persons who have lost their jobs under such circumstances cannot appeal to legal bodies for protection. (This implies that the concept of 'social partnership' has also left its stamp on labor legislation, since workers' participation in management has been reduced virtually to the right to approve of the dismissal of fellow-workers.)

But VEW union leaders went further. Entirely in line with the arguments of the board, they described the dismissed workers as 'malingerers.' A monstrous logic, indeed. The workers' 'spokesmen' found it possible to agree to the dismissal of workers disabled as the result of ruthless intensification of labor and hence of no more value to the company. Who cares whether workers falsely branded as 'malingerer' can find a job? No employer would want to hire a malingerer.

True, the situation at VEW also provides examples of a different kind. In some cases the conciliatory stand of the union bosses was criticized not only by the socialist rank and file but even by SPA-controlled production councils. On the production council of a VEW plant, where the SPA had less than the two-thirds majority needed for the adoption of a decision, the left bloc, joined by the representative of the Christian group, succeeded in blocking the management's dismissal plan. Moreover, the socialists, who had always backed the VEW board, were compelled to join the majority this time.

Lately the crisis has been invoked more and more often as justification for forms of rationalization that tend to rob the workers of their social and economic gains. Last year the company board and the executive of the central production councils, a narrow body on which only the SPA is represented, discussed a 'program of special measures' in an atmosphere of sweet cooperation. The subject was, in effect, 'austerity' measures, which are already affecting the condition of labor quite palpably.

The most absurd point of the program inspired by the 'social partnership' idea is the provision for the so-called special measure day, that is, for granting each worker one day's extra leave every month. At many enterprises, the result is that a worker who takes the extra day off on Friday has to work overtime on Saturday and Sunday, or to do precisely

what the 'special measure' is supposed to be directed against. It is perfectly natural that production councils, on which the left bloc has a majority, have rejected the executive's decision. As for the socialist-controlled councils, and they are in the majority, they have approved this decision.

The question arises: Why do the workers allow their 'spokesmen' to carry on this policy? Don't they see its disastrous effect on their standard of living and the absurdity of the assertion that 'the sacrifices made by the workers benefit the workers themselves?'

In trying to take one's bearings in this situation, one must remember, first of all, that at most enterprises the production councils are under socialist control, as we have already noted. Nor is this surprising, since the SPA is the world's strongest social-democratic party, comparatively speaking. When a conflict breaks out, the leadership of the production council says that the workers must back their 'spokesmen' because they alone can help the workers. Most workers take the bait and meekly resign themselves to anything 'social partnership' brings them.

It is probably too early to speak of an incipient reappraisal by the workers. The examples we have given are rather evidence to the contrary. Besides, at the enterprises where the socialists have a majority on the production council, many socialist functionaries stop at nothing to intimidate dissenters. Intimidation is also applied to workers suspected of planning to reject the path of 'social partnership' proposed by the SPA.

Mental terror in Austrian industry is something of a tradition. It dates from the early years of the Second Republic. Between 1946 and 1950, employers laid off hundreds of 'suspect' employees to stop the wave of strikes against wages and prices agreements meeting the requirements of 'social partnership.' First to be victimized were the communists — production council members, trade unionists, and ordinary workers. This undemocratic method is still employed openly at some major enterprises.

The dismissal of trade unionists known to be CPA members is a fairly common practice. During a new round of dismissals at Steyr-Werke, the socialist-controlled production council made no attempt to conceal its approval of the list of employees singled out for dismissal. The only argument it trotted out was that these employees 'maintained contacts' with the group representing the left-wing trade union bloc.

To take a stand for class struggle nowadays is a dangerous thing to do that may cost one one's job. However, the influence of apprehensions of this nature is often exaggerated. They are referred to now and then in an effort to justify the attitude of many Austrian workers who have ample experience and yet reconcile themselves to a compromise, which is camouflaged as 'social partnership' and does so much harm.

Advocates of 'social partnership' like to recall that after 1945, or in the early phase of this policy's

implementation, Austria's workers secured important concessions from the employers. They stress that the employers did not make these concessions under pressure from the class struggle. They invariably ignore the decisive fact that Austria neighbors on countries that have chosen the socialist road and that this reality was bound to 'soften' the position of the Austrian bourgeoisie. Again, no one should forget that for all the unquestionable initial 'gains,' the workers' socio-economic condition is still very poor by West European standards.

To illustrate the 'benefits' of the policy of 'social partnership,' reference is occasionally made to this or that nationalized company. Those who do so pretend to have forgotten that over a certain period the social rights of workers in the nationalized industries were guaranteed more effectively than in the private sector. However, these industries now bring workers under a pressure hardly ever practised in private industry.

While drawing no far-reaching conclusions from the foregoing in respect of the nationalized sector of the Austrian economy as a whole, we must realize that for all the talk about 'our common enterprise,' the measures carried out in it fit perfectly into the pattern of the private capitalist economy. It will be readily seen that the workers find themselves at a great disadvantage vis-à-vis both their employers and the foreign capitalists entrenched in the Austrian economy.

The forms which 'social partnership' will subsequently take are not hard to predict. When it comes to negotiating agreements on wages, which can no longer keep up the standard of living of the past due to growing inflation, the workers will be told that 'nothing more can be done in the circumstances.' The class struggle will continue to be described as a 'historical phenomenon' and strikes will be condemned. As for 'solidarity,' it will merely be, as in the past, the title of an illustrated trade union magazine (circulation, one million copies), nothing more.

Socialist union leaders will be allowed to talk about solidarity as much as they please, provided they interpret the term in a sense favorable to the employers. The employers, however, will use the crisis as an excuse to press forward rationalization, which is certain to leave many workers jobless. To defuse passions, the socialists and production councils will exhort workers, who have not yet lost their jobs, to 'identify' themselves with those who have. The success of this demagoguery will enable the employers to put out the same products while cutting the wage fund by one-third and maintaining 'social peace.'

According to data released by a research institute, the share of wages in Austria's national income is no greater now than 25 years ago even though the work force has grown. Curiously enough, the insti-

tute classes among wage workers industrial managers with salaries from 10 to 12 times higher than the wages of highly skilled workers. One result of 'social partnership' is precisely the fact that throughout the past 25 years the incomes gap has also been widening in the case of wage workers.

'We are all out on the same limb' or 'We are all in the same boat' is the kind of cliché used by those behind the policy of 'social partnership.' In the case of transnational companies, they turn out to be empty phrases. The 'limb' is seen as only a thin branch and the 'boat' as extra ballast burdening the flagship.

What this means in practice is revealed by the action of ENKA, a West German-Dutch company, which has decided to boost profits by closing down its rayon mill in Austria and transferring production to Thailand, where costs can be reduced. When the decision was made, an influential CPA-oriented group on the production council organized a march on Vienna and this rescued the enterprise and over 1,000 jobs.

At present the production council, being controlled by the SPA, merely pins its hopes on the talks which the Federal Chancellor is carrying on with the company board. But the government's links with transnationals prevent it from adopting measures to protect the interests of labor by, say, putting the enterprise under state control, as the workers demand. In fact, the government cannot be expected to do this, for the Chancellor once used his authority to ensure that the enterprise, once German-owned, was not nationalized after the signing of the State Treaty but transferred to ENKA.

Anyone who makes an unbiased analysis of the situation in the Austrian working-class movement will come to the conclusion that the policy of 'social partnership' on the Austrian model, which the whole SPA apparatus is busy hammering home to the working class and introducing into social relations, blocks the workers' struggle for their rights. 'The system of "social partnership",' says a resolution passed by the 23rd CPA Congress, 'has become a distinctive form of capitalist domination in Austria. . . . At every turn one comes across the effects of "social partnership": intimidation, threats of dismissal, a return to the most diverse forms of political discrimination in work places, a tendency to restrict rather than extend the rights and functions of production councils. . . . Experience confirms that partnership with capital can never be reconciled to workers' solidarity. This is why the struggle for democracy and workers' solidarity calls for the elimination of "social partnership".'

Confidence in those 'higher up' can only be shaken with the passage of time. However, the communists' growing prestige among the people and the workers' awakening class consciousness hold the promise of an early advent of this change.



The strike struggle in Asian and African countries in the 1970s

In the young Asian and African states the working-class movement is one of key components of their social and political development. But this may be said without reservations only of the present, still relatively short period. In the 1950s and even in the 1960s, on account of the backwardness of the former colonies and semi-colonies, chiefly in industrial development, the working class and its movement were at the formative stage. It was only in the past decade that on the Asian and African continents, with the exception, perhaps, of some Tropical African countries most delayed in their development, the working class has gained in strength and evolved into an independent force, while its actions are fusing with the international working-class movement. It is therefore quite natural to speak now of the general laws of the class struggle governing the working-class movement in this zone.

General conditions of the working-class movement

At the same time, this movement bears a visible imprint of the economic, social, and political conditions intrinsic to the Afro-Asian world, of its various regions, and individual countries. These conditions spring from the character of historical development and the effects of long imperialist colonial rule in most of the Asian and African countries, many of which found themselves in the vise of neo-colonial exploitation and oppression after they had achieved political independence.

This led to the establishment of authoritarian, anti-democratic forms of 'regulating' socio-political life, one of which consisted in widespread repressions and terror against the working-class movement. In many Asian and African countries legislation forbids strikes and regards participation in them as a punishable offense. For example, following the turbulent popular unrest in Egypt a law was promulgated in January 1977 on President Sadat's initiative prescribing hard labor for life for participation in strikes, rallies or demonstrations. In the liberated countries the development of the working-class movement is seriously obstructed by some other factors.

All this unquestionably hinders the development of the working-class movement in the Afro-Asian

world. Nevertheless, the working people's struggle for their immediate class interests and also for democratic aims and a progressive orientation in social development as a whole is by and large on the ascendent.

Some indicators

Official statistics published by national statistical services and summarized in the yearbooks of the International Labor Office (ILO) give only a very approximate picture of the strike movement. Usually, they ignore political strikes and labor conflicts of less than a day's duration and involving less than five or ten people, despite the fact that a very considerable number of workers are employed at small enterprises with a small personnel. In most of these countries labor conflicts are not divided into strikes and lockouts.

In the period 1968-1977 the numerical indicators of labor conflicts in some Asian and African countries were as follows (A — number of labor conflicts; B — number of workers participating in them; C — number of working days lost): (See table on page 67.)

In most of the countries listed in the table each labor conflict usually involved from 100 to 200 wage workers. But the working-class struggle of the 1970s witnessed strikes involving thousands of workers. In Egypt, for instance, every labor conflict in 1975 involved an average of 5,000-6,000-plus workers.

Strikes and development orientation

As in other forms of struggle, the scale and dynamics of the strike movement depend on the strength and organization of the working class and on the character and orientation of the political regime in the given country. In socialism-oriented countries the scale of the strike struggle of the proletariat is usually much smaller than in capitalism-oriented states. The overall reason for this is that the policy of the revolutionary-democratic leadership coincides broadly with the objective interests of the working masses.

Where social development is oriented on capitalism, the motivations of the strike movement and, consequently, the movement itself are much broader. The struggle is waged for traditional demands of the working class (higher pay, better working conditions, and so on) and against the overall orientation of the policy pursued by the ruling circles. In practice, both these elements objectively comprise a single whole. Needless to

This article was written by V. Martynov, scientific associate, Institute of the Working-Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the WMR Information Department.

		1968	1971	1973	1975	1977
Egypt	A	-	90	13	7	5
	B	-	11,425	4,222	40,527	1,042
	C	-	-	4,907	200,528	2,541
Ghana	A	36	79	13	33	61
	B	37,625	41,053	3,917	15,301	47,304
	C	100,017	116,041	3,109	39,410	205,170
India	A	2,776	2,752	3,370	1,943	2,653*
	B	166,929	1,615,140	2,545,602	1,143,426	1,876,710*
	C	17,243,679	16,545,636	20,626,253	21,900,931	21,214,281*
Malaysia	A	103	45	66	64	40
	B	31,062	5,311	14,003	12,124	7,783
	C	280,417	20,265	40,866	45,749	73,729
Morocco	A	90	259	462	267	421
	B	29,825	82,027	52,320	35,768	60,433
	C	162,883	589,334	353,499	228,523	375,802
Pakistan	A	138	141	229	260	81
	B	116,576	107,962	126,930	129,385	49,093
	C	417,428	815,211	399,317	798,183	200,865
Sri Lanka	A	197	165	448	70	124
	B	77,217	91,619	260,602	19,081	44,874
	C	988,416	568,161	1,179,042	66,476	222,047
Turkey	A	54	96	55	113	-
	B	5,259	10,916	12,286	13,848	-
	C	176,448	475,456	677,345	664,576	-
Zambia	A	206	127	68	78	51
	B	30,770	14,964	9,892	17,121	9,166
	C	65,898	18,894	6,453	51,003	15,990

*Estimate.

Source: *Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1978*, pp. 620, 621, 524-626, 628.

say, as the class-political consciousness of the working people grows the anti-capitalist orientation of strikes becomes more and more obvious.

In the Afro-Asian world the Indian working class holds first place for the scale of its strike movement. The struggle of the working people has reached a particularly high level of intensity in recent years. Strikes are frequently accompanied by fierce clashes with troops and police. For instance, in 1978 and in early 1979 there were mass strikes in transport and in the power, coal, jute and other industries. At the jute factories in West Bengal 225,000 workers remained on strike for more than six weeks. In February 1978 a general strike by nearly 200,000 dockers paralyzed India's largest ports for 11 days. The authorities had no choice but to give in to their socio-economic demands.

A feature of the strike struggle of the Indian working class is that its effectiveness is relatively high. For example, during the first half of the 1970s the outcome of the labor conflicts in India was as follows (per cent of the total number of conflicts):

	1974	1972	1973	1974	1975
Total success	26.4	29.8	36.6	31.5	23.7
Partial success	23.4	23.9	20.8	21.1	26.1
Failure	34.4	31.9	33.1	38.5	40.8
Undetermined outcome	15.8	14.4	9.5	9.8	9.4

Source: *Indian Labour Journal*, New Delhi, 1971-1976.

Understandably, this effectiveness can be achieved only by the strongest and most vigorous contingents of the Afro-Asian proletariat. They include the working class of Iran, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Sri Lanka and some other countries.

For example, a strike by 40,000 metalworkers in Turkey lasted eight months and ended in victory, in the signing in February 1978 of a collective agreement with the owners of enterprises in that industry. Other contingents of working people and the entire democratic community of Turkey declared their solidarity with the strikers.

A powerful weapon of the proletariat

In the course of the class struggle of the proletariat of Asian and African countries the range of its forms and methods steadily widens. Parallel with old, tested means of defending their interests (strikes, demonstrations, rallies), the workers are more and more frequently having recourse to methods that were formerly used only in developed capitalist countries (seizure of factories, 'chessboard' strikes — when work is ceased in various sections of an industry in accordance to a definite schedule — work-to-rule, and so on). The employment of the large arsenal of class struggles is only natural, for, as Lenin noted, 'every strike enriches the experience of the entire working class' (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 2, p. 114).

Experience points to the great efficacy of general strikes on the scale of a country, region, city or industry. As the result of an acute aggravation of class contradictions, they are usually staged under not only economic but also political slogans. In the 1970s general strikes took place in many Asian and African countries. These working-class actions were of particularly great political significance in Ethiopia (1974) and Iran (1978-1979), where they were part and even the decisive (in Iran) element of the anti-monarchist and anti-imperialist revolutions.

When we consider the strike movement in the Afro-Asian world, we should bear in mind that in many cases strikes are held despite official bans, in violation of procedure established by legislation, and without the consent of conciliatory trade unions. The wave of such strikes in the 1970s in India, Tunisia, Senegal and other Asian and African countries was evidence of the growth of the working people's class consciousness, of their aspiration for vigorous independent actions.

This tendency is strikingly illustrated by the strikes in Tunisia in 1976-1978. These involved many thousands of blue-and white-collar workers in the phosphate industry, on the railways, and in the oil-refining and metallurgical industries. Tension ran so high that the 13,000 miners, who went on strike in December 1977, declared they were prepared to take up arms to secure the satisfaction of their demands.

The events in the town of Ksar Hellal, where 1,200 workers of the nation's largest textile mill went on strike in October 1977, had repercussions in and outside Tunisia. Demanding higher pay and more efficient management, the strikers occupied the mill premises. On orders from the authorities, they were driven out by police and troops. After this the strike began to grow into a rising in which the townspeople sided with the workers. The unrest was brutally suppressed, and repressions were taken against the strikers.

This upswing of the working-class movement strongly influenced the leadership of the nation's single trade union center, the Tunisian General Confederation of Labor, compelling it to go over from conciliatory positions to opposition to the official anti-labor policy. On January 26, 1978, after protesting against the arrest of a number of trade union leaders and stating its disagreement with the government's socio-economic policy, the Confederation declared a general strike. Accompanied by unrest among unemployed young people, this strike was brutally crushed by police and troops. This was followed by the arrest and persecution of many trade unionists, the forcible change of the TGCL leadership, and mass dismissals. However,

repressions did not break the will of the Tunisian working class. Soon after the Black Thursday of January 26 it resumed its strike struggle for its interests, for freedom of trade union activity.

Class unity and politicization of the struggle

Strikes in solidarity with the struggle of workers of other factories and industries in defense of repressed working-class leaders and activists, have become quite widespread in Asian and African countries. The nationwide railwaymen's strike in India in May 1974 sparked a powerful wave of solidarity strikes throughout the nation.

Actions of this sort not only demonstrate the strength of proletarian class unity. Their political orientation is growing more clear-cut. In Ghana the strike movement that unfolded in 1977 under the leadership of the influential Trades Unions Congress undermined the military regime and compelled it to agree to hold general elections in 1979 and transfer power to a civilian administration. In October 1979, 16,000 blue-and white-collar workers of the State Land Administration of Tunisia went on strike, demanding not only the former employment level but also measures to prevent the public sector in agriculture from falling into private hands.

Experience shows, and this is natural, that the strike struggle is most successful where the trade unions are strong, well-organized, and consistently uphold the interests of the working people. In this context note should be made of the growing tendency toward unity of action by trade unions of different political and ideological orientations. In particular, the 1970s witnessed the formation of the Organization of African Trade Union Unity, which brought together national trade union centers of independent African states.

The revolutionary potential of the working class depends on the level of its political consciousness, on the extent to which it turns from a 'class in itself' into a 'class for itself.' Here the communists must play a large role. In Africa and Asia there are nearly 30 communist or workers' parties. Many of them enjoy considerable influence and have a solid base in the working-class movement. The increasingly clear-cut political orientation of the working people's struggle, which is more and more frequently aimed at achieving fundamental progressive changes and a transition to non-capitalist development, is due chiefly to the work of the Marxist-Leninist parties. The politicization of the working-class and trade union movement and the activation of the strike struggle are the proletariat's response to the policy of neo-colonialism, suppressing democratic freedoms, and anti-communism pursued by imperialism in alliance with local exploiting classes.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Contents for Volume, 22, 1979 (Numbers 1-12)

FEATURES

	No.	Page
Aczel, G. Lenin's cultural-policy principles	11	23
Alexandrov, A. Scientific and technological progress and nuclear power engineering	6	13
Angenfort, J., Heimbrecht, J. Environmental movement: results and prospects	12	10
Auersperg, P., Kwiatowski, G., Nunez Anavitarte, C. Remembering the past for the sake of the future	9	3
Axen, H. The growing role of internationalist solidarity	2	15
Babiuch, E. A historical turning point	7	7
Bagdash, K. Social reformism and the national-liberation movement	8	3
Bangoura, F. Africa's progressive forces: their choice	11	9
Batmunh, Z. Instrument of construction	10	7
Boychuck, P. Commentary. World peace and the communists	2	27
Boychuck, P. The new Soviet initiative and the struggle for its materialization	12	3
Castro, F. Marxism-Leninism and the Cuban revolution	1	4
Chandra, R. New situation, new objectives	4	73
Chaoui, N. Imperialist strategy and the Middle East problem	6	3
Chernenko, K. The CPSU's Leninist tradition: working for and with the people	5	3
The construction of socialism and communism and world development	2	3
	3	3
	4	3
Degen, B. October and the democratic working-class movement	11	5
Embarking upon the third decade	1	3
Farhad, M. The difficult path of Bangladesh	11	19
The Great October Revolution and our experience	11	3
Haoui, G. Flexibility of form, firmness of principle	9	11
Honecker, E. A period of great achievement	10	3
Ismail, A.F. A new vanguard party	1	19
Jaroszewicz, P. The lessons of September 1939	9	16

No. Page

Jensen, J. Programmatic tasks and the concrete situation	11	14
Kempny, J. Key factor of economic progress	7	15
Konstantinov, F. Lenin as a political thinker	12	15
Lazar, G. Stages of economic progress	6	8
Magnin, A. Our action program	7	12
Muhri, F. The main conditions for social transformations	5	16
Muhri, F. Spreading the truth about the new society	2	18
McLennon, G. Election lessons and the outlook for the British labor movement	8	13
N.A. In tribute to the Comintern	5	28
Nemeth, K. The party and the masses	12	5
Nørlund, I. The road to socialism	11	3
Ohman, R. Commentary. List to the right and the left's responsibility	9	16
Pato, O. The party of hope, the party of the future	10	12
Pittman, J. Commentary. Salt-II: the treaty is signed	8	17
Ponomarev, B. Existing socialism and its international significance	2	22
Ramelson, B. The British communists' strategy	11	7
Sharma, J. Ideas which unite men	11	8
Sokolov, I. Collective strength of the communists of the world	7	19
Strougal, L. The internationalism of socialist foreign policy	11	10
Varela, A. Peaceful coexistence and peaceful cooperation	7	3
Venetsanopoulos, V. Commentary. Day of militant solidarity of working people	5	23
Verdet, I. Raising economic efficiency: a fundamental task	8	8
Weiss, P. Verdict on opportunism	11	6
Zhivkov, T. Socialism's historic mission	2	4
Zorrilla, A. The revolution must be able to defend itself	11	4

PARTY EXPERIENCE

Belgium: the working-class movement and the communists	7	37
Beno, M. Guiding the building of a developed socialist society	5	68
Bilen, I. Situation in Turkey	2	35

	No.	Page
Bozhinov, T. Looking to the future	10	39
Brito, C. Communists in parliament . . .	11	46
Chaoui, N. How to end the crisis	12	18
The communists and the trade unions .	5	84
Cunhal, A. Fifth anniversary of the April revolution	4	82
Dyulgerov, P. Political leader of a collective	9	44
Fava, A. The Argentine working-class movement today	1	30
Garro, J., Potyomkin, Y. Reports at first hand. Spearheading the class struggle	7	40
Gauthier, H. The goals are set	2	48
Khenin, D. Consistent patriots and internationalists	12	27
Klimczak, W. Socio-economic develop- ment strategy	2	59
Lukaszewicz, J. Ideological and edu- cational work of the PUWP	6	18
Maidana, A. Policy of alliances and the bourgeoisie	7	33
Mittag, G. SUPG's integrated economic and social policy	8	20
Moyev, V. Report at first hand. Second day	1	51
New experience	6	28
	7	46
	8	24
	10	43
	11	51
	12	31
Ovari, M. Unforgettable experience . . .	4	94
Paiva, V., Lopes, A. A force committed to the revolutionary process	6	23
Pittman, J. The USA at a crossroads in the 1980s	12	23
Ramelson, B. Leninism and the inter- national aspect of the fight for socialism in Britain	1	39
Rodriguez, C. Escalation of terrorism . .	7	45
Turf, J. Resolving concrete problems . .	7	38
Vieira, G. The uphill road to unity . . .	5	76
Why we are with the communists	5	98

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

The agrarian question and the peasantry's role in developing countries	1	91
Boychuch, P., Laborde, J. The communists and public opinion. A key aspect of the class struggle	10	29
da Costa, J.F. International cooperation in tackling global problems	8	43
Economic policy: communist alterna- tive	9	38
Fazio, H., Fortuna, A.H. The monopolies and the power structure in Latin America	8	47
Fine, B. Capitalist regulation methods in crisis	12	51
Future of mankind and science	10	34

Gomes, J., Laborde, J., Nunez Anavitarte, C. Archenemy of the Latin American peoples	11	42
Gozhansky, T. Halt the inflation gallop	9	41
Inozemtsev, N. Capitalism over the next two decades	10	36
Katsouridis, N. In the interests of the people	9	38
Kedrov, B. Lenin's doctrine of dialectics and our day	7	25
Kröber. The social and humanist orien- tation of scientific and technologi- cal progress	8	45
Laborde, J., Fazio, H., Paredes, M. A continent-wide problem	5	47
Lomnicki, T. Theatre in the changing world	12	46
Mankind's prospects and science	8	42
Nørlund, I. Monopolies and technological progress	10	34
Ovari, M. For creative quest	7	22
Parsons, H.L. Human values in Marxism and Christianity	7	30
The party and the intelligentsia	1	70
Political system of developed socialism	6	31
Present-day imperialism: theory and practice	11	33
Restructuring international economic relations and the peoples' anti- imperialist front	5	31
Revolution and democracy	7	22
	8	29
	9	21
	10	17
Romero, S., Glinkin, A. Modernization of economic dependence	12	41
Steigerwald, R. Some aspects of the Marxist-Christian dialogue	5	57
Timofeyev, T. Deepening of social antagonisms	8	51
Volsky, V. Relative maturity, absolute dependence	6	40
The way to security: deterrence or disarmament	12	36
Wimmer, E. The middle strata and the revolutionary movement	11	28
Zagladin, V., Frolov, I. The world on the threshold of the third millennium: myth and reality	9	32

VIEWPOINTS

African panorama	2	106
	6	50
	8	63
Ashhab, N. Program for national Palestinian unity	7	56
Barrios, J. The objective prerequisites of change	10	63
Bilen, I. The purposes of NATO	6	45

	No.	Page
The Cuban revolution — a qualitative advance in the struggle of the Latin American peoples	2	87
Diaz, P.O. Alternative to the oligarchy	8	61
Dixon, F. Panama: a new stage	6	55
Duleimi, N. Stop the repressions and persecution	3	142
Ferreto, A. The perspectives of the people's movement	10	60
F.R. A sinister alliance	2	110
Gervasio, A. Resisting enemies of the revolution	5	120
Gonzales, C. Harbinger of coming battles	10	57
Hermansson, C.H. Sweden under monopoly rule	10	54
Jagan, C. Acute problems of Guyana ..	12	54
Kamel, N. Scenario of capitalism	3	135
Kianouri, N. Start of a new stage of the people's revolution	4	105
Kleven, H.I. Norway: communists against monopoly	2	93
Kude, G. The question of confidence ..	1	113
Laborde, J., Pahad, E. Threat to peace in the South Atlantic	1	122
Landefeld, B. Coming of age in struggle	9	56
Latin American panorama	12	54
Lava, J., Rybakov, V. Report at first hand	2	70
	3	116
	4	121
Luvsanhultem, N. Peking's concept of war	7	60
The Middle East knot: solutions real and imaginery	7	52
Millas, O. A foredoomed strategy	12	56
Mpakati, A. Malawi: neo-colonial profile	6	59
Nguen Than Le. Concerning the 'Boat People'	9	60
Nkomo, J. The prospects of our struggle	2	106
Nzo, A. Powerless to stop the storm ...	6	50
Pittman, J. Hegemonism and great-power policy	4	112
Rahman, M. What we want for Bangladesh	6	53
Revolution: the ways to it	10	57
Rizzy, H. The illusion of 'social partnership'	12	63
Rosales, J. The 'battle' of Puebla	12	59
Safari, H. Struggle for revolutionary and democratic renewal	1	110
Schacht, K. Reform policy in crisis	8	56
S.M. March of unfortunates	6	62
Smirnov, G. The parameters of state enterprise	10	50
Soares, J. The way to genuine democratic change	11	61
Socialism on German soil	9	48
Sudiman, S. Maoist policy and China's future	10	46

	No.	Page
Terebilov, V. In defense of human rights	7	46
Three points on the map	6	55
Tile, I. Women's rights and the communists	3	108
To Huu. Peking's shadow over Asia and the world	11	56
Toubi, T. Political lessons of the latest local elections in Israel	2	103
Touma, E. A correct and principled stand	7	52
Vella, M. Malta: the British flag is lowered	6	56
Vieira, S. In struggle for progress	8	63
Walsh, S. The crisis of Canadian confederation	3	125
Wojtaszek, E. What education for peace means	5	126
Zeray, S.M. Afghanistan: the beginning of a new era	1	103
LATIN AMERICA: TIME OF CHANGE		
After victory: the struggle continues ..	9	64
Delgado, A. Against persecution and repression	9	66
Isa Conde, N. Readiness for joint action	9	61
SCIENCE, CULTURE, IDEOLOGY		
Fedorenko, N. New frontiers of Soviet economic science	5	109
Kulcsar, K. Need for in-depth theoretical research	2	112
THE PRESS		
A.I. Facts and fairy tales	10	69
Communists' combat weapon	11	65
Dixon, F. In the struggle for independence	4	141
Duyos, O. A fundamental work	1	134
Fazio, H. Looking to the future	7	69
Furch, B. Professor Windell's tight-rope act	11	69
Henry, E. The present-day lumpen-proletariat and extremism	9	69
Hentges, P. In the name of France's future	8	68
J.P. Documenting the true history of the USA	4	136
Karkabi, Z. Origins of the Palestinian movement	8	69
Khalil, S. A policy of fraud and betrayal	4	133
Khalil, S. Zionism: substance and practices	10	67
Kuzmin, N. Developed socialism inexorably moves forward	8	66
Lautischer, P. Valuable aids	2	137
Lava, J. Their objective	5	141
Lhamsuren, B. A stirring chapter of friendship	8	71

	No.	Page
Lipkovics, K. A consistent, principled and creative policy	5	137
Mamatsis, T. Articulating the people's will	5	131
Matthews, B. Who orchestrates the Labour Party's policy?	10	65
Mayer, E. Nazi wave on the West German book market	1	136
M.Y. Scientific ideology and developed socialism	4	131
New books	6	72
	10	71
	11	70
Padilla, L. The armed forces and politics	2	127
The party press	8	72
Reusch, J. 'Left' radicalism: from 'ultra-revolutionism' to conformism and back	6	63
Schneider, H. Where the party began ..	1	143
Severtyan, R. Topical problems	8	71
Shishlin, N. An alloy of revolutionary thought and action	2	122
Sierra, S. Back in action	2	138
Solodukhin, Y. Ideas transforming the world	9	68

	No.	Page
Stanford, O. In a distorting mirror	1	130
Tastan, A. Block fascist laws, legalize the Communist Party of Turkey	4	139
Walek, A. Ksiazka I Wiedza — 60th anniversary	4	137

FACTS AND FIGURES

Effective and mutually advantageous ..	7	70
Indicators of progress	11	71
Melke, B. Efforts of capitalist rationalization of workers	6	70
The strike struggle in Asian and African countries in the 1970s	12	66
Turner, J. Multinational firms of Great Britain	2	140
In brief	7	72
	9	43
	11	72
	12	68

IN MEMORIAM

Houari Boumedienne	2	143
Agostinho Neto	11	41
Otto Schudel	9	5
Sergio Sierra	2	144

A History of India

K. Antonova,
G. Bonard-Levin,
G. Kotovsky

Book 1: From the Stone Age to the 18th century. 264 pages

Book 2: From the British conquest to the 1977 elections. 342 pages

\$25.00 a set

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

Highlights Of A Fighting History

60 Years of the Communist Party, USA

565 pages, index, appendix, graphics

In Canada order from:

PROGRESS BOOKS
71 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6
Cloth \$19.95, Paper \$6.95 (Can.)

In the USA order from:

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016
Cloth \$15.00, Paper \$5.25 (U.S.)



Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

World Marxist Review

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England
Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada
Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon

New Horizon Publications,
14 Tamakloe/Kelani Street,
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Editions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich
Société Populaire d'Editions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique
Editions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
Al-Thakafah Al-Jadidah,
Al-Saadoon Street,
Al-Rawaaf 15/3/1, Baghdad, Iraq

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckách, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 Kobenhavn K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

FLEMISH EDITION: Inatituut voor
marxistische vorming (IMAVO),
Stalingradlaan 18-20,
1000 Brussel, Belgique

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR
Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
Menandru 66, Athens, Greece
People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, Fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya,
Punjabi and Tamil

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITION: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

RUMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia
Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR
Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador
Ediciones de Cultura Popular C.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

