

WORLD

Problems of

MARXIST

Peace and Socialism

REVIEW

October 1982, Volume 25, Number 10 \$1.00



USSR / 52

**Left forces
in Europe / 8**

**Palestinians'
struggle goes on / 46**

**Equal security vs
balance of terror / 17**

**Working class
changes / 65**

**Hunger in
Africa / 71**



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

October 1982, Vol. 25, No. 10

Theoretical and information journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

Features

- 1 The CPSU's agrarian policy at the stage of developed socialism
M. Gorbachev
- 8 Cooperation among left forces in Europe
E. Scharf
- 14 Humanity will allow no nuclear holocaust
F. da Costa Gomes
- 17 Equal security versus balance of terror
P. Auersperg

The Party

- 23 Cyprus: patriotic program approved by the congress — a guide to action
D. Christofinis
- 27 The significance of festivals to the communists
C. Rohee, E. Pahad, J. West
- 31 New experience

Exchange of views

- 38 On the way to a new international information order
Symposium

Viewpoints

- 46 The people's will is unbroken — the struggle goes on
N. Ashhab (Palestinian CP)
- 51 Free Paraguay's Patriots!
- 52 USSR: country on the move
R. Valbuena, J. Waszczuk, S.P. Gueye, R. Ohman
- 61 Czechoslovakia: restructuring the economy
S. Potac
- 65 GDR: the social face of the working class
R. Weidig
- 71 Hunger in Africa: how to defeat it?
I.A. Amer
- 77 Brazil: the industry of war and national sovereignty
G. Lopez



The CPSU's agrarian policy at the stage of developed socialism

Mikhail Gorbachev
CPSU CC Political Bureau member,
CC Secretary

The elaboration of the developed socialism conception is a major achievement of the theoretical thinking of the CPSU and the fraternal parties of the socialist countries. Its most important element is the scientifically substantiated conclusion that at this stage there will be a law-governed and historically long process in which socialism develops into communism, its higher phase. Accordingly, at its recent congresses the CPSU has worked out the long-term strategy and tactics of communist construction, expressing more precisely and concretely the ways and deadlines for realizing the programmatic goals and making them the basis of its practical activity. The CPSU's agrarian policy is an important strand of this strategy.

I

The fundamental ideas of an agrarian policy which accord with the present stage of developed socialism were formulated at the March 1965 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC. The period between that plenary meeting and the plenary meeting held in May of this year, which approved the USSR's Food Program until 1990, was one of important and intense effort, of our party's fruitful theoretical and practical work to solve the agrarian problem. Developing the Marxist-Leninist doctrine in the light of the changes under way in the country's economic and social life, the CPSU has enriched agrarian theory and practice with new theoretical propositions and conclusions and has determined the ways and means for tackling the fundamental problems in the development of agriculture and related sectors of the economy. A great deal has been and is being done by General Secretary of the CPSU CC Leonid Brezhnev in working out the present agrarian policy and the techniques for its practical implementation.

On the basis of an in-depth theoretical elaboration of the question of the place, role and importance of the agrarian sector of the economy in the development of socialist society, the party decided to effect a qualitative transformation of agricultural production to make it a highly developed sector of the economy capa-

ble of reliably meeting the country's requirements in food and agricultural raw materials, and also to approximate more rapidly the material, cultural and every-day conditions of life in town and country. Such is the gist of the CPSU's present agrarian policy and its strategic orientation, which is in line with the conception of developed socialism. The entire system of economic, material, technical, social and organizational measures in implementing this line is being arranged and put into effect accordingly.

Within this system, investment policy has become paramount. The need was recognized to effect at this stage some redistribution of the national income in favor of agriculture and to increase capital investments in it. Indeed, since the March 1965 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC, almost 400 billion rubles of state and collective-farm funds has been invested in agriculture, and this is several times more than the investments which went into the development of the agrarian sector in the whole of the earlier period of socialist construction. This made it possible to transform radically the material and technical facilities on collective and state farms. Let me just say that over 75 per cent of their fixed production assets now in operation have been built up over the past 8 years.

Substantiating the guidelines for intensifying agriculture was of key theoretical and practical importance. This involves the mechanization of production processes in the fields and on the farms, extension of land improvement and more use of chemicals in production. The party's line of the utmost intensification of cropping and livestock breeding is being consistently implemented. As a result, the technical facilities available to production have been markedly amplified. Electric power supply has tripled. Every hectare of farmland now gets three times as much mineral fertilizers as it did 15 years ago. In that period, the area of improved land has increased by 70 per cent, to more than 34 million hectares. Intensive factors have become crucial in the development of production, and they now account for over 90

per cent of the whole farm-produce increment.

Together with the build-up of the material and technical facilities in agriculture, there has been a rapid development of the sectors supplying the countryside with industrial means of production. Over the 10th five-year period alone, the fixed production assets of tractor and agricultural engineering increased by 60 per cent. The chemical industry which produces mineral fertilizers, plant protectors and feed additives has been developed. The country now has ample facilities for rural and water-economy construction, and the scale of the mixed-feed and microbiological industry has been markedly enlarged. Much has been done to overcome the lag in industries processing agricultural raw materials. Over the past three five-year periods, their capacities have been increased by almost 200 per cent through large-scale capital investments.

In other words, over this period, the agrarian sector of the economy has been converted into a new and more perfect material and technical base. As a result, the productive forces of the countryside have undergone a qualitative change, and their technical level has sharply risen. The nature of agricultural labor has also changed in content: it has become more productive and has largely acquired the features of industrial labor. All these qualitative changes are in line with the requirements of developed socialism.

Specialization and concentration of production and its switch to an industrial base is another important line which has been scientifically elaborated in the present agrarian policy. The development of the productive forces in the countryside in the recent period has gone hand-in-hand with a rise in the level of socialization of production, and broad development of inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration. The country now has over 3,000 large-scale specialized live-stock breeding complexes, over 10,000 inter-farm and agro-industrial enterprises and associations, and a large number of other specialized agricultural enterprises. At the same time, intra-farm specialization on the collective and state farms is also being deepened and extended.

On the strength of all this, we have good reason to speak of a new stage in implementing Lenin's cooperative plan. In the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, the concentration of production proceeded through the collectivization of individual peasant farms; and from the 1940s to the 1960s, through the amalgamation of collective and state farms; this process is now proceeding on the basis of inter-farm cooperation of socialist

agricultural enterprises and also of agro-industrial integration, with a simultaneous establishment of large-scale specialized enterprises operating on industrial technologies. By the beginning of 1981, 84 per cent of the collective farms and more than 33 per cent of the state farms were involved in various types of cooperation.

The development of the productive forces in the countryside and the extension of the ties between agriculture and many of the industries catering for it has caused the need for a further improvement of production relations in the countryside. It became obvious in the recent period that the existing forms of management, economic operations and provision of incentives for farmers increasingly fell short of the growing requirements presented by life. This made for the need to stage large-scale economic experiments in improving management in various parts of the country. These have helped to bring out the positive and negative aspects in the development of agriculture, to draw some major generalizations and conclusions and to apply these in practice.

Social development problems in the countryside became an important element of our party's theoretical analysis and practical activity. The need to boost industry, to develop new territories, to build towns and mechanize agricultural labor, all went to create a new demographic situation in the countryside whose characteristic feature was an outflow of manpower resources from the collective and state farms to industrial centers. While this is on the whole a natural phenomena, in some areas it tended to assume excessively large proportions, and this is having an adverse effect on agriculture.

In view of this, our party is working out concrete measures for the correct solution of these problems. Since the March 1965 CC plenary meeting, a number of large-scale measures were effected: the stimulation of labor was enhanced, material incentives for workers in the countryside were raised, the collective farmers were switched to guaranteed wages, their social security was improved, and pensions were established on the terms applying to industrial and office workers. As a result, the remuneration of labor for collective farmers and state-farm workers in the recent period has been growing faster than wages in industry, and this has led to a marked approximation of their real incomes.

The growth in the number of skilled personnel in the countryside is a major achievement in the social sphere. Over the past 15 years, the number of agricultural specialists on the collec-

tive and state farms having a higher or a secondary education has doubled, to more than 1.6 million. The number of machine operators in that period has increased by roughly 50 per cent, to 4.5 million. Nearly 75 per cent of those working in the countryside now have a higher or a secondary education, complete or incomplete.

The growth of agriculture has been accelerated by the measures adopted by the party and the state and by their complex approach to the development of the agrarian sector. From 1966 to 1980, the population of the USSR increased by 35 million, while gross farm output per head went up by an average of 28 per cent a year. This has made it possible to improve markedly the Soviet people's diet. Over the past 15 years, the consumption of meat and meat products per head went up by 41 per cent, milk and dairy products by 25 per cent, vegetable oil by 24 per cent, and sugar by 30 per cent. At the end of the 1970s, according to the FAO, the daily calorie intake per head throughout the world came to 2,590, in the Western European countries, to 3,378, and in the USSR — to 3,443. Consequently, in the calorie content of nutrition our country has attained the physiological standards, and that is a major achievement of developed socialism.

However, the food problem in this country has not yet been finally removed from the agenda. The point is to effect a qualitative improvement in the structure of nutrition by increasing the consumption of meat, milk, vegetables and fruits. What are the causes behind the difficulties in rapidly solving this problem? They are diverse. Let me say, first of all, that the Soviet state had a hard legacy. Before the revolution, the country's agriculture was extremely backward and parcelled, and had a low productivity. It took a tremendous effort to overcome this lag, to turn it into large-scale social production, and to ensure a considerable growth in cropping and livestock breeding. But this development was cut short by the war.

The Second World War inflicted vast damage on our agriculture. The fascist invaders fully or partially destroyed and burned 70,000 villages, ravaged and plundered 98,000 collective farms, 1,876 state farms and 2,890 machine-and-tractor stations. For all practical purposes, livestock farming, most of the orchards and vineyards on the occupied territory were wiped out. Industry, the housing facilities and the whole infrastructure of the economy were largely destroyed, so that the resources were channelled mainly into their rehabilitation.

One should also bear in mind the peculiar-

ities of our soil and climate. Specialists have estimated that the biological productivity of soils in the USSR is lower by 25-50 per cent and more than it is, say, in the United States, Italy or France. In the Soviet Union, 58 per cent of the farmland lies in arid and semi-arid zones. Only 1.1 per cent of our farmland is in the favorable areas with a precipitation of 700 mm and more a year. The pronounced continental climate in the USSR, the frequent droughts and other unfavorable factors hamper the stable growth of crops. Within only two years (1975 and 1976) the fluctuation in the harvesting of, say, the cereal crop came to more than 83 million tons, which is almost as much as Italy, France and the FRG produce together.

Then there is also the influence exerted on the food market by some social factors. Concern for the growth of the people's well-being has led to a rising living standard. In the past 15 years, real incomes per head have doubled. Their rapid increase, with state prices for the basic foodstuffs fairly low and stable for two or three decades, has led to a marked increase in demand for the most valuable products, livestock products in the first place.

But we must also note some negative aspects which have emerged in the development of agriculture. There has been an accumulation of some outstanding problems in the shaping of its material and technical basis, in the relations between the branches of the agro-industrial complex, in management and in the economic mechanism. These shortcomings and also the extremely unfavorable weather conditions over the past three years have had an effect on the growth of agricultural production. All of this taken together has created some tension in the supply of the population with some types of food.

In view of the existing situation and the need to raise further the Soviet people's well-being, the 26th congress of the CPSU decided that it was appropriate to work out a special Food Program for the current decade. Such a program has been worked out, scrutinized and approved by the May 1982 plenary meeting of our party's Central Committee.

II

The USSR's Food Program is a further creative elaboration of the party's present agrarian policy, its logical continuation, and an organic component part of the CPSU's economic strategy in the current decade.

Of fundamental importance for understanding the substance of the Food Program, of its goals, tasks and ways of realization is Leonid Brezhnev's report at the May plenary meeting

of the Central Committee. Its decisions and deliberations are documents which "provide complete, systematic and accurate answers to the most important problems" in the country's life, to quote Lenin (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 444).

The main goal of the Food Program is reliable supply of the population with every type of food, and improvement of the quality and structure of nutrition. It provides for the creation of a food stock that will take the edge off the supply of the most valuable produce, help to create the necessary reserves and guarantee the country against any contingency. In the 12th five-year period, gross cereal crops are to average 250-255 million tons a year, or more than 900 kilograms per head. As compared with the 10th five-year period, the average annual increase for grain is to go up by 45-50 million tons; milk, by 11.3-13.3 million tons; meat, by 5.2-5.7 million tons; vegetables and melon crops, by 7-9 million tons; and fruits and berries, by 4.6-5.6 million tons. These indicators are much higher than those for the preceding two five-year periods.

The faster growth of production will help to increase the consumption of the most valuable produce. By the end of the current decade, meat consumption per head is to go up by 20 per cent, vegetables and melon crops, by 30-39 per cent, fruits and berries, by 74-84 per cent, and vegetable oil, by 50 per cent. As a result, the structure of nutrition will come close to the scientifically grounded norms.

Consistent practice of the complex and systematic approach is of key importance in tackling these problems, and it is a principle which has been written into the Food Program, which covers economic, social, organizational, scientific and technical aspects as a unity. The working out of such a program on the basis of the complex approach is in itself a novel fact in socialist planning. That is why its importance is not confined to the practical aspect, but is also of much theoretical and methodological interest. The Food Program ranges over every level of economic management: it has been adopted for the country as a whole, and is being elaborated in each republic, region (territory) and district. At every level, account is taken of the available resources and potentialities, and the development of agriculture is tied in with the development of other spheres of the agro-industrial complex for the purpose of harmonizing them.

A countrywide agro-industrial complex has in the main taken shape, and it is now regarded as an integral production system and is becoming an object of planning and management as a

single whole. This will help to eliminate the disproportions in the structure of the complex, to even out the technico-economic levels, to establish well-grounded economic relations between its individual sectors and subdivisions, to increase their efficiency and further improve the relations of production.

The conclusion that agriculture is the central unit of the country's entire agro-industrial complex is a fundamental one. It is based on large-scale cooperative and state enterprises — collective and state farms. The social sector now accounts for 90 per cent of the marketable produce of cropping and livestock breeding. The party's assumption is that at the present stage of socialist construction and over the long term, collective and state farms remain the basic form of agricultural production, which is why the Food Program envisages measures for further consolidating the social economy.

At the same time, the importance of supporting individual subsidiary farming has also been recognized. Our party regards it as a component part of socialist agriculture at the present stage, a substantial reserve for replenishing the food stock, and an important condition for the fuller use of manpower and other resources helping to solve a number of social problems. However, it would be wrong to exaggerate its potentialities. There are some flimsy inventions in the West about its "advantages." Indeed, labor productivity of subsidiary farming comes to only 50 per cent of that on the collective and state farms. In addition, one should bear in mind the fact that individual subsidiary farming is based on the social sector, which means the use of land and water free of charge; the provision, at low prices and frequently even free of charge altogether, of young animals and poultry, feedstuffs, fertilizers, electric power, means of transport, various types of services, and so on. Individual subsidiary farming will continue to develop above all through its integration with the social farms.

Intensification of the sectors of the agro-industrial complex continues to be the main line in boosting the production of foodstuffs and economic efficiency. Over the decade, the basic production assets in agriculture are to be increased by about 50 per cent, the electric-power capacities on collective and state farms, by 60 per cent, deliveries of mineral fertilizers, by 70 per cent, and the area of improved lands by 20-30 per cent, so increasing it to 41-44 million hectares.

The consistent intensification of every element of the agro-industrial complex is a line that implies perfection of its structure. This means above all faster development and tech-

nical re-equipment of the assets-producing industries, primarily agricultural engineering. In the 1980s, it is to receive double the investments as compared with the preceding decade, while investments for the whole agro-industrial complex will go up by roughly 30 per cent. Investments into the storage and processing of produce, into road and transport building and also into the production and social infrastructure are to go up substantially. This will make it possible to complete in the main, by the year 1990, the complex mechanization of production and to restructure the food industry.

The greater intensification of agricultural production is closely linked with the growth of its efficiency, and that is precisely the purpose of the Food Program. The main efforts in agriculture are being concentrated on further increasing soil fertility, crop yields and achieving high quality of produce. In livestock breeding, special attention is being given to the use of intensive fattening methods, improvement of the animal stock, and growing productivity.

Improvement of the economic mechanism and management of the agro-industrial complex is an important element of the Food Program. Inter-sectoral organs for managing the complex at every level, from the district to the country's center, are being set up by decision of the May plenary meeting of the CPSU CC. They are designed to blend the sectoral and territorial principles of administration and management, to eliminate departmentalism and duplication, and to promote the balanced development of all the sectors which ensure the increase in the output of foodstuffs. Such a structure of administration and management goes to consolidate the principles of democratic centralism and gives the enterprises in the localities greater scope for initiative and independent operation.

The establishment of new forms of administration and management is backed up with measures to improve the economic mechanism, which means consolidating the economy of the collective and state farms, making more efficient use of economic calculus, and enhancing the role of economic instruments like price, credit and profit. In view of this, the May plenary meeting of the CPSU CC outlined an extensive system of economic measures. At the beginning of 1983, the purchasing prices of many types of farm produce are to be raised, while the existing retail food prices remain unchanged. The organizational and economic relations between the various elements of the agro-industrial complex are to undergo important modifications. Much importance is at-

tached to enhancing the principles of economic calculus and parity in inter-sectoral exchange and to greater incentives for all the participants in production in the final results. Great scope is being given for the introduction of progressive methods of labor organization and remuneration, particularly for a broad use of shop-type management structure and remuneration on a team basis.

The 26th congress of the CPSU determined the ways for further improving the living conditions of working people in the countryside, and this is embodied in the Food Program. Unprecedentedly large funds have been appropriated for the social needs of the countryside: 160 billion rubles, or nearly double the figure for the preceding decade. By 1991, modern housing with total floor space of 378 million sq. m. is to be built on the collective and state farms, which is 40 per cent more than was built in the preceding decade. More than twice the number of children's preschool institutions are to be opened, the network of cultural and everyday facilities is to be expanded and the volume of everyday services doubled. The level of communal services — centralized water supply and heating and sewerage — is to be raised considerably. The improvement in working and living conditions will make the agricultural trades more attractive and will help to increase the efficiency of production.

Of special importance for our country is the further development of the road network and improvement of communications between the collective and state farms and the cities and the industrial centers. In the 1980s, roughly 130,000 kilometers of highways and 150,000 kilometers of farm roads are to be built, and this is twice as much as in the preceding decade.

The realization of these measures is a matter of principle, because they are an expression of a fundamental policy aimed to obliterate the essential distinctions between town and country, and so to translate into life one of the key requirements of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialist construction.

III

The results of the May 1982 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC and the Food Program of the USSR which it approved have been met with interest by the communist and workers' parties and progressive opinion in other countries. Democratic opinion has noted with satisfaction that in this sharpening international situation and the step-up of the arms race by the aggressive forces of imperialism, the Soviet Union once again demonstrated its peaceful aspirations by putting forward large-scale tasks for

boosting food production and raising the people's well-being.

The Food Program is an important and constructive contribution by the USSR to the solution of the world food problem. The Soviet people are well aware of the state of food supply in the world and of the difficulties which the peoples of many countries have to face in this connection. Malnutrition and hunger continue to cause grave diseases and death among millions of people on various continents of the globe. The epicenter of the world food crisis is in the less developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America recently liberated from colonial oppression.

The Soviet Union regards this crisis as one of the most important global socio-economic problems which has confronted humankind in the latter half of the current century. Leonid Brezhnev drew attention to this fact and added that mass starvation in some less developed countries requires special attention and joint efforts by many states.

Some people in the West are trying to use the difficult food situation in the world for unseemly purposes. They have circulated propaganda inventions about the difficulties in our country's agriculture allegedly being one of the causes behind the food crisis in the world.

These assertions are belied by the facts. Consider this simple fact: over the past 15 years, cereal crops in the USSR have increased by an average of almost 75 million tons a year, or 57 per cent. In annual terms, overall agricultural output in this country has grown almost 150 per cent faster than the growth of the population, and 50-100 per cent faster than it did in Common Market countries and in the United States. With 6 per cent of the world's population, the Soviet Union produces 13 per cent of the world's grain, 20 per cent of the milk, 10 per cent of the meat and 12 per cent of the eggs. We intend to continue doing our utmost to increase crop yields and extend the area under crop, taking in, above all, ever larger crops of cereals.

The keynote of the recent Eighth Session of the UN Food Council in Mexico was: the reduction of crops and food output should be equated with a crime in law. The delegations of many less developed countries called on all the states to do their utmost to increase farm output and help the areas ravaged by hunger. But these calls have not met with a response everywhere. The U.S. administration intends to effect a program for reducing the area under cereal crops. Farmers are urged to cut the acreage under wheat by 20 per cent, and under grain feeds by 15 per cent. This is being done above all to keep export prices high and to maximize the profits

of the monopolies. The monopolies of agribusiness have brazenly used every opportunity to spiral prices. Thus, during the severe drought which hit many countries in the early 1970s, the price of wheat was raised by 170 per cent within two years alone (1973-1974), and the price of rice, by 270 per cent. Such policies demonstrate scorn for the needs of starving people and for public opinion, aggravate the world's food situation and sharply restrict the less developed countries' possibilities to acquire food.

The international division of labor, whose benefits are enjoyed by most states in the world, implies trade in various goods, including farm produce, and that is natural. Even those capitalist countries which have favorable soils and climates and a developed agriculture have been buying large quantities of food, including cereals, for decades. In developing an active foreign trade, the Soviet Union also imports and exports agricultural produce. Soviet purchases abroad are based on the goods which the less developed countries do not, as a rule, import at all, or import in relatively small quantities, and most frequently export themselves. As for the purchases of wheat, it is important to bear in mind that these are effected mainly under long-term agreements, and this is in itself a stabilizing factor on the world wheat market.

The main causes of the existing food situation in the newly liberated countries spring from the imperialist policy which has always been aimed to secure economic advantages for monopoly capital. Today, this is expressed in the conduct of neocolonialist policies which prevent the young states from building up an independent national economy, including a multisectoral agriculture.

The Soviet Union has been helping the newly liberated countries in various ways to develop their agriculture and to solve the food problem. Such assistance is realized within the framework of inter-state agreements on economic and technical cooperation, which are based on the principles of complete equality of the parties, mutual advantage and non-interference in domestic affairs. Our approach is to help strengthen their national agriculture and allied industries. Here, much has already been done. The key lines of Soviet assistance are: development of water and land resources, organization of agricultural producer, seed and stock farms, machine-and-tractor stations and repair shops. We have been giving them large-scale assistance in training national personnel for agriculture.

On the whole, with the assistance of the

USSR, work on over 1,000 projects ensuring the development of agriculture and related industries has been fulfilled or is under way in developing countries and also in socialist states, like Mongolia, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. Among such projects are almost 270 large state cropping and livestock farms, more than 100 land improvement projects, 380 enterprises for the processing and storage of farm produce, production of mineral fertilizers, and so on. The projects already fulfilled have helped to involve in agriculture over 1.1 million hectares of land, and to build up capacities for the production of over 790,000 tons of mineral fertilizers a year. This ensures the additional harvesting of millions of tons of grain and other produce.

The governments and public of less developed countries are aware that the socialist countries' support is effective, selfless, and just, and that it is based on fundamentally different principles than that of the capitalist powers. U.S. imperialism, for instance, has always used food "aid" in order to establish its influence in various Third World countries and to secure its strategic interests there. Most notorious is the U.S. practice of using grain deliveries as an instrument of political pressure. Those who refuse to bow to U.S. diktat are barred from the food market. The food blockade against Cuba is now more than 20 years old. This "punishment" has now been extended to Nicaragua and a number of other states liberated from colonial domination. Efforts were also made to use it against the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries.

Such practices drive home the importance of the conclusion drawn by the Central Committee's May plenary meeting that the Food Program of the USSR proceeds from the need to reduce food imports from the capitalist world in view of the fact that the leaders of some states, notably U.S. imperialist circles, seek to convert conventional commercial operations into an instrument for political pressure.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has no intention at all of giving up the advantages of the international division of labor and international trade and this is reflected in the documents of the May plenary meeting of the CPSU CC, in the course of which it was said: "It is quite natural that the draft program envisages cooperation with foreign countries, with the socialist countries in the first place."

The USSR has long and successfully cooperated with the socialist community countries in the exchange of produce turned out by the sectors of the agro-industrial complex. In the past

five-year period alone, we supplied the CMEA countries 10.5 million tons of grain, 2.3 million tons of cotton fibers, 472,000 tons of fish and fish products, and 541,000 tons of vegetable oil, while importing 1.4 million tons of meat and meat products, 17 million tons of crude sugar, 2 million tons of fresh fruit, and hundreds of thousands of tons of vegetables. The socialist countries are engaged in broad exchanges of many types of manufactured products. From 1976 to 1980, the Soviet Union imported from the CMEA countries 26,000 tractors and 141,000 tons of pesticides, while exporting 178,000 tractors, and 11 million tons of mineral fertilizers.

This practice will be continued by common consent in the future as well. There is a special section in the Food Program on the development of economic ties with other socialist community countries, which sets forth the main lines of their joint activity in deepening cooperation in research, agriculture, processing of raw materials, consistent development of cooperation and specialization in the manufacture of machinery, mineral fertilizers, etc.

The Soviet Union wants the CMEA countries which have good experience in processing meat, milk and vegetable products and sugar beet, in building and operating refrigerators, storage facilities, flour mills and bakeries to take part in building and remodelling facilities in its agro-industrial complex.

The USSR is to develop further its cooperation with newly liberated countries wishing to do so. While helping them to consolidate their agriculture, we shall simultaneously import the traditional produce of tropical and sub-tropical agriculture which is not grown but for which there is a demand in this country.

The framing of the Food Program has enlivened interest in the development of cooperation with the Soviet Union among various firms and organizations in the capitalist countries. The Soviet attitude here is well-known, and it has always been marked by a constructive approach. We stand for all-round cooperation and mutually advantageous trade with everyone who does so without discrimination and political pressure. The USSR has no intention of fencing itself from mutually advantageous economic relations, but we cannot but draw the inescapable conclusions from the acts of U.S. aggressive circles, which resort to the policy of sanctions and boycotts.

The successful solution of the world food problem is closely bound up with the struggle for peace and an easing of international tension. The Communist Party and the Soviet government have consistently advocated and

continue to advocate an end to the arms race and the establishment of good-neighborly relations with all the peoples. Positive results in disarmament could help to release and put to use sizable funds and a large scientific and technical potential for developing agriculture

throughout the world, including aid to the less developed countries. The USSR Food Program is organically linked with the Peace Program for the 1980s, which was adopted by the 26th congress of the CPSU, and with the whole of our consistently peaceful foreign policy.

Cooperation among left forces in Europe

Erwin Scharf

Political Bureau member, CC Secretary,
Communist Party of Austria

There is a certain fascination about the name of Europe. It is inseparable from the age-long history and cultural progress of humanity. "Europe" is a concept traditionally associated with an advanced economy and a high standard of public education. To be sure, this does not at all warrant facile conclusions or claims to "Europe's exclusiveness." The continent where we live is in no way outside the sphere of operation of the objective laws of social development and the class struggle.

For centuries this small continent has been an arena of armed conflicts and in the 20th century became the hotbed of two world wars. The memory of the victims and ravages of war makes Europeans particularly aware of the new danger threatening world peace. Today the concept of Europe connotes the peoples' strong desire to stave off the war danger and ensure that conflicts give way to mutual understanding and cooperation.

The Europeans' desire to achieve lasting peace on their continent, to cooperate and not to wage war, has repeatedly found expression in calls for and diverse formulas of unification. One may recall, for instance, the slogan of establishing a United States of Europe which was advanced 70 years ago. It created illusions that simply disregarded class realities. After all, a united Europe in those days could only mean, to quote Lenin, "an agreement between the European capitalists . . . but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe . . ." (V.I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 341).

After World War II a new balance of forces emerged on the continent. The victorious offensive of the Soviet Army, the defeat of Hitler's war machine, and the anti-fascist struggle in the countries occupied by the nazis resulted in the formation of a community of socialist states

in Eastern and Southeastern Europe whose peoples began to cooperate closely on the basis of the common class interests of the working people and the principles of socialist internationalism.

In Western Europe, unitary trends led to the rise of the European Economic Community (EEC). The monopoly capital and ruling circles of the six original members of this alignment¹ were set on shoring up the positions of capitalism and evolving a common platform for struggle against the working-class movement and existing socialism. Neither conflicting interests inside the EEC, nor its contradictions with other countries and groups of countries of the capitalist world overshadow these principles, which are in keeping with the policy of the NATO military political bloc.

Cooperation among the EEC countries, the intertwining of their economic structures and currency systems, the coordination of social policies, legal norms and foreign policy lines certainly have their effect on social consciousness. The ruling circles have widely publicized the thesis that integration can ease the burden of crisis phenomena in the economy and in power structures. People who have lost confidence in the ability of national governments to cope with the crisis fall for this propaganda and are ready to pin big hopes on integration.

The possibility of using integrational institutions for the solution of social problems is also being discussed in some sectors of the West European working-class movement. This has given rise to various ideas of evolving new forms of cooperation among communists, socialists, social democrats and members of other peace-loving, progressive and democratic currents as an alternative to the policy geared solely to the interests of monopoly capital. In some cases such ideas are formulated as a draft

platform for joint action by the left forces and parties of Western Europe; this has prompted the press to coin the term "Euroleft."

We communists welcome the idea of cooperation among left forces. We are opposed to sectarianism and willing to seek common ground and take joint action with all who are intent on and equal to upholding the working people's interests, resisting the onslaught of reaction and militarism and defending peace in the given socio-political conditions. But we know full well (and not only from our own experience) that in practice cooperation among left forces often turns out to be no easy task. It may be useful, therefore, to attempt an analysis of the objective and subjective factors for such cooperation so as to detect the barriers and "reefs" impeding, or likely to impede it, and ascertain how they can be removed. For obvious reasons, I will concern myself primarily with Austria.

I

Among potential partners, the social democrats would unquestionably be assigned the most important role. This is due to their strength and influence in Austria and throughout Western Europe.

The ideological and political paths followed by the social democrats of Western Europe in postwar years are well known. During the cold war, they strove to come forward as a "third force." This position and the hopes put on it were clearly expressed by, among others, Oscar Pollak, chief editor of *Die Zukunft*, central organ and theoretical journal of the Socialist Party of Austria (SPA). "All in the world who refuse to be either American, or Russian, that is, the overwhelming majority of peoples, can be won over to our side," he wrote.²

Many working people failed to see through the smokescreen of verbiage. Things went so far that the idea of distancing oneself from the Soviet Union, the first worker-peasant state on earth, the country which had made the decisive contribution to the defeat of fascism, began to seem acceptable. In an atmosphere poisoned with anti-Sovietism, the SPA press ventured to state openly that it was necessary to help the United States win the cold war.

That was one trend in the policy of the social democrats. But there was also another. It consisted in attempts to profit by the mood of protest against capitalist exploitation that manifested itself time and again in actions of the working class. On this basis, the social democratic parties of many West European countries succeeded after 1945 in gaining political leverage and asserting themselves more or less

successfully as alternative ruling parties of bourgeois society. As a rule, the social democrats were opposed to traditional conservative parties: the British Labour Party, to the Tories; the Social Democratic Party of Germany, to the CDU/CSU bloc; the SPA, to the Austrian People's Party (APP). Social democratic leaders skilfully took advantage of the struggle for the change of parties in the government to divert the left within their own parties from working for a socialist transformation of society.

Ruling social democratic parties proceeded from the "need" to steer a "middle-of-the-road course" between the interests of the working class and those of big capital. This objectively put them in a position in which they could render state-monopoly capitalism even greater services than the traditional bourgeois parties. It was to this situation in Austria that the communists referred in making the following statement: "As it does not have to heed the peasant strata and small proprietors too much, the SPA as a ruling party is in a better position in many respects to carry out definite reforms in the interest of big capital than the APP."³

We communists understandably criticized this home and foreign policy of the social democrats. But we also put forward constructive proposals that could form the basis for joint action by left forces in the working people's interests and in the national interests of our country on the international scene. The SPA leadership invariably replied to that in the spirit of the most primitive anti-communism.

As time passed certain changes came about in the social democrats' concepts and policy. In Austria this became visible when the United States found itself hopelessly bogged down in its aggression against Vietnam, which showed clearly who defends freedom and who threatens and strangles it in an imperialist war of conquest. Not only in Austria but throughout the capitalist world, the myth making out the USA to be the "leading power of the free West" was crumbling. The upsurge of liberation movements in many countries and areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America made for a further spread of anti-imperialist sentiments. The imperialist policy of brute force drew resolute protests from youth, writers, scientists and other professional groups. All this had an echo among the social democrats, too.

There is no overlooking the fact that today both individual parties and the Socialist International (SI) as a whole are searching for a more flexible and differentiated approach to global processes. For instance, the SI leadership has "discovered" the significance of the "Third World" and is now doing its best to present

itself as its defender. Influential social democratic parties officially sympathize with the liberation forces of El Salvador, render assistance to the Nicaraguan government and condemn Israel's aggression in the Middle East, its terrorism against the Palestinians. In the more complicated international situation of the 80s, the social democrats show that they appreciate the values of détente and are ready to preserve and further its achievements. This undoubtedly offers ample opportunities to find common grounds that could become the prerequisite of a constructive communist-socialist dialogue and large-scale joint actions by left forces. Whether this prerequisite materializes will hinge largely on the communists' ability to gear themselves up to these new opportunities.

In saying this, we are not shutting our eyes to our differences with the social democrats over matters of principle. The political activity of their parties often has motives, long-term objectives and ideological presentations, which the communists cannot accept. Take, for instance, support for liberation movements. Many social democratic strategists hold that it should not be given in the interests of the fighting peoples themselves but only with a view to delivering these movements from the "Soviet embrace," as an Austrian politician once put it, or in other words, bringing them under social democratic influence. The issue of resistance to the imperialist, militarist policy of the United States is another example. Social democrats are often willing to join in this effort but their ideologists always hasten to stress that they remain allies of what they call the "great democracy of the West."

It is quite clear that the social democrats, for their part, disagree with and argue against many aspects of our position, primarily ideological ones. But then there is no question of cooperation among left forces in the ideological sphere. What is proposed is political cooperation, a sphere in which much could be done given reciprocal goodwill.

II

What could and should be the most important sphere of such cooperation between communists and social democrats, among all democratic forces of society, is the struggle against the war danger, for disarmament.

The social democrats' stand on these issues is a reflection of contradictions and controversies in their own ranks. The SI advances constructive initiatives and criticizes the policy of "overkill capacity" and Reagan's policy of confrontation. This is a departure from their earlier

position. The views set out in an article by Walter Hacker, International Secretary of the SPA, are indicative in this respect. After taking part as a member of the SI Consultative Council for Disarmament in talks held in Washington and Moscow, he made the following comment: "To sum it up briefly and somewhat roughly, Moscow still counts rather on talks and regards control over armaments and achieving disarmament as early goals. The tone of the U.S. side is bellicose; the dangerous view dominant there is that disarmament could only be brought about through the long detour of armament. This is, indeed, why the Reagan administration has, as everybody knows, set out to implement the biggest armaments program that the world has ever seen."⁴

Such positions help pave the way for communist-socialist cooperation aimed at solving the key international problem of today.

In any case, we for our part support sober estimations of the situation and constructive initiatives coming from the social democrats. We are also prepared to fully agree with the head of government of neutral Austria, SPA Chairman Bruno Kreisky, when he describes a "balance in the military sphere in Europe" as a prerequisite of détente. But we categorically disagree with him when he says, as he did in the same interview, that "this military balance can only be ensured with U.S. aid."⁵ The Chancellor makes clear that the balance has been upset and that to re-establish it, the United States and NATO must increase their arms stockpile. Yet this is an idea endangering peace.

The above example shows the substance of the matter. Cooperation among left forces does not at all imply complete and all-round agreement and renunciation of mutual criticism. Controversies are inevitable. But when they concern this or that specific position, attention should not be focused on whose position it is but rather on what it means. Thus, the contention that the military balance in Europe has been upset is unacceptable to us not because it has been voiced by the SPA leader, but because it distorts the truth, doing it plainly in favor of militarist, bellicose U.S. circles. Obviously, neither communists, nor other true left forces, meaning also those who belong organizationally to the social democrats, can contribute to U.S. and NATO attempts to turn Europe into a "forward theater of war," the battlefield of a "limited" nuclear war.

It is revealing, none the less, that the more influential social democratic leaders still say "no" to cooperation with the communists in their own country. Walter Hacker, for one, was

allowed to discuss with representatives of the CPSU problems of détente and disarmament but he is not allowed to negotiate with representatives of the CPA. This invites the conclusion that SPA leaders are ready to sacrifice the substance of the matter, which in this case means mobilizing forces to promote world peace, as long as they can avoid joint action with the communist movement in Austria itself. They adhere, as it were, to a formula under which all that is proposed by the Communist Party must be turned down out of hand.

This came out very clearly in the context of the peace demonstration held in Vienna on May 15, 1982, one of the most powerful demonstrations to take place in Austria since 1945. On that occasion, too, the social democratic leadership tried hard to falsify the political message of the demonstration and bar the communists from it. However, its attempts were thwarted with the help of numerous Persons' Committees⁶ functioning at the local level. As a result, the various groups that joined in the demonstration (their list is very long) included the Communist Youth League of Austria and the League of Communist Students, as well as the Women's Democratic Union, the trade union left bloc, the Slovenian Union of Friends of Klavdivo⁷ and other organizations in which communists hold leading positions.

First of all the demonstrators demanded a ban on the neutron bomb and called for struggle against the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe. The leaders of the SPA and the APP showed equal zeal in opposing this political platform approved by all demonstrators. They wanted events around Afghanistan, the situation in Poland, and so on, to be brought to the fore. *Arbeiterzeitung*, the central organ of the SPA, repeatedly criticized what it called "shortcomings" in the program of the demonstration. As for its chief editor, he let the cat out of the bag by urging the functionaries of his own party to remain "uncompromising opponents of communist dictatorship." "This alone implies," he said, "that Austrian social democrats must rule out unity of action with CPA members . . . No one can or wants to bar the communists from joining in actions of democratic organizations or individuals. But to organize such joint actions would mean discrediting their purpose in advance."⁸ Surely no one could have said more clearly that communists were free to join in but they should have no say because their convictions do not suit the SPA leadership.

Operating from this position, the SPA leadership was unable to impose its will on the May 15 demonstration. It became quite obvious

that local organizations (Persons' Committees) rejected the diktat of the SPA and the APP leadership and were guided by their commitment to the cause of peace and not by considerations of party policy. The same spirit of commitment was also shown by the numerous organizations of Young Socialists, the Catholic Working Youth and groups close to it. In other words, the left, general democratic movement is increasingly aware and shows in practice that it is necessary to give priority to specific political tasks and seek their fulfillment together with both like-minded people and all those who are willing to cooperate in spite of divergences of world view or other differences.

This is also our standpoint. Deep as the ideological differences dividing Marxist-Leninists and social democrats are, we do not regard them as an obstacle to cooperation among left forces. We have no prejudice that could prevent us from seeing, recognizing and supporting constructive initiatives of the SI directed toward solving the problem of disarmament, preserving and carrying forward détente and consolidating European security. This means that we communists raise no obstacles to cooperation among left forces. Obstacles are raised by those of our potential partners who are still blinded by anti-communism.

III

The socio-political destiny of Western Europe agitates all who are in the left movement. Communist parties have stated their views on this matter more than once. They have stressed the need to see to it that the development of Western Europe meets the interests of peace and détente, and have declared for cooperation among the left and democratic forces of Western Europe in resisting militarism and reaction. To specify, this is the meaning of the document adopted by the Brussels Meeting of West European Communist Parties (January 1974); the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe (June 1976) discussed the same problem.

Let us see how the social democrats approach these problems. It is interesting to quote from *L'Unità* statements by some members of the European Parliament, in which 124 representatives of every contingent of socialism, Labour and the European social democratic movements⁹ form the largest group.

"Yes, there are possibilities for joint actions with the communists in the European Parliament," says Katharina Focke, a West German social democrat. She indicates the likely lines of cooperation — an East-West dialogue be-

tween socialist and capitalist countries, North-South relations with developing countries, and, in this connection, the problems of peace and disarmament — and states: "These could be spheres of a common quest by the left to assure Europe a role of its own in the world."¹⁰

Jacques Moreau, a French Socialist MP, refers to President Francois Mitterrand's formula of "social space," which means combating unemployment, inequality and injustice in Western Europe. He says that there are also some other "specific points for left initiatives aimed at reviving the idea of Europe."¹¹

Spyridon Plaskovitis of PASOK, the Greek Socialist Party, considers that "a Europe which feels as if it were an appendage to the United States cannot make a policy of its own . . . The political independence of Europe is one of the fundamental conditions for détente and disarmament . . ." PASOK, he stresses, has already begun to discuss with Romania and Bulgaria at the government level the idea of creating a nuclear weapons free zone in the Balkans and has met with a favorable response. "There is a future here for the community and there is a future here for left unity."¹²

It follows that some representatives of socialist and social democratic parties show a degree of readiness to cooperate with the communists "at the European level" (but not necessarily in their own countries). There are two things worthy of note. First, views are expressed that are useful for consolidating peace and furthering international cooperation and that meet the interests of the working people. Second, emphasis is laid on the "independence of (Western) Europe" and the "European idea" is upheld as a certain absolute value. Thus, on the one hand, social democratic MPs speak out as left-wingers; on the other, however, they are anxious, as it were, to emphasize their "Europeanism."

Many of the proposals accord unquestionably with the tasks of the left movement and there can be no doubt that communists will always make common cause with socialists and social democrats in the struggle against monopoly domination, against unemployment and social inequality. On foreign policy issues, too, we fully subscribe to the realistic position of those social democrats who are motivated by a desire to make Europe a region free from atomic weapons and propose developing direct cooperation with socialist countries to this end.

In this sense, the idea of "European independence" is not alien to us. We interpret it as the need to end the economic, military, polit-

ical and, in large measure, spiritual hegemony of the United States in Western Europe. It is an open secret, however, that some other contingents of the left movement interpret the concept of regional independence differently, namely, in the sense of being equidistant from the U.S. and the Soviet Union. An effort is being made once again to cast an "independent Europe" in the role of a "third force" in the worldwide contest. We have every reason in terms of scientific theory to regard this formula as untenable. But the matter is worth approaching from another angle, namely, the political one.

It is a fact that in the past decade some West European countries have been following a policy more independent of the USA, and adherents of the "European idea" refer to this. However, in their reasoning they occasionally leave out the most important point either deliberately, or by an oversight. One has only to ask what has enabled a number of West European countries to show relative independence on the international scene to realize that they owe this chiefly to the fact that the increased might of the socialist community has changed the over-all balance of world forces and provided favorable conditions for détente.

We consider it highly important to spell out these realities. The idea of cooperation among left forces in the interests of peace, détente, social progress and democracy, set out in the projects associated in the press with the term "Euroleft," could be assessed as quite positive if this cooperation were not seen as an alternative to the communists' cohesion and to alliance with the most powerful left and democratic force of Europe, the socialist community and the ruling communist parties of its member countries.

A peaceful and independent Europe cannot be achieved through opposition to existing socialism. And communists must carry on consistent ideological work if they want this to be realized by their potential "Euroleft" partners (in using this term, we are certainly aware of its inaccuracy). What we mean is the need to show the fundamental antithesis between the interests of the Soviet Union and those of the United States stemming from the difference in their social systems. A clear understanding of the imperialist character of U.S. foreign policy and the peace policy of the Soviet Union resulting from the very nature of socialism will help concentrate political actions on achieving détente, disarmament and peace.

Our potential partners in Austria, like many social democrats abroad, suspect or are even convinced that what makes us say all this is

so-called dogmatism. We are confident, however, that in the course of the contest in the international arena a process of mutual learning begins, with a growing realization of the need to seriously set about mustering left forces politically and just as seriously see to it that this cooperation, if achieved, bears fruit. It is this concern that guides us communists when we take a stand against attempts to isolate the West European left movement and separate it from its natural international allies.

IV

In the long run, the possibility of political cooperation among the left forces of Western Europe will be determined by the community of their social basis. This basis is made up of the working class and other working people. All left movements proclaim themselves spokesmen of the interests of the working masses exploited by monopoly capital, hit by unemployment and inflation and forced to bear the brunt of the capitalist crisis.

The social democratic movement itself is not free of social contradictions. "It is true that the Austrian social democrats have at their head a stratum of elective élite, functionaries and managers belonging to the oligarchic leadership of state monopoly capitalism ideologically, by virtue of their income and political privileges, that is, by their material condition. But this does not apply to hundreds of thousands of SPA members, who belong to the working class by virtue of their objective condition."¹³

This definition contained in our party document stresses that the working class forms the mass basis of social democracy in Austria. From this we come to the logical conclusion that "to win more and more socialist comrades over for unitary struggle it is necessary to make a principled critical assessment of the role and policy of the SPA leadership."¹⁴

This is not to say that the communists deny in principle the possibility of agreement "at the top" between the two parties. On the contrary, we seek agreement on communist-socialist cooperation at all party levels. True, past experience has shown that agreement "at the top" was generally a result of pressure "from below." This pressure was applied and assumed a "binding" character mostly when communists succeeded in bringing home to the working people the urgency of their demands and slogans and when an exacerbation of the contradictions of the capitalist system helped them in this. Hence the importance of the communists' own strength and standing in the enterprises, among the working population.

This also answers a legitimate question: Won't social democratic parties try to take advantage of the cooperation offered by the communists to stress, in view of their influence on the masses, their own role as the first, the leading left force in Western Europe, and in this way build up their positions in the working-class movement at the communists' expense?

Long-time experience clearly shows that real and durable cooperation between communists and social democrats is possible primarily where it has been agreed on in the interest of achieving a specific common goal. Concentration on such a goal makes it possible to put aside ideological differences without demanding that the partners should renounce their fundamental positions. No other formula can assure success in the effort to organize cooperation of the left forces of Europe. An extension of the alliance and the bringing in of parties and groups, some of which have vague political notions and are often receptive to ideas of the capitalist establishment, make it still more imperative for the communists to have a clearcut and principled ideological line.

Orientation to the interests of the working class and the working masses is of decisive importance in this matter. We are convinced that this is the only criterion to be used in searching for agreement and seeking political cooperation among left forces. It also determines the communists' attitude to the social democrats' specific positions. The principle we apply in this case is: whatever meets the interests of the working class deserves support and whatever is at variance with them should be rejected. Concessions on matters of principle would amount to support for the right-wing currents in the social democratic movement. Cooperation on the basis of principle will promote the healthy developments already in evidence in the ranks of social democratic parties.

As regards our own party, it now has opportunities, as we have seen, to develop cooperation — even in the face of resistance from anti-communist SPA leaders — on various specific issues with the social democrats and other democratic and progressive forces in defense of the demands of the working class, for new democratic rights and for peace. The CPA can do this on the basis of its principled Marxist-Leninist orientation and because it has won a place for itself at the grass roots level.

But what role could our party play in cooperation among communists, social democrats and other democratic and progressive forces if this cooperation were based solely on agreements at the top? What would become of the numerically small CPA if for this purpose it

adapted to the social democrats' position? And what if it refused to adapt? Wouldn't it in that case find itself outside "Euroleft" unity?

I believe any restriction of the proposed cooperation, on account of ideology, religion (cooperation should evidently encompass Christians as well), numerical strength or geography (such as the area of the EEC), would reduce rather than increase its potentialities in the struggle for peace, disarmament, democracy and social progress. At the same time it would weaken the independent role of communist parties, primarily those participating in such unity, something which would only benefit those social democratic circles which cherish the idea of their own hegemony in the working-class movement and in West European political life generally.

Of course, it is a question, first and foremost, of the working class and its historical mission. We are convinced, however, that the working class cannot accomplish its mission without a revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party. The CPA view on this issue is stated explicitly in the following passage of its program: "Even a large party cannot lead the working class to victory and liberation if it seeks an 'accommodation' where a decision is needed . . . A revolutionary party, whatever its size, is indispensable for the working-class movement as the driving force in everyday struggles and as the guiding force in major social struggles."¹⁵

Dangerous trends in international relations, above all the growing imperialist threat to peace, the stepped-up activity of reactionary parties and political groups of the bourgeoisie, and the gravity of the crisis besetting capitalist society, all make cooperation among left forces an imperative of today. Left parties can come to terms on many issues. Their cooperation will become reality if built as a political response to the class interests and demands of the working people.

1. Along with the EEC, an institutionally looser European Free Trade Association was set up. It has neutral countries, including Austria, among its members.
2. *Die Zukunft*, mid-January 1948, p. 1.
3. *Politisch-ideologische Leitsätze der KPO*. Vienna, 1974, p. 11.
4. *Impulse* (organ of the SPA Committee on Education), Vienna, March 1982.
5. *Arbeiterzeitung*, March 3, 1982.
6. Set up on an informal basis for action on specific problems, Persons' Committees are made up of committed citizens operating as private persons and not as spokesmen of parties or any other organizations.
7. Organization formed around *Kladivo* (The Hammer), a periodical published by Slovenian students.
8. *Wochenpresse*, March 30, 1982.
9. See *L'Unita*, April 14, 1982.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Politisch-ideologische Leitsätze der KPO*, p. 22.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
15. *Sozialismus in Österreichs Farben*. Parteiprogramm der KPO. Vienna, 1982, p. 56.

Humanity will allow no nuclear holocaust

Francisco da Costa Gomes

Marshal Francisco da Costa Gomes, Vice-President of the World Peace Council, is a noted Portuguese statesman, soldier and public figure. Prior to the April Revolution of 1974 he was a high-ranking member of the Portuguese military mission to NATO, Deputy Secretary of State for the Armed Forces, commander of colonial troops in Angola and Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces (he resigned from this post shortly before the overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal to signify his disagreement with the regime's colonial policy). After the downfall of the dictatorship he was a member of the extraordinary revolutionary Junta of National Salvation and President of the Republic (September 30, 1974 — June 13, 1976).

Following are Costa Gomes' answers to questions put by *WMR*.

Q. How would you describe the present stage of the struggle for peace?

A. I think the current stage of the struggle for peace is noteworthy in that it involves an unprecedented range of people. The struggle has assumed a mass character as a result of a sharp change in the people's thinking. Indeed, a mere three years ago the peace movement was active mainly in Europe. Now it has undoubtedly extended its geographical and organizational boundaries by spreading to virtually the whole planet. Let me give you an example. The World Peace Council now has 137 national sections. I believe the paramount fact is that the

mass of people are coming to see the disastrous nature of nuclear war and the reality of the threat of humanity being wiped out if war isn't staved off.

Q. Why did the "explosion" of the masses' anti-war activity occur in precisely the late 70s and early 80s?

A. For many years all information on nuclear energy, above all atomic weapons, was classified. It was only accessible to a limited number of politicians and military men plus possibly some journalists, although they were hardly included. I remember very well the time when only a few officers could be given access to all atomic plans in international military headquarters under strict security regulations. But they, too, were only allowed this when absolutely necessary, even if they represented a nuclear power.

In these circumstances the general public had a very vague idea of the atomic problem. Not until the beginning of the past decade did military men and politicians, and subsequently the population at large, come gradually to realize the danger posed by an unchecked arms race and growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. That was when it transpired that the available nuclear weapons of mass destruction were already enough to blow up the whole planet. People saw that they found themselves in a situation which could very well lead to a holocaust and the complete destruction of humanity. And so the call for the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe rang out like an alarm signal. Several promising agreements were concluded.

But what happened afterwards? Following a brief pause the arms race, primarily in nuclear arms, was stepped up again. The result was new quantitative as well as qualitative parameters. Everybody is aware now that both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization have a sufficient supply of nuclear weapons to destroy all life on earth many times over.

The situation is also threatening because there are factors increasing the danger and likelihood of nuclear war. One of the most important of them is that the probability of a fatal "shot" is increasing with the growing stockpile of nuclear weapons and the expanding range of their use. Moreover, both nuclear weapons and the issue of their use are ceasing to be the exclusive responsibility of the high command and are becoming a matter for the tactical command as well. This adds to the danger of unauthorized use of arms of mass destruction. We have all seen and sensed that warning systems, however good, are no safeguard against error and are likely to give false

alarm signals, as they actually did in the United States in November 1981 (this happened three times), and to put the world on the brink of a nuclear precipice.

Q. Supporters of diverse political trends try to understand, as is only natural, what makes millions of people protest against the mounting nuclear threat. Attention occasionally focuses on fear, but is fear the only thing? Some go to the absurd extreme of claiming that the anti-war movement "plays into the hands of Moscow" and is consequently inspired by it. Would you like to comment on that?

A. What unites people above all else is, I think, tremendous concern about the future of humanity and, needless to say, fear of the complete destruction of all life on earth, without any chance of survival. But it's also perfectly evident that the peoples now realize that this calamity without parallel can be headed off, that to maintain peace is a realistic task provided it is tackled jointly. Every conflict can be settled by means of dialogue and exchange of views, by negotiation, at international forums, by international arbitration.

The UN should make a tangible contribution to the fulfillment of this task. Regrettably, it has so far lacked the strength to ensure the implementation of its own decisions. There is hope, however, that in time all countries will come to the conclusion that their sovereignty will be in no way infringed if they vest the UN with powers enabling it to really help settle problems and disputes between states.

As for the allegation that the powerful upsurge in the anti-war movement is a result of "interference by a certain power," it is no more than a crude lie invented and used by certain people and certain administrations to conceal their plans. To this end people are told that the peace movement is merely an instrument of putting "Moscow's orders" into effect. Yet the peace movement is a worldwide public movement. It encompasses the most diverse political, social and religious trends, people differing in ideological and philosophical views. Their chief common concern is to preserve peace by removing the nuclear menace.

However, we are all preoccupied by other global, universal problems, such as those of establishing a new economic order, ending hunger and illiteracy, and providing housing, by social inequities persisting on our planet and directly related to the fight against the danger of nuclear war. All these problems are an indirect or direct obstacle to the achievement of this chief goal. They, too, require greater attention.

Q. What are the salient features of the peace forces' struggle in Portugal?

A. The Portuguese peace movement differs from similar movements in other West European countries primarily in the sense that it has not had the powerful impact of two world wars. Portugal has escaped world cataclysms. It waged a colonial war in Africa for thirteen and a half years but that war, which raged more than 8,000 kilometers from our coast, never affected Portugal proper. To be sure, people had an idea of the fighting and the casualties and heard the stories of their kin and acquaintances who were directly involved but even so the war didn't affect the soul of every Portuguese, wasn't seen by them as a common misfortune. This is why the peace movement of our people still encounters difficulties unknown to other West Europeans, who went through World War II.

This lag is disappearing as the Portuguese peace movement gains in dynamism. We note with satisfaction that the movement is extending its influence to the whole country, if unevenly. Progress is particularly marked in coastal areas, where most industries are concentrated. It's there that peace supporters are carrying on particularly effective work in close

cooperation with the trade unions, work which involves a substantial part of the urban and rural population. More and more Portuguese stop to think what would happen to their country and the whole planet in the event of a nuclear disaster.

An important indicator of our public's growing concern about the danger of nuclear war is the formation of a new movement. No to Nuclear Weapons in Portugal,¹ on the initiative of the Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation. This peace organization was brought into being after some ministers of the Democratic Alliance government² had stated that they would allow the transit of nuclear arms through Portugal, the setting up of dumps and even the stationing of nuclear weapons of mass destruction on Portuguese soil. If this came about the danger of our country being devastated by a nuclear blow would greatly increase. I doubt that plans of this kind, if carried out, would directly and tangibly benefit NATO. I will certainly not affirm that NATO could derive no profit whatever from that but then the gains wouldn't justify the threat posed to Portugal. After all the geographical situation of our country makes it highly vulnerable to an atomic blow. The best way to avoid such a blow is not to have even now any nuclear arms in dumps situated on our soil and bar their transit through Portugal.

Q. Do you look on the near future, the closing decades of the 20th century, with pessimism or optimism?

A. I feel rather optimistic. Humanity is progressing. Science and technology have scored impressive advances in the past 50 years. I think the 20th century is an extraordinary century in terms of scientific and technological progress. It is highly important that man's development has been accelerated to an unprecedented degree since World War II, that is, in peace time. This gives the lie to those who claimed that progress in industry, science and technology was impossible without war. We are witnessing amazing peace-time accomplishments of the human mind which have enabled people to live on this wonderful planet, the earth, much better than before. I believe in people and trust they realize that peaceful development is the only way to make everybody's life happier and the world more just. I believe we are advancing to this kind of world.

1. See WMR, June 1982.

2. The ruling Democratic Alliance coalition comprises three right-wing parties: the Social Democratic Party, Center Social Democratic Party and People's Monarchic Party. — Ed.

Soviet Foreign Policy

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

Volume 1 From the Great
October Revolution to
World War II

500 pages

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

728 pages

Cloth \$25.00 the set

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont.

M5V 2P6

Equal security versus balance of terror

Pavel Auersperg

CC member, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia,
WMR Editorial Board member

COMMENTARY

The Soviet Union has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The leading socialist country, which has the entire nuclear arsenal of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, has taken a step of paramount significance toward delivering humankind from its justified apprehensions about the destiny of peace in the world.

The Soviet decision may be glossed over (and this is exactly what a large section of the bourgeois press is doing) and cheap rhetoric may be used (such as "propaganda ploy") to belittle its importance, but nobody can deny the simple and indisputable fact that a new quality has been introduced into world politics of the nuclear age. Indeed, ever since June 17, 1982, the day on which from the United Nations lectern the Soviet commitment was made public and came into force, every government, every political party, and every public movement has had to reckon with the objective circumstance that at one pole of the world confrontation the possibility has been excluded of using nuclear weapons save as a *retaliatory measure*, while at the other pole a nuclear "*pre-emptive*" first-strike is regarded as thinkable.

The world learned of the Soviet decision from Leonid Brezhnev's message to the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament. The very fact that that forum was convened was a response to the world community's growing anxiety over the danger from modern kinds of weapons and their unparalleled stockpiles on our planet. The grim dilemma of our day was defined four years ago by the UN General Assembly at its first special session on the same problem: "We must," says the relevant resolution, either "halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."¹ With this inexorable "either-or" as the spur, a series of reasonable recommendations, useful for peace, was submitted on behalf of the UN at the time. However, these remained a dead letter — they were not translated into international understandings.

It was hoped that the second special session

would find a way of moving from speech-making and appeals to a realistic bridling of the arms race, to a relaxation of worldwide anxiety. Although the bourgeois press trumpets the allegation that this time, too, the General Assembly showed it was an "unproductive forum," actually the session evolved into a sort of milestone of present-day international history. The unilateral Soviet commitment announced at that session was a tangible contribution to the creation of a barrier on the road to a global nuclear holocaust.

There is every reason to describe the Soviet decision as unprecedented, as historically unique. But this does not mean it is a special, isolated action taken "over and above," as it were, socialism's usual foreign policy principles and guidelines. On the contrary, the Soviet pledge not to use nuclear weapons first is in full harmony with these very principles and takes precisely these guidelines a step further.

If we consider only the external, striking aspect of the matter, it must be seen that the June decision is a continuation of the former line dictated by the strictly defensive character of the Soviet military doctrine. The USSR has long ago declared its readiness not to use nuclear weapons against countries that do not manufacture them, do not acquire them, and do not deploy them on their territory. The latest Soviet commitment removes terms and limitations of this kind; it is a pledge to *all* the countries of the world. Also, it is not hard to see its intimate link to the proposal, made jointly by the Warsaw Treaty countries as early as 1976, that all the nations that had signed the Helsinki Final Act should undertake the commitment to abstain from a nuclear first-strike against each other.

If we go farther and look closer at things it will be all the more impossible to dodge the conclusion that the Soviet decision is a natural offshoot of the USSR's foreign policy. Suffice it to refer, in this connection, to the peace programs passed by the 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU and the Peace Program for the 1980s adopted by the 26th congress. In all these documents, which mark out the Soviet Union's

course on the world scene, it is accentuated that peace and general security must be strengthened not in words but in deeds, through concrete measures and constructive initiatives.

In letter and spirit all three programs pursue the central aim of averting a nuclear catastrophe. The step taken in June, which is new in itself and, in a sense, constitutes a new development in the world political situation as a whole, rests on a well-considered foreign policy concept and embodies the consistent character of the chosen line. This step, the CC Presidium of our party noted, was "further confirmation of the principled character of the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy, which it has been unswervingly pursuing ever since the first days of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in the course of the entire period of over six decades during which the world's first socialist state has been in existence."²

But what does consistency in foreign policy mean? The world we live in is, after all, extremely inconstant. Not infrequently we wake up in the morning to find that the picture of international life has changed overnight. Obviously, under these conditions praise is not merited by foreign policy consistency understood as stubborn adherence to formulas worked out yesterday and to patterns set once and for all. Politics have to be flexible. They have to react to the world's changing realities. But this flexibility is in no way inimical to true consistency. The thing is only to find in the new situation the means, in keeping with its specifics, to achieve fundamental aims that remain immutable.

I hope this reasoning does not appear to be much too abstract. It has a direct bearing on the Soviet Union's stand on the question of a nuclear first-strike. For the decision taken by the USSR is not only a consistent, as I have already said, development of its foreign policy line but also a concrete response to the course of international events.

It was taken at a time that can under no circumstances be called a global lull. June 1982 was a time which the U.S. President was using on his West European tour for violent, bellicose attacks against the socialist community and, generally, all revolutionary, liberation forces in the world. It was a time of conflict over the Malvinas (Falkland Islands), of the carnage-wreaking Israeli invasion of Lebanon, and of the resumption of hostilities between Iran and Iraq. To use a figure of speech coined in pre-nuclear times, many of the events in June had the smell of gunpowder about them. Moreover, the political situation of that single month was

strikingly illustrative of the sinister trends of a longer period. For several years imperialist reaction has been seeking to bury détente and return the world to a policy of balancing on the brink of war.

In all areas of international life the work of imperialism's, notably of the USA's, foreign policy machinery is being increasingly geared to a crusade against socialism, against all the liberation, progressive forces. In the sphere of economic relations, the tactic of selective embargoes is evolving into a trade and credit blockade strategy. In the socio-political sphere the accent is being openly put on interference in the internal affairs of socialist countries, on suppression by force of the movements for national freedom and social renewal that are curbing private enterprise. In ideology the recommendation to all the schools of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism is to rely on wild rhetoric, the model for which has been set by the U.S. President himself with his maxim of leaving "Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history."³

Such is the platform and mode of action of, notably, the present U.S. leadership. Try as you will, you will not find in them the slightest indication of either sober thinking or political circumspection, which, it is believed, distinguish experienced representatives of capital, of business. Reaction on both sides of the Atlantic is quite happy with this state of affairs. The *Wall Street Journal*, for instance, prints and the West German *Die Welt* repeats the statement of a spokesman of U.S. "neoconservatism" to the effect that this is as it should be because the time has passed of "businessmen who know a thing or two about competition but nothing at all about confrontations and conflicts, and — most important — lack the grit to gamble."⁴

In other words, today the extreme right wing of the bourgeoisie is gaining the upper hand, that selfsame right wing that Lenin called the bourgeoisie's "war party" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 361-362, 370-371, 374-378). One cannot think of a more accurate definition, especially if it is borne in mind that blind reliance on military strength as the means of shaping the world to its tastes and interests has become the cornerstone of the policies pursued in Washington. Hence the unprecedented magnitude of militarization and hence the new record military spending. Hence, too, the new heights of political arrogance that give the President license to declare that the promises wrested from him by Congress to halt the inflation of the military budget should not disturb the Pentagon or, in other words, that the requirements of the military department would

always have precedence over political assurances.

But the main thing emanating from this is the spurring of the arms race, which increasingly holds out the threat of irreparable consequences, especially as imperialism's unbridled buildup of military strength is accompanied by the promulgation of doctrines and "directives" stressing its intention to use all means, including nuclear weapons, to get what it wants.

The Pentagon, for instance, has completed a scenario for a nuclear war against the USSR "lasting up to six months." Western commentators note that "it is the first time that the Government has declared that the United States can win a nuclear war with the Soviet Union."⁵ Reports that a document to this effect had been drawn up were leaked to the press in August. One could assume, therefore, that in June work on it was in full swing.

And in this international situation the USSR came forward with the commitment to abstain from a nuclear first-strike. Many people, both adversaries and friends of socialism, were perplexed by the Soviet government's choice of the moment to adopt and announce its decision. What puzzles some is: Should it not have been more logical to expect the USSR to harden its own stand in response to the escalation of threats from the other side? Others ask: Does not the Soviet commitment soften the front of counteraction to imperialism's mounting aggressiveness?

Let us try to analyze these doubts.

Let us begin with those that stem from the presumption that the step taken by the Soviet Union removes, as it were, one of the obstacles to imperialist adventurism. But there are no grounds for this presumption. It can only spring from a confusion of concepts. One cannot, after all, identify a unilateral renunciation of the first use of a certain type of weapon with unilateral disarmament. In fact, there is no question of any lowering of the combat readiness level of the Soviet Armed Forces. The Soviet Defense Minister has explained this at length.⁶

Thus, the friends of socialism, the progressive, liberation forces of the world should not worry that the general staffs nurturing plans hostile to the socialist community will mistake the Soviet Union's act of peace for a sign of its military weakness.

Now a word about the compatibility or incompatibility of the Soviet decision with the present course of events on the international scene.

In launching its assault on détente, the "war

party" counted on an easy success. It calculated that the hard line taken by Washington would be countered by a similarly hard response from the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole. Under this scenario the socialist countries were to be forced to join in discrediting the idea of détente. Moreover, it was believed that they would be compelled to do so by the long-entrenched logic of international relations, in accordance with which the response to saber-rattling is to bring up cannon. As a result, plans were laid for an early burial of détente with the participation of all the countries that had jointly created and developed it.

But what actually occurred? The shaken edifice of détente did not after all collapse. More. The value of the basic achievements of the period of international thaw increased. As was emphasized, for example, at the July meeting between the General Secretary of our party's CC and President of the CSSR Gustav Husak and Leonid Brezhnev, the development of the European and world situation had by no means invalidated the results of the Helsinki Conference, while the significance of its Final Act had grown more striking than ever in the present complex situation.⁷ The Presidium of the CPCz Central Committee stresses that "however great the threat overhanging the world, the possibilities for harnessing the menace of war are nonetheless still greater."⁸

Barefaced blackmail and provocations by imperialism have not coerced the fraternal socialist countries into stopping their constructive efforts to strengthen world peace. Held at a time when the world situation was already deteriorating, the 26th congress of the CPSU, the 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and the congresses of the parties of some other socialist countries were unequivocal in calling for efforts to bring down the level of international tension and to move toward that goal regardless of the obstacles being raised by imperialism.

Consequently, there are two logics in present-day international life. One is the logic of intensifying confrontation. Here the presumption is that the response to every action increasing political tension in the world should still further heighten that tension. The other is the logic stemming from concern for universal security. It likewise requires a response to trends and actions threatening peace. However, it must be a response that would help to remove this threat instead of aggravating it.

For those who regard the mounting confrontation as a desirable or fatally inevitable way of world development, the Soviet decision not to use nuclear weapons first will probably remain

"illogical." But everybody who realizes the danger of this confrontation, everybody who feels it is necessary and possible to safeguard our planet against a nuclear catastrophe is bound to recognize that the Soviet step is both logical and opportune. For it was made at precisely the moment when imperialism's adventurist policy and the arms race whipped up by it had taken the threat to world peace to a critically high level.

The Soviet Union's unilateral commitment made the distinction between the postures of socialism and imperialism on the key issue of our day, the question of war and peace, more striking than ever. It is no secret that the essence and depth of this distinction are not always clearly seen by international opinion, including some sections of its left wing.

For example, it is in many instances believed that the two sides involved in the arms race similarly regard it as a burden and are similarly engaged in looking for the most effective, equally acceptable ways of halting it. To people who think along these lines it seems that the obstacle to ending the deadlock over disarmament is the disagreement over the ceiling to be put on the number of missiles and warheads, or the argument over the priorities and duration of the stages for scaling down this or that weapons system, or mutual intractability in the talks on the necessary control measures. But is this actually the stumbling-block?

The question of the balance of military strength is part and parcel of the disarmament problem. In the judgments on what it is like today and what it may be or should be like tomorrow the prior word belongs not to military experts. It is, first and foremost, the subject of politics. And the principal obstacle to practical agreement on disarmament stems precisely from the fundamental distinctions in the political concepts from which this problem is addressed by socialism and by the "war party" of monopoly capital.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries insist on a meticulous observance of the principle that the existing approximate equilibrium of military strength should not be upset. In Washington the present leadership openly pursues the aim of achieving military superiority over the USSR, of turning the USA into the premier military power. Accepting this U.S. guideline, the NATO bloc is as a whole seeking to surpass the Warsaw Treaty Organization in military power. It is not hard to see that this wide divergence of attitudes gives an entirely different dimension to the concrete proposals which each side is making in negotiations and in public debates on disarmament.

Take the Reagan zero option, for example. The U.S. President has suggested clearing Europe entirely of medium-range missiles, reducing their number to zero. What more, it would seem, could one want? But those who impetuously saw this proposal as a sincere intention to help settle the disarmament problem made a serious mistake. They simply displayed an imprudent forgetfulness of Washington's underlying course toward achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. Far from deviating from this course, the Reagan zero option fits squarely into it. What it signifies is neither more nor less than that in a Europe "free of missiles" the USA and NATO would gain indisputable superiority thanks to the other nuclear weapons systems at their disposal in the region.

A realistic zero option, to use this formula, comes from the Soviet Union's proposal to freeze the military confrontation in Europe at its present level and then begin reducing it down to the ultimate abolition of all the means of nuclear warfare deployed in that part of the world. In this approach to the matter the principle of preserving military equilibrium is of paramount importance. Its observance is the guarantee that at no stage of the progress to zero will there arise a situation in which the interests of anybody's security are prejudiced.

One sometimes hears the assertion that in essence the concept of military equilibrium coalesces with the balance of terror doctrine adopted and preached by imperialism. In both cases, it is said, the key role in preserving peace and consolidating universal security is accorded to military strength. Is that, in fact, true?

To gain a better understanding of this issue it would be useful to consider it in its broad historical dimension. After all, the polemic between socialism and imperialism over the problems of security and disarmament did not begin today or yesterday. It commenced on the heels of the emergence of the first socialist state. And at once the paths along which the foreign policy concepts of the opposing social systems developed veered in opposite directions.

They came sharply into conflict, for example, in the diplomatic struggle over the problem of disarmament at the close of the 1920s and the early 1930s. Plans ostensibly aimed at achieving the salutary purpose of halting the stockpiling of weapons, cutting back arsenals, and limiting the possibility of armed force being used in inter-state conflicts were put on the international agenda one after another. Among others, there were the British plans of Lord Robert Cecil and the Foreign Secretary John Simon. They projected the abolition mainly of

ground troops, which would naturally have given no little advantage to Britain, which was one of the leading naval powers at the time. There were the French plans of Joseph Paul-Boncour and, later, of Andre Tardieu, both of which were designed to give France military hegemony in Europe. As a matter of record, the Tardieu plan had the vigorous support of bourgeois Czechoslovakia, which would have lost nothing by the plan for it was already heavily dependent on French capital. Plans were put forward on behalf of the USA suggesting reducing those types of weapons which the USA itself did not have in sufficient quantities at the time. The idea of ending the "Versailles inequality" in armaments was put forward by Germany. Heinrich Brüning began by suggesting equal limitations for all states, but Kurt von Schleicher and Konstantin von Neurath very soon afterwards demanded an upgrading of Germany's armaments. Then Hitler quickly and dramatically showed what was meant by the "restoration of equality."

Soviet proposals, too, embodied notably in a plan for complete disarmament, were discussed in the League of Nations and at an international conference convened by it in 1932. These proposals got no support from representatives of bourgeois states. Indeed, could this support be expected from those who were preoccupied with paving the way to the future Munich policy?

The details of the discussions of those days, the arguments of some and the objections of others — all this is now mainly of historical interest. But there are some essential points that have not lost their significance to this day. It is extremely indicative that despite their diversity, all the disarmament plans peddled by representatives of the bourgeois states boiled down conceptually to the idea of ensuring their own security to the detriment of the security of others. But in the Soviet project, as distinct from all these plans, the accent was placed on concern for general security that excluded any advantages for some states over others, any kind of national egoism.

Much water — and, regrettably, much blood — has flowed since then. The times have changed, and so has military technology. Today, any talk about disarmament begins, naturally, with missiles, with nuclear weapons, of which there was not so much as a hint in those days. But if one ponders the essence one will see that in all the calculations and comparisons, whether they concern the troop contingents deployed in Europe, or the Pershings and SS-20s, or any other weapons systems and complexes — in all these computations

and the proposals based on them, the selfsame two philosophies of peace, the selfsame opposing concepts of security come into conflict.

Ever since the balance of terror doctrine saw the light of day, it has been dished up by its adherents as the recipe for the preservation of peace. But let us try to join in their line of reasoning. They contend that the threat of war will recede with the growth of its potential participants' fear of the consequences of an armed conflict. These consequences will evidently be more terrible if the quantity of the weaponry ready for use is larger and if its destructive, lethal force is greater. Is it not obvious that put to the test, this "recipe for peace" is nothing less than a prescription for an endless arms race?

The proponents of the balance of terror doctrine take issue with this conclusion. They claim that they insist on a reduction of the level of armaments and that they have their own ideas and proposals on this score. What are they? Precisely such that if implemented would enable them, at every stage of disarmament, to retain a tangible military superiority. One can thus appreciate what role this strategy assigns to "terror." As regards its "balance," this is exactly what is swept away at the very start. "Intimidation" must be unilateral. The "premier military power" must sow terror so as not to experience it itself.

Consequently, this doctrine is specious even in its wording. And if one considers its in-depth content — not military-strategic but philosophical — it will be seen to boil down to the selfsame concept of "self-security" with total disregard for the interests of other countries and peoples and, more, providing for the flagrant flouting of these interests with, among other things, "superior" armed strength.⁹

Needless to say, concern for own security is an essential feature of the foreign policy of socialism as well. The peace philosophy guiding and permeating this policy attaches paramount significance to the defense of revolutionary, socialist achievements. But, it also recognizes and asserts the right of all peoples to equal security. It insists that the security of any state will be stronger if general security is more reliable. From this it follows that the road to world peace passes not through the whipping up of mutual terror but exclusively through a balanced reduction of the level of armaments, through the building of mutual confidence. This merits special mention today, on the eve of the resumption of the Madrid meeting with the question of a European disarmament conference on its agenda. The convening of this conference and then its success are indis-

pensable to making security the property of the peoples of Europe, to making it general and equal for all of them.

The concept of security championed by the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and other socialist community countries attaches considerable significance to the inviolability of the equilibrium between the military strength of socialism and imperialism. There is nothing here of mental acrobatics, nothing of casuistry. It is simply a requirement to look soberly at the objective state of affairs in the world — such as it is today and such as it will be tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. The only question is whether this equilibrium will be sustained at the present or higher or lower level. Only one thing ensues from non-recognition of the principle of maintaining it, and it is the whipping up of the arms race. On the contrary, to accept this principle and establish it as a norm mandatory for everybody would mean to clear the way for disarmament, to lay the beginning for enlarging the area of international confidence.

Thus, the idea of military equilibrium is first and foremost a political category. Its basic significance is that by adequately reflecting world realities, it underscores the cardinal element of the international edifice, which must be strengthened to ensure equal security to all countries.

As I have already noted, the Soviet commitment to refrain from a nuclear first-strike in no way upsets the existing equilibrium of military strength or impinges on the security of the socialist community. At the same time, it quite obviously serves to reinforce universal security, including the security of the USA and the other NATO countries. We should like to believe that among the ruling circles of these countries, too, there are sober minds capable of understanding that the Soviet decision is a contribution to the strengthening of the national security of their peoples which it would be futile to expect from the billions and trillions being squandered on expanding military arsenals.

In recent months there have been many peace meetings and rallies in Czechoslovakia. The International Peace March 82 passed across our country. Similar processions are taking place along the roads of tens of other countries, along the streets of thousands of towns. There is no precedent to the magnitude of the anti-missile, anti-nuclear, and general anti-war movement of our day. Its distinguishing features are its unparalleled mass character and its spontaneous vigor that ranges far beyond any organized shores. In this lies its strength. And in

this there is also a certain weakness, because in some of its ideas and slogans it goes astray and this could debilitate the struggle for peace. Perhaps these are minor and inevitable deficiencies within what is on the whole an effective and indispensable movement for the cause of peace. But if these deficiencies could be minimized, the movement could be even more effective. This is desired by all its participants, by the communists in the first place. That is why it would not be superfluous to draw attention once again to how important it is for all the participants in the anti-war movement to shed illusions, to rid themselves of notions that may be lofty but have no foundation in the realities of the modern world.

A question that arises in this connection and requires both clarity of thought and unambiguity of conclusion is that of the correlation between what is desired and what is possible in the sphere of disarmament. In the case of many people who are sincerely worried about the volatile accumulation of armaments, the protest against the resultant menace takes the shape of an appeal for the immediate eradication from the face of the earth of all means of destruction and annihilation, for immediate general and complete disarmament. From maximalist positions of this kind, every individual step helping to reinforce general security or making it possible at least partially to reduce the tension of military confrontation is assessed as worthless. Sinking into this sort of radicalism, spokesmen of some left trends go so far as to accuse the Soviet Union of retreating from its own idea of general and complete disarmament, of "exchanging" it for "good-for-nothing half-measures," one of which, it is alleged, is the commitment to abstain from a nuclear first-strike.

We may ask: Will the world anti-war movement gain much if it goes by the formula of "all or nothing at all," if it denounces any change for the better in international affairs that does not spell out complete disarmament? This question hardly needs a detailed reply. It ought to be clear to everybody, and the communists are particularly well aware of it, that no serious movement can afford to succumb to the "infantile disorder" of leftism.

As regards the accusations of the USSR "retreating" from the idea of general and complete disarmament, they are no more than a figment of the imagination. Who, where, and when in the Soviet Union or any other socialist community country gave the least cause to believe that some reassessment of values has taken place in this context, that socialism has

adopted a foreign policy ideal differing from that expressed in Lenin's winged words, "a world without armaments"? If one seriously wants that ideal to be attained and looks for the practical ways toward it, one cannot allow oneself to be up in the clouds and lose touch with the realities of this earth. Indeed, only a world without armaments can ensure full, general, and equal security to all states and peoples. The road to it is long and tortuous. Every step made in that direction is of inestimable value. And the Soviet decision not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is precisely such a step.

1. *Resolutions and Decisions Adopted by the General Assembly During Its Tenth Special Session, 23 May-30 June 1978. Supplement No. 4/A/S-10/4/, New York, 1978, p. 5.*

2. *Rude pravo*, August 7, 1982.

3. *The Times*, June 9, 1982.

4. *Die Welt*, July 26, 1982.

5. *The Times*, August 16, 1982.

6. D.F. Ustinov. "Ward Off the Threat of a Nuclear War," *Pravda*, July 12, 1982.

7. *Rude pravo*, July 31, 1982.

8. *Rude pravo*, August 7, 1982.

9. For several decades "self-security" has been the basis of Israel's foreign policy strategy. Everybody knows only too well what stems from this theoretical postulate in practice.



Patriotic program approved by the congress: a guide to action

Donis Christofinis

CC Political Bureau member, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL)

There are circumstances which lend our struggle in Cyprus special significance. In the presidential elections due in several months, the anti-imperialist patriotic forces will be faced with a virtually common front of foreign and domestic reaction. Tension in the Eastern Mediterranean has come to a head due especially to the Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Imperialism is doing its utmost at the world level to destroy détente.

The external and internal conditions of the Cypriot people's struggle, the principles and nature of cooperation among patriots and democrats, the communists' role and tasks in the democratic movement, and the possibilities and prospects of national development¹ — all that affects the destiny of our country in one way or another has found reflection in the progress and outcome of the 15th congress of AKEL (May 1982). Its documents show the party's approach to key international issues; they indicate a realistic way to a peaceful, democratic settlement of national problems and stress the objective need to strengthen AKEL and its political positions in society. I will now deal with the main lines of communist activity as specified by the congress decisions.

The war menace that is so palpable in our region is an outgrowth of U.S. imperialist reaction's policy of aggression and expansion. Official Washington claims that there are things

"more important than peace" and that it is feasible not only to begin a nuclear war but to win it. In trying to launch a "crusade against communism," the imperialists expect to enable the United States to impose its will on other countries, to blackmail them with impunity and, whenever it deems it necessary, resort to direct coercion, including extreme measures. They count on growing military power and its unlimited use in foreign policy.

No task is more important today than to protect life on earth by averting the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. AKEL identifies itself with all who are opposed to the imperialist policy of gaining military superiority, to the production of neutron weapons and the NATO decision to deploy new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The powerful wave of mass demonstrations for peace that swept West European countries made for the growth of anti-war sentiments among the public. In Cyprus as everywhere else, people realize the need to defend their vital interests; they are joining more actively in the struggle to remove all barriers to universal security. People's common sense is an ally of the communists. Lenin's famous words, "we must . . . help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 252), are more valid than ever, for this is one of the communists' most important internationalist

duties. To help the masses "master the secrets of international politics," it is essential to open their eyes to the real source of the war menace.

The 15th congress of AKEL expressed unqualified support for the Soviet Union's constructive proposals intended to provide dependable safeguards against nuclear war, promote détente and lower armaments levels with a view to bringing about general and complete disarmament. Special mention should be made of the Soviet commitment announced by Leonid Brezhnev not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If other nuclear powers were to make a similar commitment, the danger of world war would be greatly reduced. We constantly expose the lies of U.S. and NATO special services about the alleged Soviet military threat, lies which betray a desire to mislead and weaken the peace forces.

Those who spread falsehoods about Soviet foreign policy often accuse our party of "lacking" patriotism and label us as "agents of Moscow." But how can anyone be a patriot without fighting against a real threat of universal annihilation? Surely the desire of both the Soviet government and all communists to defend everyone's right to a peaceful life meets the interests of the majority of Cypriots and the peoples of the whole planet.

The 15th congress of AKEL reaffirmed the Cypriot communists' view of their struggle as part of the worldwide struggle for peace, against imperialism, for national liberation, democracy and social progress. The party has made and continues to make a contribution to mass demonstrations against foreign military bases and the neutron bomb, for disarmament. Over 65,000 people joined in a recent 20-kilometer peace march, organized under the auspices of the Cyprus Peace Council, through the Akrotiri military base near Limassol. AKEL plans to continue organizing large-scale popular actions and laying bare the policy of aggression which the U.S. hawks, their allies and their agents are pursuing in various parts of the world. In its resolution the congress especially emphasized the Cypriot communists' militant solidarity with the struggle of the people of El Salvador, with revolutionary Nicaragua, socialist Cuba, the heroic Palestinian people and the progressive forces of Lebanon, the patriots of Namibia, and the fighters against South Africa's racist regime.

This internationalist effort is most closely linked with the party's sustained struggle for a just solution of the Cyprus problem. We communists insist on the liberation of the island's territory occupied by Turkish troops, the elimination of the effects of the 1974 coup and

the Turkish invasion and occupation, an end to foreign interference in the affairs of our people, the removal of imperialist military bases from Cyprus and the dismantling of radar stations supporting spy missions by U.S. U-2 planes.

Cypriots want their island freed from all imperialist presence and occupation by foreign troops and seek the establishment of a democratic federal state committed to an active policy of non-alignment. By advocating a complete demilitarization of the island, AKEL wants to contribute to the worldwide struggle for disarmament, against nuclear war, for a peaceful future for all peoples.

The 15th congress called on the party to strengthen the democratic unity of all patriots. We realize that the communists alone cannot solve the nation's pressing problems. This requires support from the bulk of the population and necessitates an alliance comprising the workers, peasants, intellectuals and other working people, and the section of the national bourgeoisie which is not associated with foreign monopoly capital. We believe the patriotic front should include, as is done in the free territory, Turkish Cypriots (Marxists and members of progressive, democratic groups living in the occupied areas). AKEL declares for a rapprochement between the two communities, the pulling down of the wall between them, joint efforts by the Greeks and Turks of the island to settle outstanding problems, and for the formation of a united front against foreign interference, whether on the part of Turkey, Greece, Britain or America.

An important step toward such a broad alliance was taken on April 20, 1982, when an agreement on cooperation was signed by the Democratic Party (DEKO)² and AKEL under a common minimum program. This is something new since the communists, who express the fundamental interests of the working class and other working people, have entered into agreement and evolved an action platform in common with the ruling bourgeois centrist party, which by no means champions socialism. We are united by the desire to deliver Cyprus from foreign occupation and restore full independence, that is, to solve successfully problems resulting from the coup organized by the Greek fascist junta and from foreign invasion and to eliminate the imperialist threat.

The minimum program adopted by the two parties was approved by the congress, for its purpose is to achieve these objectives. The joint program envisages the pursuit of a policy ensuring broad interaction of the patriotic democratic forces and the unity of the people in general, the country's stable development, the

protection and improvement of democratic institutions, better functioning of the state apparatus and government-controlled institutions, implementation of social and economic transformations serving the interests of the masses, especially those of the needy sections, a rapprochement between the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots, and the restoration of confidence, friendship and cooperation between the two communities.

We communists know that the minimum program in its present form does not go beyond the framework of the bourgeois democracy existing in Cyprus. It only puts on record what the two partners agree on. The form of cooperation which AKEL and DEKO have decided on is neither a "mini," nor a "maxi" popular front as certain Cypriot quarters would have it. Setting up such a front is not even being considered at this stage of the struggle, which is primarily a struggle against the occupation, for liberation, against imperialism.

However, the program, while emphasizing the need to solve the nation's fundamental problems, makes it possible to seek a substantial improvement in the people's life. In the period ahead the communists intend to campaign for a more equitable distribution of the national income in the interests of economically vulnerable social strata, and for higher wages, salaries, pensions and aids. We seek the promotion of free education, the implementation of a state scheme for the provision of free medical care and medicines and the creation of more jobs for young specialists and school-leavers. The agreement on democratic cooperation envisages the working-out and implementation of appropriate measures under a new social and economic policy.

AKEL considers that there are opportunities for the materialization of the projected measures. First of all, Spyros Kyprianou, President of the Republic and Chairman of DEKO, has declared the minimum program to be the government's official program. Second, the cooperating parties are strong enough in parliament to defeat obstruction on the part of reactionary pro-imperialist forces.³ Third, a top-level inter-party committee set up for the purpose will oversee the implementation of the joint program and submit its conclusions and recommendations to the President. It is neither a governmental, nor a supragovernmental institution but a working body of the two parties coordinating their efforts as agreed. Similar committees are to be formed in all the provinces, towns and villages to draw the masses into the fight for the people's fundamental interests and ensure that the patriotic democratic

forces' common candidate wins the 1983 presidential elections. Fourth, cooperation between AKEL and DEKO paves the way for an extensive democratization of the state apparatus and may help transform it into an instrument of freeing Cyprus. Both parties are set on seeking a purge in the army, police, government bodies and paragonovernmental agencies to rid them of those guilty of complicity in the putsch, subversion and corruption. Fifth and most important of all, the announced aims of the bipartisan agreement and the two parties' coordinated efforts have enjoyed the working people's support from the outset. It is to be hoped that the social basis of democratic cooperation will grow stronger as their tasks are accomplished.

The agreement does not imply that the cooperating parties renounce their ideological principles or class positions, nor does it encroach on their organizational and political independence. Each party retains, of course, its class essence and publicizes its own world view to win new adherents. Hence certain difficulties and differences in approaching social phenomena, which is objectively bound to complicate the search for mutually acceptable solutions now and then. Occasionally it takes time to reach agreement and organize joint action. Differences persist over some issues, such as the attitude to the country's entry into the EEC.

To be sure, it takes the communists a great deal of patience, restraint, tact and skill to follow their line within the framework of equitable cooperation. Decisions of the 15th congress reflect the party's maturity and the resolve of its cadre to fulfil the main tasks set by the agreed patriotic program. We feel that, if carried out, the program will create greater opportunities and better material conditions for further social changes and for struggle in the interest of a socialist future for the Cypriots. We sincerely wish that the efforts of AKEL and DEKO are backed by the country's other patriots and democrats, and seek unity of action with all who are willing to help put the minimum program into practice.

The task of achieving patriotic and democratic unity is becoming more urgent as the presidential elections approach. Foreign and home reaction has long been trying hard to drive a wedge between AKEL and DEKO, for their cooperation is an obstacle to the plans of the extreme rightists grouped in the Democratic Rally party, whose aim is to seize power and turn Cyprus into an imperialist protectorate. This cooperation suits neither Turkey, nor the reactionary sections of the island's Turkish

population, for they are intent on legitimizing the occupation and establishing a separate state on the seized territory. Discontent is also shown by those in Greece who regard our country virtually as their domain. The democratic alliance that has emerged is also condemned by various church organizations, which represent it as a product of "Red intrigue." Britain, the United States and the NATO command are up in arms against the two parties' coordinated policy and this is perfectly understandable, since the democratic line chosen by the two parties is designed to free Cyprus from foreign interference and foreign military bases. Lastly, the minimum program and the joint efforts of the Communists and Democrats to implement it are fiercely attacked by extreme "leftists" and people who pose as leftist, for this kind of alliance does not fit into their pseudo-revolutionary pattern.

All these attacks — both at home and abroad — are new evidence that we are on the right path. The 15th congress unanimously endorsed the program for cooperation with DEKO. AKEL is determined to continue honoring its commitments in good faith and fight for the freedom and independence of the country and the vital rights and interests of the masses. The stronger the party is in the coming period, the more fruitful its effort will be.

The influx of new people into the party is a welcome development of recent years. The party membership has increased by 2,479 since its 14th congress. As of May 1982, the party had nearly 14,000 members. The outlook for the future is encouraging; the fact that 96,000 gave their votes to AKEL in last year's general election is an indication of the potentialities of increasing the party's numerical strength. Party organizations are campaigning with fresh vigor to enlist "thousands of new members from all the strata of the people of Cyprus, so that our party consolidate itself and make its presence felt where the people live and work, at every place of work as well as every place of residence, every village, every neighborhood."⁴ We need to recruit more young workers, working women, specialists, handicraftsmen and peasants. And of course, we must continue seeing to it that workers constitute an appreciable majority and form the backbone of AKEL.

Speakers at the congress stressed the importance of improving the ideological education of new members and making greater use of their abilities and professional qualities. Experienced party members will have to help the newly-admitted communists become real fighters for the interests of the working class and other working people. Some party mem-

bers are as yet not active enough, for objective causes of a family or other nature prevent some comrades from overcoming a passive attitude and showing real militancy. In such cases, we try to draw them more vigorously into action for our common cause. Passivity also affects an occasional party cell. The congress delegates pointed out that struggle against manifestations of sectarianism and bureaucratic practices and utmost promotion of criticism, self-criticism and the democratic standards of party life are, now as in the past, effective means of heightening the militancy of party members and primary cells.

Today AKEL attaches particular importance to the training and education of new people eligible for promotion to leading party posts. Leaders do not emerge overnight, as we all know; they attain maturity and are tried and tested in hard work and everyday struggle for the working people's interests. To prove their worth as new party workers and achieve tangible results, they must equip themselves with sound theoretical and political knowledge. The party sees to it that comrades receive proper Marxist-Leninist training.

The political positions of communists become stronger provided the level of their ideological work among the masses is high enough. At a time when imperialism and reaction constantly inject the poison of their ideology into the people's consciousness, AKEL must tell the people the truth about what goes on in Cyprus and throughout the world and help them see the possibilities of radical change. The greatest attention must be given to the younger generation, a primary target of imperialist, reactionary propaganda.

The party uses tested forms of work among the masses; it circulates leaflets, pamphlets and articles dealing with topical matters and organizes lectures and talks through its political schools. However, life demands a search for new methods of ideological work more in keeping with each particular situation; it also demands party guidance of this work. In accordance with the guidelines of the latest congress, the AKEL CC is re-organizing and strengthening its Ideological Department which must supply its counterparts at the district level with material on current ideological and political issues on the understanding that party groups will subsequently discuss it and spell out AKEL's position to the masses. Much will have to be done to improve party publications, increase their circulation and win a larger readership for them. The purpose of the measures we are now carrying out is to take the offensive on the ideological and political front

and expose imperialist and reactionary schemes more effectively.

The communists owe their strength to their solid links with the people's mass movement represented by professional, youth, women's and other organizations. Our party is proud of its great contribution to the formation and strengthening of these forces. They now champion independence and social progress, serve as a bastion of cooperation between Communists and Democrats and contribute to closer relations and cooperation among all true patriots. Contacts are maintained within the framework of the popular movement between democratic organizations of the Greek and Turkish communities of the island. They create the prerequisites of renewing relations based on mutual understanding, friendship and cooperation between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, relations broken off as a result of foreign invasion. The mass movement is following a correct path and gaining strength. We communists see it as a reliable ally in the struggle for the interests of the working class and other

working people of Cyprus and a better future for them.

Only a few months have passed since the 15th congress of AKEL. But its decisions have already had a beneficial impact on every field of the communists' manifold activities. Developments have confirmed the vitality of the policy line approved by the congress. The communists' consistent internationalism, loyalty to the principles and goals of cooperation among the democratic forces of Cyprus and militancy in the struggle against foreign and home reaction add to the party's prestige among the masses and help it build up its strength. We feel certain that the path we have chosen will lead us to further gains.

1. See also Ezekias Papaioannou, "The Future We Want," WMR, September 1982.

2. The ruling bourgeois-democratic party of Cyprus (founded in 1976). — Ed.

3. As a result of the latest general election (May 1981), AKEL holds 12 and DEKO, 8 of the 35 seats in the National Assembly. — Ed.

4. Haravghi, May 30, 1982.

The significance of festivals to the communists

Clement Rohee, Essop Pahad, James West,
WMR Editorial Council members

IMPRESSIONS OF THE DUISBURG FESTIVAL

At the festival of *Unsere Zeit*, newspaper of the FRG communists, we were, properly speaking, representatives of, or writers for the newspaper of the People's Progressive Party of Guyana *Mirror*, the Marxist journal *African Communist*, and *Daily World*, the U.S. communist newspaper. For various reasons festivals such as this do not, regrettably, take place in our respective countries and probably will not take place for some time to come. We knew that there is vehement anti-communism in the Federal Republic so that the GCP, too, does not have an easy time. All the more were we impressed by the enthusiasm and dedication of the thousands of communists who organized this variety of political, cultural, and other activities. This inspired us with pride in the comrades of a fraternal party, which have made this festival such a success.

We pondered the question that we have put in the heading. What do the communists get

out of such festivals, why do they put in so much time and effort, often at the expense of their holidays?

We put these questions to GCP members from different lands and to non-communists at the stands, in the pavilions, and in open-air grounds where solidarity rallies and concerts were held. We shall confine ourselves to the most typical considerations articulated in this collective interview.

The first person we interviewed was Georg Polikeit, editor-in-chief of *Unsere Zeit*, Presidium member of the GCP Board, and the chief "administrator" of the festival. Let's give him the floor:

"This is the fifth major festival of our newspaper and our party. These festivals are a fine opportunity to show the public, the working people in the first place, the party's true character and face, demonstrate its links to the working class and its solidarity with the international working-class movement and the worldwide struggle against imperialism, for social and national liberation.

"A distinguishing feature of the current festival is that it is taking place against the background of a spreading powerful peace movement. Our motto for this year is "Peace, Détente, Disarmament," which is what the vast majority of the FRG's population wants. Here, at the festival, the GCP explains its stand on these issues, which are vital to all humankind, and advances three demands, which are crucial to the country: renunciation of the NATO missile decision, acceptance of the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and a freeze on nuclear arsenals, and denial of the country's territory for the stationing of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Our party is trying to promote more effective interaction between the working class and the peace movement. It is imperative that this movement should grow and be in a position to compel the government to respond constructively to all peace initiatives. Many of the people coming to our festival are non-communists — social democrats, trade unionists, and other citizens active in the peace movement. The GCP thereby hopes to contribute to the development of the dialogue between all these elements and of joint actions by them against the arms race, for peace and détente.

"Another political objective which the festival is helping to achieve, through the mass movement, is to get the government to pursue a different social policy and thwart the assault on the working people's living standard and rights.

"Let me add that the festival is unquestionably significant as a means of strengthening the party itself. The preparations take many weeks and involve the efforts of thousands of communists, who do this work voluntarily (nearly a thousand, who took special leave for this, built the festival township in the course of a week. — Authors). This work gives them much satisfaction, for each sees that our party is a force and this circumstance influences people's thinking, gives them confidence in victory, adds to their optimism in the struggle for peace and socialism, reinforces the faith of the communists in the party's potentialities and, consequently, enhances the militancy of the party itself.

"Of course, the festival bolsters the sense of cordial, close comradeship between communists from various parts of the country, from north to south. The opportunity to meet new friends and renew old acquaintances likewise contributes to a good, militant feeling in the party. The presence of foreign guests, of delegations from fraternal parties and their newspapers, also helps. Our comrades are able to see

for themselves that they are part of a great international movement that decisively determines world politics.

"We have also invited to our festival democratic organizations of immigrant workers and foreign students, fighters against imperialism, for national liberation. The ruling circles of the FRG are currently inciting hostility toward immigrants and trying to use unemployment to sow nationalistic feeling among our working class. Unlike the other parties in the FRG, the communist party gives immigrant workers opportunities, including such festivals, to assert themselves, to state their aspirations and interests, and thereby counter the misrepresentation of their struggles by bourgeois propaganda.

"Lastly, a word about extending the party's influence, about enlisting new members. During the preparations for the festival we have distributed among workers nationwide many tens of thousands of copies of information material, and canvassed from house to house, from door to door — chiefly in the workers' neighborhoods of big cities — to extend a personal invitation to people to come to the festival. Of course, we invited friends and acquaintances with whom we cooperate in the different democratic movements, notably peace fighters and trade union militants.

"The communists thus renew old and make new contacts outside the party. Where a party group succeeds in drawing scores of people to the festival it gets entirely new points of departure for its further work. This helps to break the ring of isolation into which the ruling circles endeavor to imprison the GCP organizations. Then it becomes easier, say, to sell our newspaper regularly to people who have been to our festival, to call them to join in party actions organized on a smaller, local scale. In short, the party's force of attraction grows. And the result is that we get new applications for membership during and after the festival."

"No other party ..."

Communist festivals get coverage in the press of fraternal parties (the festival in Duisburg has already been reported, of course). The pattern is therefore, in principle, a familiar one: a bustling township spread spaciouly over the Wedau sports complex, the pavilions and stands of the regional and district GCP organizations and of the party groups of individual enterprises — within the three festival days one can get a detailed picture of the country's geography. But the main thing has been the huge crowds, the people who brave the rain and cold wind (during the three festival days there were over

400,000 visitors). Everything is impressive — not only to us, foreign guests, but also to the hosts. This is especially important to those who came from districts where there are as yet few communists and the feeling is in some cases one of uncertainty. Here they see and realize that the party's influence is much greater than its numerical strength, that it is able to bring together and draw into discussion so many people.

"We don't get very many tangible results in our ordinary, day-to-day work. This is because the conditions are complex," notes *Helmut Honigmann*, who works at a hospital in *Mettman*. "It is a pleasure to see so many comrades here, to feel our collective strength."

Helmut's wife *Beatrix*, who is also a communist, agrees with him. They came to the festival with their 11-month son.

"It's really great meeting non-communists from your own district here in the festival township. It gives you a sense of accomplishment, for it's the result of your own work," says *Reinhard Fischbach*, a social service official in *Biolefeld*, North Rhine-Westphalia. He believes it would be useful to hold such festivals in the localities, in various parts of the country, for not everybody can tear himself away from his work in a distant region to go to a general party festival.

"The people's festivals of the GCP," declares *Erich Rolk*, deputy chairman of the Hamburg regional organization, "are inspiring for party members. They have worked hard to prepare them, see how successful their efforts have been, and return to their party work with redoubled energy."

A growing number of young people come to the communist festivals, we were told. This fills the atmosphere with youthful zest and energy. "The preparations for the festival (it required enormous work) were great fun," said *Monika Schneidereit* of Dortmund University. "We did everything ourselves, and innovated as we went along."

Edit Phlipsen, who wore a corded star on her jacket for outstanding work in circulating *Unsere Zeit*, said: "You ask whether the festival makes us feel stronger? I don't think you are putting the question right. The communists are always strong for the simple reason that we are fighting for the interests of ordinary people, of working people, to allow them to live a life of peace. They see or will see this. The newspapers of the bourgeoisie work for the rich, but *UZ* is for the working masses." Here was optimism with a capital O.

Meetings of communists from different parts of the country give them the opportunity of

sharing experience. In the pavilion of the Bremen regional organization of the GCP *Peter Zimmerman*, member of a district committee, related that he had the opportunity to discuss methods of work at industrial enterprises with comrades from other localities, learn how workers were enlisted into the party at these enterprises, and specify their attitude to problems that are general to the country at large, for example, mass dismissals.

Everybody we spoke to agreed that no other party would have been able to organize a festival such as this. "Quite a few 'people's festivals' are held in the FRG, for instance, the Oktoberfest in Munich," said *Michael Fuhrer*, secretary of a South Bavarian regional organization. "But it's a commercial undertaking, as inevitably would be any other festival attempted by any other party. But ours is a truly people's festival."

"There's a reason why we always gather in a town in the Ruhr: it's a workers' festival, and you don't have to be rich to come, have a good time, and derive satisfaction from the friendly, well-wishing atmosphere," said *Friedbert Saffrin*, committee member of the Solingen district GCP organization and a trade unionist. "And all because ours is the only party that has so many activists prepared to work unselfishly, voluntarily, and selflessly, without stinting time and effort."

The consciousness of this is also a source of pride for the communists. *Katarina Hulsman*, a social worker from Herne, and *Fritz Schmit*, an 80-year-old party veteran from Monchengladbach said that the *UZ* festivals are a continuation of the tradition of workers' festivals of the 1920s and the early 1930s, with, of course, a new content consistent with the present conditions of the struggle.

A microcosm of the life of communists

Of course, what we have been told fosters the GCP's numerical growth and enhances its prestige in society, and among other political forces. The party puts itself on review at the festival, and many people get their first impression of it. The festival, as one of the comrades put it aptly, is a "microcosm of the life of communists."

"At the festival," says *Monika Schneidereit*, "people see that the communists are not so few after all, and this impresses them. Why do people come to the festival? Because we have gone from house to house, and worked in the civil initiative committees, the peace movement, and other organizations. To prepare for the festival it is necessary to talk to people, and this means knowing what to say. Bourgeois

propaganda usually portrays communists as 'taciturn and hidebound.' That's not true, and we have been able to prove it."

Anti-communism is belied by the entire atmosphere of the festival — the talks, the discussions, the sale of Marxist literature, the meetings with GCP leaders, the international solidarity and peace rallies, and the performances of professional and amateur actors (parodies of well-known politicians drew particularly large audiences).

As regards the enlistment of new party members and new readers of UZ, this takes place, of course, not only at the festival itself. During the preparations there was a membership drive, and the results were announced on the first day of the festival. The drive continued during the festival itself. Michael Fuhrer noted with pride that by noon of the third day 30 people had applied for membership in the South Bavarian organization. This is quite an achievement if it is borne in mind how far Duisburg is from Munich — a good 650 kilometers. But the main results must come later, of course.

The strengthening of the party itself means an expansion of its potential for cooperation with other political forces and involvement of new strata of the population.

Ernst Schafer, a steelworker in Hattingen, a trade union militant, and member of the town council, related: "At the factory we, communists, have the reputation of being good trade unionists. The workers elect and re-elect communists to the town council, for they know that we will champion their interests. At the festival people see for themselves that the communists are concerned with matters directly affecting the life of all workers. For example, unemployment, social and democratic rights and, most important, the struggle for peace. This gives us a community of interests."

We had the opportunity of talking to a social democrat. He was Michael Nienhaus, a Munster student. Here are his words:

"First, I should like to say that I have been a member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany for seven years. During that period this is the second time I have been at an *Unsere Zeit* festival. I have seen the organizational ability of the GCP, of its members and of the newspaper's subscribers. I regard this as evidence of the communist party's potentialities as a real political force in the country. One meets members of other political parties at the festival, and its organizers should be congratulated for this. It is my belief that festivals like this one can do much to create conditions favoring unity of action by the communists and socialists. You are perhaps aware that the right-wing social

democrats always try to pressure the party's healthy forces to stay away from GCP festivals. When I return to my home-town I will feel it a duty to tell my comrades of the experience I have accumulated here in the past three days. I am certain that many will listen seriously and take it as food for thought."

Comrades from the GCP told us of cooperation with other forces — the "greens," the "alternativists," the civil initiative movements — of cooperation that is also fostered by the festivals. One of them was Heinz Kampe, chairman of a Lower Saxony regional organization. The festival, he said, gave a good opportunity to discuss with comrades from different places what and how things should be done in that direction.

The opponents of the communists are likewise beginning to see that the festival helps to disperse anti-communist prejudices. Robert Kubitza of the town of Herne has said that "the bourgeois press heaps all sorts of insults and abuse on the people who go to the festival. It writes, for instance, that the communists organize these festivals to further their political ambitions. This is not merely slander. It is slander motivated by fear."

In conclusion, we should like to give the floor to the festival's host, Heinz Muhlhaus, chairman of the Duisburg district organization of the GCP:

"What does our district organization expect of this festival? First, a boost for the party's political work and success in winning the sympathy of the town's population, enlisting new members, and getting more subscribers for *Unsere Zeit*. In short, a strengthening of the party as a whole through the efforts of a district level organization. Every district organization is therefore interested in holding such a festival despite the additional effort that it entails. We hope many people, particularly workers of big factories, will find their way to our party. But the overriding benefit of the festival is that it helps to represent the GCP as a party whose political aspirations coincide with those of large masses of working people."

"We also strive, of course, to have the sympathy won by the communists at these festivals yield concrete results later, say, during elections. For Duisburg and the whole of North Rhine-Westphalia it is important that the GCP polls more votes at the municipal elections slated for 1984."

"In working toward that end we do not forget that peace is the main condition for social progress, without peace there can be nothing. Our festival, too, is dedicated to peace and solidari-

ty. We expect it to give a further impulse to the struggle for peace and employment and contribute to working-class unity of action, to the organization of joint actions by the working-class and anti-war movements.

"Every communist of Duisberg is proud of the festival's success. There will now be greater persuasiveness than ever when they tell their workmates to join our party if they want things to be better."

New experience

OUR INTERVIEWS

HOW AUTHORITY GROWS

François Hoffman

CC Executive Committee member,
CP Luxembourg,
Deputy Editor-in-Chief,
Zeitung vom Letzeburger Vollek

Q. What do you believe to be the main task of the communist press today?

A. Albert Einstein once remarked that in a Fourth World War people would shoot at each other only with a sling, if anyone were left to shoot at all. Consequently, if humankind is not to be hurled back to prehistoric times, if it is not to be annihilated, there must be no Third World War. That is now the purpose of the efforts being exerted by millions of men and women, and that is also the main task of communist journalism.

Events of the past few years show that a broad front of those who oppose war has taken shape in Western Europe and other parts of the globe. It has brought together representatives of various strata of the population, regardless of ideological views. In many countries, the communists and their press act as the organizing and stimulating force of the anti-war movement. Our task is, of course, to explain the interconnection between the struggle for peace and the struggle for democratic social transformations. That is something we have always done and will continue to do. But one must realistically assess the existing situation and not to entertain the illusion that the masses can comprehend this interconnection rapidly and just about automatically. It is impossible to carry on a struggle for peace with the hope of immediately scoring all-round political successes. The present situation dictates the need to bring to the fore efforts aimed to avert a war. In the communist and working-class movement the need to reckon with the national specifics and the choice of different ways are frequently debated. But in the struggle for peace there is only one common goal.

Hence, I believe, the demand on the commu-

nists and their mass media to promote the development of joint action against the threat of war, to carry on explanatory work competently, vividly and understandably, and to support the adoption of measures ensuring peace and détente. One must take into account the fact that imperialist propaganda keeps drumming in one and the same idea, and coordinates its acts according to goal and time.

In the recent period, the struggle for peace has acquired its own dynamic, involving ever greater numbers of people. But time does not wait and we communists must not rely on any automatic growth of this struggle and must work to deepen and accelerate the incipient processes.

Q. What is your newspaper doing for this purpose, how is it fulfilling its task?

A. I would identify four main lines in our work. First, explanation of the USSR's peace-loving policy and its constructive initiatives. Second, presentation of the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war for humankind. Third, exposure of the aggressive nature of imperialism and the Pentagon's attempts to turn Europe into an arena for an exchange of nuclear strikes. And fourth, demonstration of the absurdity of the arms race, which swallows up vast amounts of money that could have been used for socio-economic development.

Persevering explanatory work by the communists (I have in mind not only the newspaper but also statements by members of the CPL in Parliament, on radio and television) is yielding results. In the past many people here assumed that a small country like Luxembourg would not be involved in an atomic war despite its membership in NATO, but now there has been a shift in public opinion. It is becoming ever clearer that Luxembourg has also been harnessed to NATO's global strategic plans, and that the idea is to turn our country into a military backyard.

More and more inhabitants of Luxembourg are being agitated by questions of peace and disarmament, and much of the credit here goes to the Communist Party, which has succeeded in involving broad strata of the population in

the anti-war movement and finding and skillfully using convincing arguments. It is noteworthy that many representatives of religious circles and ecologists have joined the movement, each for his own motives and inducements, but all for the single purpose of preventing humankind's annihilation. But that is far from being the full list of potential allies in the anti-war struggle, and we are working hard to extend the ranks of the active fighters for peace.

Q. What are the difficulties you have to face and how are they being overcome?

A. Bourgeois propaganda makes use of diverse forms of ideological subversion, ranging from crude slander and cooking of facts and figures to subtle methods of manipulation of people's minds to divert them from the real problems and to keep them from discussing political issues. We have to take a daily and even hourly stand against anti-communism and anti-Sovietism with which the reports of the bourgeois mass media are shot through. Our newspaper uses various genres — reports, statistical surveys and polemical notes. The printing works where our newspaper is printed publishes books and pamphlets on topical subjects. But we do not always manage to respond swiftly to the emerging issues. There are only four of us at the editorial office and now and again we are simply short of time. We are given much help by our activists and non-staff correspondents at the enterprises.

The national periodical market is effectively monopolized by the *Luxemburger Wort*, organ of the Christian Social People's Party. Incidentally, its circulation per head puts it at the top of the world. It controls the publication of all official statements and information coming from the ministries and other governmental organs and advertising. You will realize that this means that the newspaper has vast financial potentialities. We, for our part, have no such backing, but still manage to circulate 15,000-20,000 copies of our newspaper every day. And when, for instance, we published a special issue on the general nation-wide strike the printing was very much larger and was sold out at once.

We devote much attention to extending and strengthening ties with our readers. For this purpose, we hold traditional festivals of the communist press and regional party festivals. The newspaper is distributed at the factory gates and also from door to door in the neighborhoods — and this is especially true of its special issues. It is frequently handed out free of charge because we want to give people a chance to read the paper and find out what it says. In this way we enlarge our readership.

That this work is yielding results will be seen from the steady growth of the paper's circulation and its authority.

SMALL PRIVATE SECTOR: WITH THE WORKING PEOPLE OR WITH THE EMPLOYERS?

Joaquim Gorjao Duarte
CC alternate member, Portuguese CP

Q. At party conferences and on the pages of the press, Portuguese communists frequently deal with problems facing the small and middle traders and entrepreneurs. Why does the PCP give so much attention to them?

A. The communists regard these strata of the population as allies of the working class in the fight against the restoration of capital's positions in the country and for strengthening the democratic regime. Hence the need constantly and attentively to study their role and place in Portugal's social life and in its economy.

Statistics show that this role is a big one. Thus, 70 per cent of factories and plants are in the small and middle bracket. They account for 45 per cent of the investments in fixed assets and employ 80 per cent of the wage workers. Let me add that small private initiative has the dominant role to play in the traditional sectors of the Portuguese economy which are oriented toward the external market: textiles, leather goods, cork products, woodworking and fish-canning.

The PCP has repeatedly spoken out on the problems faced by this sector of the economy. We have shown that it is in a state of decline. Most of the small enterprises have obsolete machinery, operate the old way and without any prospects, and have to face growing financial difficulties. In trade, the bulk of these enterprises use low-efficiency manual labor and "yesterday's" technology. Another besetting curse is the extremely low level of professional training of the entrepreneurs themselves, and this has an adverse effect on their economic operations.

In view of all the circumstances, the party believes that in the event of Portugal's entry into the EEC, small-scale enterprise will be confronted with tremendous difficulties and will be doomed to gradual extinction. The communists believe that whole sectors of the national industry are in need of urgent investments to modernize the obsolete facilities and require constant financial and technical assistance from the state. There is a need not only to restructure but also to enlarge many enterprises

so as to raise labor productivity and make them more competitive.

I have, of course, outlined the PCP's proposals in the broadest terms. These should not be considered outside the context of the general problems of the Portuguese economy. We cannot separate the private sector from the public sector, although relations between them are now taking shape spontaneously. To put them in order, there is a need above all for planning to enable the small entrepreneurs to make the utmost contribution to the country's economic development. In short, there is a need for urgent measures in accordance with Portugal's new realities.

Q. What is the response among the small and middle entrepreneurs to the PCP's proposals? What are the forms and methods of the communists' work with members of this section of the population?

A. The party has great difficulties in spreading its views and proposals in the petty-bourgeois strata of town and country. Our activity is seriously complicated by the fact that television, radio and the government newspapers are controlled by the right-wing parties. Nor should one forget the persistent anti-communist prejudices which are habitual for the petty and middle bourgeoisie and which are being fanned in every way by reactionary propaganda.

Still, we make efforts to find, test in practice and apply various forms of work taking into account the specifics of the social condition and mentality of entrepreneurs and businessmen in this category. Of much importance are PCP conferences on economic problems, which are held to discuss, analyze and formulate concrete proposals aimed to improve the situation in various sectors of the economy, including the small and middle private sector.

How do we seek to carry the meaning of our proposals to those to whom they are addressed? For that purpose, the communists arrange special colloquiums, meetings and round-tables with the participation of traders and industrialists. We also invite them to nationwide functions. Thus, several entrepreneurs turning out export products attended the "Portugal and the Common Market" conference held by the PCP in 1980.

The number of our party members among industrialists and traders is not large — something like two per cent. In their party organizations they fulfil various assignments: they take part in the activity of PCP working centers, in arranging festivals, in collecting membership dues, and in cooperating with local organs of power headed by left-wing and democratic

forces. But as *Militante** has repeatedly noted, assignments meeting their specific interests are not yet being found everywhere for communists representing these strata of the population. There is a need, in particular, to help them arrange unitary work among their colleagues and to act more vigorously and with greater results in organizations of entrepreneurs and traders.

It is very hard to work there, because many elements of the structure, administration and inner life of these associations have been retained from the fascist period, and this even includes some of the people in charge. Nevertheless, despite the boycott which is on the whole characteristic of the employers' attitude to PCP ideas, our views penetrate into the organizations of entrepreneurs and traders.

Q. Is there a connection between the extent of the party's influence at an enterprise and the social stand taken by its owner? How frequently has it been possible to achieve unity between the working people, on the one hand, and the small industrialists and businessmen, on the other, in the fight against the policy of restoring the positions of capitalism?

A. It is hard to answer this question in general terms. The communist party believes that in concrete situations it is quite possible to have joint action by entrepreneurs and working people, say, in defense of a plant and of jobs. Supposing the owner of a small enterprise wants to receive a credit. The bank's refusal may jeopardize many, if not all, the jobs. Consequently, both the working people and the entrepreneur have a stake in receiving a subsidy that will help to avert the closure of the enterprise.

We assume that the stronger the party and the influence of the trade unions at the enterprise, the better the working people's understanding of the specifics and complexities of such relations and the easier it will be to find a path to joint action. But it is not right, of course, to forget about the objective class contradictions between the two sides.

In the "golden period" of the revolution — from 1974 to mid-1976 — the businessmen's condition was markedly improved as a result of a number of progressive measures meeting the interests of broad masses of people. In the southern provinces, the traders declared in one voice that they had only gained from the agrarian reform. Until April 25, rural working people as a rule had money only two times a year, having to live on credit, from hand to

*PCP Bulletin on theoretical and organizational matters. — Ed.

mouth, the rest of the time. The agrarian reform guaranteed and increased the number of jobs and ensured stable incomes. This also went to benefit the businessmen, as trade increased and brought higher incomes. Just now, trade is feeling the adverse effects of the destruction of the agrarian reform and the increase in the number of unemployed.

Masses of small industrialists and traders are coming to realize that the policy of the Democratic Alliance government is having a negative effect on their business. The curbing of production activity, the narrowing down of the domestic market, the reduction in the population's purchasing power tend to ruin and depress an ever greater number of small and middle enterprises.

An expression of the current discontent and awareness of the causes of the worsening situation was the participation by small traders and entrepreneurs in general strikes by the working people in February and May 1982, whose slogan demanded the resignation of the right-wing government. On February 12, 1,800 commercial enterprises were closed in Lisbon, and a large number of businessmen also joined in the strike in other towns and populated localities across the country. (Kouco — 100 per cent, Seival — 90 per cent, Moita — 80 per cent, Tortosendo — 40 per cent, etc.) This is an eloquent example which shows that objective conditions and true interests induce the small and middle industrialists and traders to understand that their problems can be solved only with a policy of economic development and within the mass popular movement for consolidating the gains of the April Revolution and against the offensive by big capital and reaction.

DOCUMENTS

FRANCE

Preparations for elections

A National Conference of the French Communist Party on preparation for the municipal elections in March of next year was held in the town of Arcueil near Paris. Its resolution says that, with the left forces running the country, the 1983 elections will be an important stage in the broad struggle for social and democratic reforms meeting the working people's urge for social progress and broader freedoms. The alliance and successes of the forces working for change can and must reinforce the will of the masses to gain the upper hand over the right-wing forces, to ensure social justice and the country's further upswing, to reaffirm the

growing role of the local organs of power, to extend the positions of the left in all the communes and to win a majority in more municipal councils.

The national conference called on the communists to start broad preparations for the municipal elections. The first important question, the document says, is one concerning the voting procedure. The FCP believes that the principle of proportional representation is a clear and honest one. It helps to ensure the fairest representation of various political trends and their participation in the life of the communes and makes it possible to reckon with the will of each voter. Consultations with other left-wing parties have been started on this matter. The fundamentals of an agreement with respect for the position of each party have already been determined.

The second key question discussed at the conference is that of the left forces' alliance. The resolution reaffirms that the FCP believes it to be necessary to draw up broad lists of candidates of the alliance in all the communes before the start of the electoral campaign.

With their alliance, the left-wing forces scored a success in 1977. They have successfully run the municipal councils in which they had a majority. The left-wing forces are also running the country just now through their alliance. That is why it would be incomprehensible, the document says, if, for some minor motives, they were to campaign separately in the first round of the elections. This would give the pretext for attacks by right-wing forces seeking to restore their positions and already prepared, for their part, to unite everywhere in order to undermine the processes of renewal.

The national conference of the FCP authorized the Central Committee to reach an agreement with all the left-wing forces so as to decide to campaign together in the 1983 elections.

GUADELOUPE

Addressed to every family

The Guadeloupe CP has issued a document entitled "For Changes in Guadeloupe." It wants a new policy in the key spheres of social life so as to promote economic development and social progress. The measures proposed by the GCP envisage, in particular, activation of national production and an economic upswing, transformation of the mass media network into an instrument of development, enlightenment and culture, establishment of an efficient system of public health service, democratization of the sphere of education, improvement of the

work of transport organizations catering for the working people, and development of mass tourism to meet the country's economic interests.

These proposals, which the GCP has presented to the French authorities,* are based on the communists' main demand, which is to ensure the right of the Guadeloupe people to participation in running their own country. The party believes that it is possible to cooperate with the present government of France, if it truly decides to decolonize Guadeloupe, and if its decentralization measures take account of the Guadeloupeans' will.

The GCP proposals have been issued in a pamphlet. The party has called on the working people and all the other inhabitants of the country to read these proposals and to discuss them in every family so as to understand better the communists' policy and to join them in fighting for genuine changes in Guadeloupe.

IN THE MIRROR OF THE PRESS

UNEN

Vehicles of party policy

The organ of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party has carried an editorial article on ways of improving ideological and educational work in the labor collectives. Such a task was set before the communists by the 18th congress of the MPRP and subsequent plenary meetings of the party's CC. Considerable experience has already been gained in improving ideological and political-education activity. At the same time, Unen says, efforts should be made to make the content of this work more meaningful and the forms in line with the requirements and needs of the working people.

The newspaper cites the example of the central aimak (district) where organizer-agitators have been working in all the production sections over the past five years. They now number 800, and they are taking an active part in responsible national economic campaigns, like the grain harvesting, the procurement of animal feed, etc. Their current reports, lectures and talks with the population serve to explain the party's policy in the key sectors of socialist construction and help to arrange the study and use of advanced experience.

Teams of agitators have now been set up in all the aimaks of the republic. Unen stresses the need to improve and strengthen the agitators' ties with the work collectives.

*Since 1946, Guadeloupe has been a French "overseas department." — Ed.

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

RADIO VENCEREMOS

"Like all true democrats, I have been following with much excitement and solidarity the operations by the Salvadoran patriots of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. I frequently find in the press reports from El Salvador mentioning the Front's radio station Venceremos. But I have not yet read anything in detail about it. Could you help?"

Rajemanhal Singh

Bombay, India

We passed on the request to Jaime Barrios, CC Political Commission member, CP El Salvador, who says:

Every day, at 6.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m., Radio Venceremos goes on the air. It is the official voice of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. It broadcasts from El Salvador, Central America, as the signal of freedom, the signal of the struggle against oppression and imperialism. Radio Venceremos begins its every broadcast with these facts, which it conveys to listeners in the Caribbean countries and in the south of the United States, in Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and, of course, El Salvador itself.

One must realize the great effort and sacrifice it takes to have the few lines which are written on paper go out onto the air. A great many difficulties and problems have to be overcome to ensure a two-hour broadcast. The radio station has now been working for more than 18 months, and has interrupted its broadcasts only once for two days.

I am sure the time will come when a full biography of Venceremos will be written. Meanwhile, I shall confine myself to a few facts, as extracts from it.

After the military-civilian junta seized power, it hit out savagely at the mass media held by those who are on the side of the fighting people. The Catholic Pan-American Voice radio station has been blown up, and the newspapers *El Independiente* and *La cronica del pueblo* and the Independent News Agency have been destroyed. The oligarchy silenced the legal organs of the press and radio and established stringent censorship and total control of the mass media.

But more terrible than the material losses inflicted by the bandits was the massacre of democratically and revolutionary-minded journalists, who suffered the fierce brutality of these executioners:

But in these conditions, when death was the penalty for anyone found having a leaflet of the

FLN or of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FRD) in the course of a search or arrest, the patriotic forces found the means for maintaining ties with broad masses of people and for keeping them informed about the advance of the revolutionary process in El Salvador. They set up Radio Venceremos.

The idea of setting it up came from a group of young journalists who had graduated from the University of San Salvador. They managed to involve operators and news readers from commercial radio stations and other volunteers with a knowledge of how to arrange and carry on radio broadcasts. But it turned out that none of these people had any idea of the technical services such a station required. They spared no effort to carry on their work and were successful in realizing their plans.

A radio transmitter and other equipment required for a radio station were gradually brought in from abroad. The instructions of how to handle the equipment were contained on pieces of paper attached to the devices, and were laconic: "On," "Volume," "AC switch." There were no exact instructions of how to find the required 40-meter band on the scale. "Megahertz? What language is that?" — they asked themselves as they sat in front of the transmitter. But soon they got the hang of things and made the first trial broadcast. It was a success.

They now had to proceed, and as fast as possible. Time did not wait: the FLN was preparing a general offensive, which was to mark the countdown on the people's revolutionary war. On January 10, 1981, Radio Venceremos broadcast the order of the front command about the start of that operation.

When the first part of the military operations was over, the station continued its broadcasts, sometimes going on the air three times a day. That was an exceptionally difficult period. The enemy had gone over to a counter-offensive along the whole frontline in an effort to check the advances of our troops. For 125 days, from the day the reactionary junta's plans failed in May, the station made 300 broadcasts with a total of 340 hours of broadcasting time. That was a major achievement of the FLN in the field of propaganda and military information. It was highly appreciated by Comandante Joaquin Villalobos, who said: "it is exceptionally important to realize that in El Salvador regular contingents of revolutionaries are viable and can lay military siege to the enemy. To realize that there is a radio station whose location is known to the enemy but who is incapable of silencing it is weighty evidence that the Salvadoran people are close to their victory."

Indeed, the enemy knows that the radio station broadcasts from the Morazan department. U.S. spy ships based in Fonseca Bay supply the junta with all the necessary information about Venceremos. On the basis of this information, a plan to wipe out the station was worked out last year. On December 14, members of the high command of the junta's army announced to local and foreign newsmen that in Morazan department they had "seized the underground transmitter of Radio Venceremos with all its equipment, propaganda materials, tape recorder cassettes and records, tools and ancillary equipment." They even promised to show the journalists the things confiscated. But they could not do that. The radio station lived on. Under threat of seizure by the enemy, who had concentrated at least 2,000 soldiers in the area where the transmitter was located, the group of fighters at the station succeeded in moving it to a safer place within a matter of days.

One member of this group said that no sooner had they reached the designated spot, unloaded the transmitter and other equipment, than they received orders to return immediately. It took them two days to do so, and it was this short period in which the station did not go on the air: the only time this happened in the 18 months of its existence. Meanwhile, the "victory" promised by the army turned out to be a crushing defeat, and on December 16 the voice of the insurgents was once again on the air.

Truth — and the truth alone — is the principle on which Venceremos operates, and this truth has the same effect on the reactionary regime as salt has on an open wound. The station's sign call of freedom helps to direct and organize the people, it reaches every part of the country and is heard by the peoples of the world who follow the Salvadorans' heroic liberation struggle.

Circles of Radio Venceremos listeners have been set up in the guerrilla camps, and the villages under the control of the FLN. They meet mainly in the evenings and work under the direction of political commissars. Members of these circles discuss the commentaries and reports broadcast by the station, hear talks on the situation in the country and the rest of the world, and analyze the current events and military situation.

There are similar, but clandestine, circles in the towns. This is a new form of mass organization. Each such group has a monitor, who always has a tape-recorder at his disposal. When control on the part of the authorities becomes intolerable, the cassettes containing recordings of the radio broadcasts are taken from

house to house, to factories and offices, schools and market places. For their part, members of the circles write information reports and letters with questions which are conveyed to the radio station along clandestine channels. This helps the radio's workers to gain a better view of the situation.

What are the forms used in these broadcasts? Apart from the main commentaries and news bulletins, Venceremos carries reports from the battlefields, interviews with FLN and FRD leaders and statements by foreign leaders. One program is called "personal messages" and it serves as a channel for contacting relatives and friends. Literary programs deal with the works of young authors among members of the radio station and listeners. Venceremos is a school of the armed uprising. It gives instructions on how to make weapons, to store medicines and foodstuffs and explains urban guerrilla tactics. All of this is extremely important in coordinating the actions of thousands of people.

In short, there is good reason to assert that Radio Venceremos is the fruit of the unbending will and heroic work of a group of revolutionary fighters relying on masses of people. One of them once said: "Every drop of gas for the generator means numerous difficulties and sacrifices." But these efforts and sacrifices are not in vain. They help to keep alive the voice of the FLN and the FRD, the voice of a people fighting for freedom, democracy and independence.

Venceremos! We shall win!

IN BRIEF

COLOMBIA

The fourth festival of the newspaper *Voz Proletaria*, the central organ of the Colombian CP, was held in Bogota. This year's festival was of special importance, for it coincided with the newspaper's 25th anniversary. It was celebrated together with the Colombian communists by representatives from a number of fraternal newspapers, and delegations from Nicaragua, Venezuela, Chile, Uruguay and other countries. A photo exhibition told of the struggle of the party and the whole Colombian people against repression, and for democracy and a better life. There was much demand for Marxist literature and various publications about the socialist countries which were on sale during the festival, which was a demonstration of the growing influence and authority of the Communist Party among the masses.

HUNGARY

Library of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism is a series which has been published for years and now numbers 130 volumes. Kossuth, the political literature publishers, have started the publication of a new cycle of books under the title "Sources." The first volume in the cycle is a collection of articles by Marx and Engels about the revolutionary events of 1848-1849. The cycle is to present a panorama of the development of Marxist-Leninist theory over a century and a half. These books, published in large printings, are intended for mass study, including the network of party education.

IRAN

The supporters of the People's Party of Iran (Tudeh) abroad have started the publication of a weekly, *Rahe Tudeh* (Way of Tudeh). Its first issue sets out the goals and tasks of the new publication, which are defense of the anti-imperialist people's revolution in Iran, exposure of the propaganda plots of imperialism and counter-revolutionary groupings, and publication of documents and other PPI material for the purpose of disseminating its ideological tenets and views on domestic and foreign policy issues.

KAMPUCHEA

The Secretariat of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea issued a directive under which the country celebrated the anniversary of the founding of the PRPK.

MEXICO

The results of the general elections held in July of this year have been published. The United Socialist Party of Mexico officially won 1,113,000 votes (5.81 per cent). In a statement on the results of the elections, the party says that vote-rigging in the final count was used to minimize the actual role of the opposition parties in the country's political life. Such things, the statement says, do nothing to strengthen democracy. The United Socialist Party demands that the authorities should take appropriate measures to review the results of the returns and to exercise due control over every stage of the electoral process.

SPAIN

The traditional festival of the CP Spain was held in Madrid for three days. In a colorfully bedecked park, where the festival was held, there were pavilions of party organizations

from various districts of the country, and stands of newspapers of communist and workers' parties. A large exposition dealt with the CPS weekly *Mundo Obrero* and the journal *Nuestra Bandera*. In the course of the festival, talks and discussions were held on "The Struggle against

the Danger of War," "Spain and NATO," "The Working-Class Movement and the Economic Crisis," "The Struggle of the Peoples of Central America for Freedom," and on the activity of the Spanish communists in the municipalities. The festival culminated in a mass meeting.



On the way to a new international information order

THE COMMUNIST VIEW OF THE STRUGGLE TO DEMOCRATIZE INFORMATION

Problems of the struggle to create a new international information order are attracting the growing attention of the communist and workers' parties. These problems were considered at a symposium in Prague, Czechoslovakia, sponsored by the journal *World Marxist Review*. The symposium was opened by Sergei Tsukasov, *WMR* Managing Editor. The participants in the discussion were representatives of fraternal parties on the journal: Jeronimo Carrera (CC member, Communist Party of Venezuela), Georg Kwiatowsky (German Communist Party), Ibrahim Malik (CC member, Communist Party of Israel), Jack Phillips (CEC alternate member, Communist Party of Canada), Agamemnon Stavrou (CC member, AKEL, Cyprus), Raul Valbuena (CC member, Colombian Communist Party), Manuel Delgado (CC member, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica), Raul Valdes Vivo (CC member, Communist Party of Cuba), Felix Dixon (CC member, People's Party of Panama), Jerzy Waszczuk (Polish United Workers' Party), Samuel Behak (Communist Party of Uruguay), José Lava (CC Political Bureau member, Communist Party of the Philippines), and also John Nkosi (South African Communist Party), Yassen Zasursky (professor, dean, Department of Journalism, Moscow State University, USSR), Yuri Kashlev, (Dr. Sc. History, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Commission for UNESCO), Alice Bunzlova (docent, head of chair, Department of Journalism, Charles University, Prague, Czechoslovakia), and Slavoi Haskovec (docent, assistant dean,

Department of Journalism, Charles University, Prague, Czechoslovakia).

Basic points made at the discussion

The mass media play a growing role in the socio-political and cultural life of humanity. In the world today there are over 30,000 radio transmitting stations, 1.3 billion radio receivers, and 500 million TV sets. The world's daily printed output consists of 8,200 newspapers with a total circulation of 440 million copies, tens of thousands of other periodicals, and nearly 1,800 book titles. Small wonder that the term "information explosion" has gained currency in the past few decades. Progress in communications and publishing, spurred by the scientific and technological revolution, is making the mass media unprecedentedly operative and enabling them to influence a huge audience quickly.

This circumstance acquires particularly great significance in the context of the aggravation of the international ideological struggle. At the close of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s imperialism drastically stepped up its attacks against the forces of peace and social progress, against positive social changes, and against the policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which constitutes the main obstacle to the realization of monopoly capital's reactionary designs. In this confrontation the mass media play a special role, directly influencing the international climate and the relations between countries and between peoples. The press, radio, television, and documentaries involve millions of people in developments in any part of the planet and actively shape public opinion on

fundamental issues of present-day world politics. The international climate, the possibility of averting another devastating war and resolving global problems, and the level of mutual confidence depend to a large extent on what sort of information is disseminated in the different latitudes.

The growing significance of information in the life of humankind has brought to life the idea of a new international information order. What does this concept mean? The symposium showed that it consists of two basic elements: first, the need for democratically drawing up and adopting norms for an international exchange of information and, second, the need for a system of mass communications embracing the whole world and making it possible to proceed with this exchange equitably, in the interests of all countries and peoples. It is not the purpose of a new world information order to replace the "old," for in fact there is no "old" order. Democratic norms of international information relations globally and a world system of mass communications have to be worked out for the first time, without any precedents. The struggle for this new order is only just beginning.

Information imperialism: substance and media

In the sphere of information there are presently two types of relations and two highly sophisticated information systems. One was created by imperialism, and the other consists of the mass media of the socialist community. In the Third World the level of development of such media is on the whole still inadequate and uneven, to say the least. In Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which have nearly two-thirds of the world's population, there are only 5 per cent of the world's TV broadcasting capacities, 15 per cent of its TV sets, and one-eighth of its newspaper output. In Asian, African, and Latin American countries most of the mass media are owned by imperialist capital, and while formally they are national they take their orders from their foreign masters.

As was noted during the discussion, information "exchange" between industrialized capitalist and developing countries is mostly a one-way street. The Third World gets 95 per cent of its information on developments worldwide from foreign bourgeois information agencies, which, naturally, slant facts in a manner advantageous to imperialism. For its part, information from national agencies of developing countries (where they exist) finds no place in the newspapers, journals, and radio and TV programs of the imperialist powers.

The exception is what is called negative information — reports of natural calamities, catastrophes, famine, religious-communal conflicts, and so on. The socio-economic achievements of peoples who have won liberation are either ignored altogether or get a distorted, slanted interpretation.

That is why the activities of the capitalist information monopolies on the international scene are defined as information imperialism. This concept entered the political and scientific vocabulary in the mid-1970s. It was at once attacked by bourgeois ideologues, who tried to portray it as a purely propaganda exercise of the communists that allegedly has nothing to do with reality. Even circles close to progressive forces sometimes fail to see this concept as a complex objective phenomenon and its class character. Lenin's theory of imperialism allows showing beyond the shadow of a doubt that the basic laws of the capitalist mode of production and the general development trends of bourgeois society at the state-monopoly stage operate in the sphere of information as well.

The symposium made it clear that the fundamental features of the present-day organization of the bourgeois mass media fit into the system of characteristic features of imperialism which Lenin discovered.

The concentration of production and capital is expressed, above all, in the increasing monopolization of the capitalist information market, in which several giant corporations have seized undivided control during the past few decades. In the non-socialist world these corporations control about 80 per cent of the daily newspapers, 90 per cent of the radio stations operating on international frequencies, and 95 per cent of the television broadcasting facilities. Some 80 per cent of the information disseminated in capitalist and developing countries comes from the teletypes of the four largest bourgeois agencies: United Press International, Associated Press, Reuters and France Presse.

Relative to the trend toward the merging of banking and industrial capital, in the sphere of information this finds expression in the formation of powerful and influential finance-publishing groups. For instance, until recently UPI was run by the Scripps group, which owns 31 newspapers and several radio and television broadcasting stations. In June 1982 it was bought by the Media News Corporation. In Britain four large finance-publishing groups control 86 per cent of the circulation of all newspapers.

Another feature of imperialism, namely, the export of capital alongside the export of goods, is clearly seen in this area as well. Whereas

prior to the 1970s the chief aim of the major information corporations was to disseminate their own product in other countries, today they seek to seize key positions in these countries by setting up dependent press, radio, and television facilities and subordinating the national media to themselves by way of financial and technological assistance. Data was produced at the symposium to show that in Colombia, for example, the U.S. Chrysler Col-motors Corporation has become a co-owner of Caracol, the largest national radio corporation, while the Columbia Broadcasting System, which is likewise based in the USA, and a pool of local television companies dependent on it control 70 per cent of the television programs.

A natural feature of information imperialism, as of imperialism as a whole, is the formation of *international monopolies*, of powerful transnational corporations. Currently, 15 of these corporations dominate the output of radio and television equipment and electronic equipment for publishing, radio and tele-satellite communication, and other elements of the mass media technical infrastructure. They buy up radio and television stations, newspapers and journals, and invade the information market directly. In 10 of these corporations, first fiddle is played by U.S. capital. It is not surprising, therefore, that the centers of information imperialism are increasingly directed and coordinated from the USA.

However, this does not ease the contradictions and competitive collisions between such centers operating from different capitalist countries, and in this we see the fifth feature of imperialism, namely, the *world's division into spheres of influence*, the area of information in this case. The struggle for influence in this area is today particularly wide-ranging. Whereas at the close of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century the contending imperialist forces sought control chiefly of this or that "non-civilized" part of the world, today even countries that are at the state-monopoly stage of development fall victim to their information supremacy. At the symposium it was noted that from the standpoint of the content of information, countries like, for instance, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark depend on transnational monopolies to the same extent as many Asian, African, and Latin American states.

Marxism-Leninism defines imperialism as state-monopoly capitalism characterized by a *close intertwining of the interests and functions of the ruling circles of capitalist states with the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie*. How is

this feature translated in information imperialism?

In their efforts to prove that in the capitalist world the mass media are "free" and "independent" in the choice of their positions, bourgeois ideologues usually offer the argument that there the production and dissemination of information are a "private business" and by virtue of that are protected from any influence on the part of the authorities. This argument was also considered at the symposium.

In some capitalist countries a portion of the mass media is the property of the state. In individual cases this is the result of gains by democratic forces as, for example, the public status of state radio and television-broadcasting in the FRG. True, the communists and members of other progressive movements have to wage an unremitting struggle against the use of these media for reactionary purposes. In other cases, we observe a direct fusion of mass media with the political establishment in bourgeois society. However, even where mass media are private property their "independence" is illusory. Owners of newspapers, journals, radio and TV broadcasting stations, and information agencies are members of the capitalist class, and in their coverage of important developments these "private" media inevitably take the stand of that class, dovetailing with the system of state-monopoly regulation of the mass media.

The fusion of the interests and links of politics, business, and the press has brought about, to quote the distinguished American diplomat and historian George F. Kennan, the appearance of a "varied but numerous and vociferous band."¹ It is sometimes hard even to define in what propaganda actions the tone is set by the ruling circles and in what by private entrepreneurs. For example, for the governments of imperialist powers the "Soviet threat" is a means of justifying their aggressive foreign policy line; for the businessmen of the military-industrial complex it is an argument for getting more contracts and profits; while for the mass media bosses it is a convenient stereotype for constantly holding the attention of people by means of scary sensations. Thus, although the subjective intentions of the members of the propaganda chorus may differ, objectively their voices join together to uphold the policies of the ruling class.

Of course, some differences arise between the various groups of the bourgeoisie. In some cases these are deep-going contradictions, which are reflected in the press, radio and television. An example is the critical attitude to the administration taken by some U.S. mass media during the Vietnam adventure; this attitude

stemmed from the fact that they were controlled by that section of the ruling class that had no interest in continuing the aggression. One can also cite vociferous campaigns in the USA such as the Watergate affair or exposures of corruption in the inner circle of presidents. But as soon as matters go to the length of affecting the foundations of the capitalist system, the private press drops its mask of "independence" and closes ranks with the ruling circles.²

In the development of the bourgeois mass media one sees reactionary elements more and more strongly entrenching themselves in them. This is due to the steady penetration of the information sphere by monopolies intimately linked to the military-industrial complex or directly involved in it, notably IBM, Westinghouse, and Western Electric corporations of the USA, the Matra corporation of France, and the Siemens and AEG-Telefunken corporations of West Germany.

The ideological and political outlooks of big owners inescapably predetermine the behavior pattern of the mass media run by them. Roy Thomson, the international newspaper magnate, has acknowledged that those who possess wealth are usually conservative. At the symposium, instances were cited of journalists being dismissed from the capitalist mass media because the owners felt their views were not conservative enough.

Journalists are also pressured and intensively brainwashed by the bourgeois state. It is no secret that columnists writing for British newspapers and journals regularly get a package of propaganda handouts from the Foreign Office. Scandalous exposures in the USA have shown that over a period of many years 400 American journalists, most of them enjoying considerable prestige, wrote under dictation from the CIA or simply signed their names to material written in the CIA.

Information imperialism is a special form of struggle by the moribund system against the revolutionary, progressive forces. As an ideology it preaches anti-communism, social inequality, militarism and racial hatred. As a policy it is a set of subtle means designed to undermine the foundations of the social system in countries where the working class has been victorious, diminish the attractiveness of their example to other peoples, and discredit revolutionary and national liberation movements.

The bourgeois mass media go to all lengths to conceal or distort the truth about existing socialism. Information about the life and home and foreign policies of socialist countries is in most cases dished up in the traditional anti-communist clichés of imperialist propaganda.

The information monopolies ignore or crudely falsify the activities of communist and workers' parties. In the non-socialist part of the world it is extremely difficult for communists to gain access to government or privately-owned mass media, to state their fundamental class positions in big bourgeois publications, over the radio, or in front of the television camera.

Information imperialism is the main obstacle to a new international information order. The creation of an effective alternative to it, of a counterbalance to imperialist tendencies in the sphere of information, is a high priority of the progressive forces.

Two diametrically different approaches

The idea of a new international information order entered political life some years ago. This was fostered by two fundamental changes in the world situation. The first was the attainment of a military-strategic equilibrium between the largest imperialist powers, on the one hand, and the socialist-community countries, on the other. An outcome of this was the switch, in the mid-1970s, from confrontation to détente and to a reconsideration of East-West relations in various fields, including information. It was in this period that 35 nations took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki, 1975) and made the first-ever effort to work out the principles for the exchange of information between countries with different social systems. These principles were recorded in a special section of this conference's Final Act.

The second change was the visible invigoration of the movement of developing countries, notably of non-aligned nations, for the restructuring of the world economic order and the entire spectrum of international relations. In this movement the conviction grew that the struggle of the participating countries for economic and political equality should be reinforced by a striving for information independence, whose attainment is regarded as the culminating stage of the process of decolonization.

Although some important provisions of a new international information order have been recorded in a series of international documents, much remains to be done to work out an all-embracing, clear-cut and coherent concept.

The basic stand of the protagonists and opponents of the new order was seen in bold relief in the debate on the Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, the Improvement

of Human Rights and the Struggle Against Racism, Apartheid and Propaganda of War which was adopted by UNESCO's 20th General Conference in November 1978. The significance of this document, which lays down a number of norms for the work of the press, radio, television and information agencies, is that it orients the mass media to serving the cause of peace, understanding and friendship among peoples. The Declaration stresses the need for ending propaganda of war, neocolonialism, racism and apartheid, and the importance of the mass media in making it possible to hear the voice of the struggle of oppressed peoples. It was the first time that an international document of such a high level called to "correct the inequalities in the flow of information to and from developing countries"³ and underscored the professional responsibility of journalists for reporting.

Thus, in the main, the Declaration mirrored the common approach of socialist and newly liberated countries to information problems. The imperialist powers were in principle opposed to the appearance of a document of that kind and sought to prevent its adoption, but when it was nonetheless adopted they attacked both the Declaration and UNESCO. Misrepresenting one of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, these powers are endeavoring to impose the "free flow of information" formula.

This has become the slogan of the champions of the bourgeois concept of an information order. The documents of the so-called World Conference of Independent Mass Media, held in the small French town of Talloires on May 15-17, 1981, give an idea of the content of this concept and the aims pursued by its architects. The declaration adopted at that conference opposes the idea of a new international information order with the thesis of a "global information order." This seemingly minor distinction in terminology contains a profound political significance. The absence of only the word "new" shows that the advocates of information imperialism have no intention at all of abandoning their positions, which do not conform to the present situation in the world. The replacement of the word "international" by the word "global" means that such an "order" would give the information monopolies of the capitalist powers the right to disseminate their product on a global scale without taking the frontiers and national interests of other countries into consideration.

On what, in the view of the authors of the Talloires Declaration, should the "free flow of information" be based? First, on so-called

pluralism, in other words, the existence of a multiplicity of mass media allegedly expressing different viewpoints; second, on the financial "independence" of these media allegedly ensured by advertising revenues; and, third, on "the pursuit of truth" as the professional responsibility of the press.

Those who spoke at the symposium clearly showed that the "cornerstones" of this concept of an information order are a fiction that is daily and hourly exposed by the realities of the capitalist world. What "pluralism" is there to speak of when the concentration of the mass media is proceeding apace in the capitalist countries? The participants in the Talloires Conference evidently had in mind the "pluralism" about which, in an outburst of frankness, *The New York Times* wrote soon after the UNESCO Declaration was adopted, namely, that for Americans there can be no freedom of speech or "balanced information" if no freedom of speech is granted also to those who advocate racism and apartheid, and war.

As regards advertising, even bourgeois researchers themselves have long considered it a legitimate form of bribery. In the USA and many other capitalist countries the revenues of the bourgeois press from advertising are many times larger than the revenues from the sale of the newspapers and journals themselves, but does this make them "independent"? As soon as one or another publication carries anything that conflicts with the fundamental interests of the big advertisers, the generous flow becomes a pitiful trickle or stops altogether, while the very existence of the imprudent newspaper or journal is jeopardized.

Lastly, there is also a false ring to the words of the Talloires Declaration that the professional responsibility of the press "is the pursuit of truth." To smother truth, imperialism and reactionary regimes use every possible method — from bribery of media workers to discrimination against democratic journalists and cold-blooded murder. A dismal and sometimes tragic fate awaits bourgeois journalists who venture to get at the truth, to lift the curtain on the background of imperialism's crimes.

Instead of prompting the pursuit of truth, the ideology and practices of capitalist society induce journalists to give events an interpretation that serves the interests of the media magnates, the policies of the ruling classes. Hence the slanting of facts, the flagrant distortion of reality, the pursuit of sensations and scandals to divert people from thinking of important social problems, of the destinies of nations and of humankind as a whole. That is what voids the attempt of the authors of the Talloires Declara-

tion to make some capital out of professional-ethical concepts.

In all its basic aspects this document comes into conflict with the UNESCO Declaration, with the principles of a new international information order. Need one wonder that it was hailed by the most reactionary imperialist circles. Hardly had the Talloires Conference ended than a group of United States legislators called for support of its decisions, demanded a condemnation of UNESCO for its 1978 Declaration, and threatened that body with financial sanctions.

Anti-imperialism requires consistency

In the approach of the newly liberated countries to the problems of a new international information order one observes, first, an anti-imperialist orientation, a determination to shake off the spiritual domination of the old world and, second, a well-founded striving to tie in these problems with the struggle for a new world economic order, for the reshaping of the entire system of international relations on a basis of equality.

However, some of the concepts being elaborated for a new international information order contain provisions, assessments and conclusions which the communists, it was pointed out at the symposium, cannot accept. For instance, in considering economic and information problems representatives of some newly liberated countries divide humankind into two opposing parts: the "rich North" and the "poor South." This pattern, borrowed from bourgeois propaganda, includes in the "North" not only imperialist but also socialist countries, thereby imputing to existing socialism some of the responsibility for the backwardness of the former colonial world in economic development and in the international exchange of information.

Nor can one accept the view that the new international information order boils down solely to the relations of the developing countries with industrialized capitalist powers. On the basis of a critical analysis of this argument it was pointed out at the symposium that the struggle for the establishment of such an order ranges much further, because the efforts of imperialism in the sphere of information as well are directed not only against the newly liberated countries but also against the countries of the socialist community, against all the forces of peace, democracy and progress.

Lastly, it is illusory to hope to resolve the information problem purely by financial and technical means, with assistance from imperialist states. It will be recalled that this proposal was made to the developing countries

at UNESCO's 20th General Conference by the USA in an effort to prevent UNESCO from adopting its Declaration. Freedom of speech is suppressed and democratic norms of the work of the mass media are violated in some Third World countries that call for a new international information order. Using such facts, spokesmen of imperialism contend that a new information order would bring the mass media under control of government censors. But such an order would in fact signify not the restriction but an extension and deepening of democracy in information. The struggle for this order is linked intimately to ensuring genuine freedom of speech in countries now ruled by reactionary regimes.

In order to drive a wedge between the newly liberated and socialist countries, imperialist propaganda uses the inconsistency and vacillation of some Third World representatives in their approach to a new international information order. These were seen in statements made by some political leaders and in individual Asian, African and Latin American studies of questions related to information.

An end cannot be put to information imperialism, it was noted at the symposium, if nothing is done about such aspects of it as "psychological warfare" and ideological subversion against existing socialism, as anti-communism and militarism. It is only when this objective need is appreciated that it will be possible to form a broad anti-imperialist front capable of establishing true equality and democratic principles in information.

Communists as champions of the new order

It was shown at the symposium that the communists regard the idea of a new international information order as one of the most pressing democratic requirements today. To put it into effect, the efforts solely of governments are not enough. There must be broad and active support from the public, from mass progressive movements. Moreover, in the epoch of imperialism this idea inevitably acquires a class, proletarian content.

Were a new information order to be established it would be a big factor reinforcing the class struggle on the world scene for the solution of such cardinal problems as ensuring peace, détente and disarmament, and promoting cooperation between countries with different social systems. It would have a particularly strong influence on ideological aspects of the class struggle, for it would put an end to the use of means and methods that conflict with the norms of international law. "The ideological struggle," Leonid Brezhnev said in an inter-

view given to the French newspaper *Le Monde*, "should not develop into psychological warfare, and it should not be used as a means for interfering in the internal affairs of countries and peoples or lead to a political or military confrontation. If it is, it may bring about a catastrophe in which millions of people may perish together with, so to say, their concepts.

The spread of the principles of accuracy and objectivity of information to the ideological struggle would provide equal conditions for the contending sides. As everybody knows, lies have been and remain the favorite weapon of bourgeois propaganda against the organized working-class movement, against all revolutionary forces. The stake on inventions, unabashed twisting of facts, and manipulation of public opinion gives imperialism some transient advantages. "It is easy to tell an untruth," Lenin noted, "but sometimes it takes a long time to find out the truth" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 18, p. 469). The establishment of democratic principles in the sphere of information would make it possible to deny these advantages to the bourgeoisie and turn the ideological confrontation into an honest contest of ideas.

The fact that the new international information order has to be fought for, it was said at the symposium, confronts the communist and workers' parties with some specific tasks.

The ruling parties of the socialist community countries play an important part in the struggle to restructure the international system of information. On their initiative resolutions and documents aimed at asserting fundamentally new relations in this sphere have been adopted at the state level over a period of some years.⁴

Speaking of the significance of the actions taken by socialist countries in the struggle for a new international information order, the participants in the symposium declared that capitalism's unchallenged spiritual domination on the international scene ended with the appearance of the Soviet Union, the first country of the victorious proletariat. Socialism's conversion into a world socio-economic system had far-reaching effects on the global situation regarding information. By establishing and developing equitable exchanges of information among themselves and with many other countries, the socialist nations set an example of what really just relations should be like in this sphere.

In keeping with the resolutions of congresses of the communist and workers' parties of their countries, the mass media of the socialist community are militating against ideological subversion and the anti-communist campaigns of

bourgeois propaganda, against information imperialism.

It was not accidental that President Reagan advanced a program with the high-sounding but false heading "Truth" as one of the basic propaganda exercises of the USA. It was designed to counter the foreign policy information of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on fundamental issues of present-day international life and on the competition between the two systems. However, the actions conceived within the framework of this program did not justify the hopes placed in them. The political TV show "Let Poland Be Poland," in which Reagan participated personally, was a failure even in the eyes of bourgeois analysts. It failed not because inadequate funds were earmarked for it or that there was a lack of experts on international propaganda. It ended in a fiasco because its orchestrators fear and avoid the facts, because they operate with the most primitive anti-communist stereotypes of the cold war period.

The communists of the socialist world see their task in extending internationalist assistance to the democratic mass media of developing countries, in supporting progressive organizations of journalists advocating a new international information order. They understand and sympathize with the striving of Asian, African and Latin American peoples to set up their own information systems, safeguard themselves against imperialism's ideological expansion and put an end to spiritual colonialism. While extending all possible assistance to them in developing the mass media and training their own journalists, the socialist community countries do not attempt, as the imperialist powers do, to implant facsimiles of their own information structures and do not demand any special privileges.

The newly liberated countries are the largest and an extremely active group of advocates of a new international information order. The communists of these nations support those who are working to create genuinely democratic national and regional information services, exposing the attempts of the imperialist press monopolies to establish their control of these services, and vigorously upholding equitable cooperation in information.

The formation of the Caribbean, Pan-African, Asian, and Arab information agencies and also the Non-Aligned Countries News Agencies Pool⁵ have been major milestones in surmounting information imperialism. Imperialist propaganda gave them a hostile reception, asserting, for instance, that the amalgamation of the agencies of non-aligned countries would deny

the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America access to "free information." At first the bourgeois information agencies refused to recognize this Pool, hoping to precipitate its financial collapse, and now they are trying to gain control of it, to dissolve it in a "multi-national information pool" of capitalist and developing countries. This design is meeting with resistance.

Much was said at the symposium about the role of the communists of industrialized capitalist countries in the struggle for a new international information order. They see this role chiefly in explaining, alongside other international democratic demands, the need to restructure information relations; in showing the true face of the bourgeois mass media in their own states and their social and ideological mission of inciting anti-communism and anti-Sovietism and supporting militarist, reactionary forces; and in furthering various forms of struggle to limit capital's omnipotence in information. In some capitalist countries the communist parties are urging control of the big mass media by the working people and their organizations. In particular, at its Mannheim Congress in 1978 the German Communist Party included in its program a provision calling for the democratization of these media. In 1979 it adopted a document under the heading "For a Democratic Policy in the Mass Media," in which it formulated the aims of the communists of the FRG in the struggle for greater working people's participation in the management of the press, radio and television, against the growing influence of the monopolies in the sphere of culture, and for the nationalization of the information corporations.⁶

Many fraternal parties, it was pointed out at the symposium, consider that one of the ways of countering information imperialism is to support the alternative mass media that, despite their limitations, are trying to give a more or less objective picture of developments and draw closer to the needs and aspirations of the working population. These are, of course, the left alternatives to the reactionary bourgeois press, for example, some local radical newspapers. The communists, some of the speakers said, support those forces in bourgeois society that are helping to narrow monopoly domination. The Communist Party of Canada has proposed the establishment of a publicly owned network of newspapers modelled after the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which offers some relief from the American commercial programs people can receive on their radio and television sets. The Communist Party of

Austria believes that state monopoly in radio and television is a condition for countering the reactionary press corporations.

The development and improvement of the communist press, it was said at the symposium, are of major significance to the process of democratizing the mass media and asserting the principles of a new international order in this sphere. The view was offered that militancy and steadfastness in the main areas of the anti-imperialist movement and in promoting peace, democracy and social progress are primary to enhancing the prestige, influence and mass character of the communist press.

The symposium showed that the internationalism of the communists spells out solidarity with those who are advocating a new international information order. But the communists do not confine themselves to showing solidarity. They are making a large direct contribution to the struggle for this order, regarding it as an element of the democratic restructuring of the entire range of international relations. Is this aim, placed on the agenda by the entire course of socio-political development, attainable today? Yes, it is, provided the threat of a thermonuclear war is averted, the world settles down to a lasting peace, and there is effective unity of action by all democratic, anti-imperialist forces.

1. George F. Kennan, *The Cloud of Danger*, Boston, 1977, p. 153.

2. James West, "The Monopoly Octopuses' Tentacles," *WMR*, May 1981.

3. *Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, the Improvement of Human Rights and the Struggle Against Racism, Apartheid and Propaganda of War*, Paris, UNESCO, 1979, p. 14.

4. Acting on a proposal by socialist countries as early as 1947, the UN passed its Resolution No. 110(III) condemning any form of propaganda aiming at or capable of creating or increasing the threat of war, a violation of peace, or an act of aggression. That same year the UN passed its Resolution No. 127(II) suggesting that its member-states take steps to prevent the circulation of false or slanted news prejudicial to friendly relations among nations. In 1959 socialist countries submitted to the UN General Assembly the draft of a convention on freedom of information, establishing the requirement that information be accurate and objective, and also introducing the principle of public responsibility for the dissemination of information. Moreover, it will be recalled that in 1972 the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR suggested that UNESCO draw up the draft of a declaration on the use of the mass media in the interests of peace and international understanding. After many years of discussion and preparatory work, this proposal was translated into the 1978 UNESCO Declaration with the participation of the International Organization of Journalists and other democratic bodies.

5. This Pool was set up by decision of the 1976 Colombo

Summit of Non-Aligned Countries. With an initial membership of only 26 countries, it now consists of nearly 70. The Pool has six regional centers — in Cuba, Yugoslavia, India, Iraq, Tunisia, Morocco. Its daily output of information amounts to about 40,000 words. Of course, compared with the big news agencies this is not much, but

it must be remembered that for the time being the Pool is not functioning at full capacity on account of the boycott and discrimination by the bourgeois news media of the imperialist powers.

6. G. Deumlich, "Freedom of Opinion Illusions Blasted," WMR, August 1981.



The people's will is unbroken — the struggle goes on

Naim Ashhab
CC Political Bureau member,
Palestinian Communist Party

The main objective of the U.S.-Israeli aggression in Lebanon, which was planned openly, before the very eyes of world opinion, are known well enough. This journal has commented on them,¹ and so I will only deal with the concomitants of the criminal act.

It was launched after the population of the occupied Palestinian areas had carried out actions unprecedented in extent and intensity against attempts to impose a so-called civilian administration. The Israeli authorities regarded it as a step toward the final annexation of the territories held by them since 1967. But the fight of the population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip showed the world that Tel Aviv's policy was meeting resistance among the Palestinians, who stand together in upholding their legitimate national demands. They are set on making the invaders go, on establishing an independent state and on securing the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes according to the UN resolutions. In the course of their actions the Palestinian people reaffirmed their solid unity behind the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as their only lawful spokesman. As for the invaders, they showed appalling brutality again by committing atrocious crimes. This outraged the world public, added to the international isolation of Israel's rulers and made the world so much more aware than before of the justice and legitimacy of the Palestinians' patriotic struggle. The PLO won greater prestige than ever.

However, there were other notable factors at work in the Middle East. They tended to create an atmosphere favorable to aggression and were undoubtedly taken into account by those who planned the invasion and decided on its timing. The more important of these factors may be listed as follows:

First, the process of "normalizing" relations between Egypt and Israel had been completed. It had led to the stationing of "a multinational force" in the Sinai, which definitively excluded a major Arab country from the score when the initiators of the aggression got down to assessing the balance of military forces.

Second, the Iranian-Iraqi war had exhausted both countries, primarily their armed forces, in two years of fighting. It deprived the Palestine Resistance Movement (PRM), Syria and the Lebanese National Patriotic Forces (NPF) of the two belligerents' material and manpower resources as a strategic reserve. As Rafael Eitan, Chief of the Israeli General Staff, put it, the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf had provided excellent conditions for the Zionists' aggression.

Third, the United States and NATO were building up their military presence in the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean; foreign troops were stationed in Egypt under the Camp David deal and a U.S. rapid deployment force was conducting war games in our area.

Fourth, steps had been taken to form a military bloc of Gulf countries under the aegis of Saudi Arabia, a measure fitting into Washington's bid for a "strategic consensus" intended to unite the reactionary regimes of the region, including the parties to the Camp David deal, on anti-Soviet lines.

In addition to these basic factors favorable to Tel Aviv's plans for aggression, there were less important ones that the aggressor took into account none the less. They included differences over secondary, passing disputes among the Arab forces committed to the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and Camp David. A further factor was the low efficiency of the Steadfastness and Resistance Front. This draw-

back stood out in bold relief precisely when the Front should have acted as a united vanguard to induce the Arab world as a whole to take a stand ensuring at least a minimum of what was needed to beat off the invaders.

Israel's aggression goes beyond regional bounds. It is also a stage in the process of stepping up world tensions begun by the Reagan administration, the most reactionary and aggressive U.S. administration of the recent period. The Middle East is in the flames of war, and this has turned our region into the source of a most serious threat to world peace.

The invasion of Lebanon brought out the qualitatively new level of Washington's and Tel Aviv's coordinated action in implementing the agreement on "strategic cooperation" signed by them in the autumn of 1981. Washington constantly offered a helping hand to the Israeli butchers perpetrating genocide in Lebanon. The aggressor's defense was assumed by none other than the U.S. President himself. Reagan virtually backed up Tel Aviv's big lie, the allegation that the Israeli invasion was a "defensive operation." The American bombs, missiles and shells used by the aggressor against the civilian population of Beirut were likewise described by him as "defensive."

Washington did not confine itself to supplying Israel with the latest deadly weapons, including cluster, pellet and phosphorous bombs prohibited under international agreements.² It protected the invaders diplomatically by vetoing Security Council decisions aimed at stopping the aggression. The behavior of the U.S. delegation was frankly obstructionist. It presented that international organization with a challenge of outrageous cynicism, undermining its efficiency and prestige.

The scenario of this cooperation was prepared and agreed on beforehand. Immediately after Israel had begun its armed action, Washington joined in what may be called Operation Camouflage. It was claimed that the invasion of Lebanon pursued a limited aim — that of safeguarding Israeli settlements in the border area against artillery and mortar fire from Palestinian fighters. The fraud was calculated to neutralize certain vacillating political forces in Arab countries.

When, however, Israeli troops crossed the line alleged to be the limit of their thrust into Lebanese territory, Washington changed its vocabulary and proceeded to fully support Israel's political claims, insisting that they be met as the price of halting the advance of the troops. What this meant in practice was the demand that all foreign troops be pulled out of Lebanon. In this way the Israeli army's bandit-like inva-

sion was equated with the presence of PRM fighters and Syrian troops forming part of the inter-Arab peace-keeping force moved in at the request of the lawful government of Lebanon and by decision of an Arab summit.

Lastly, after the Israeli troops had completed the encirclement of West Beirut, Reagan's personal envoy, Philip Habib, whose words and deeds in the diplomatic sphere were regularly backed up with devastating Israeli bombings and shellings, concentrated on securing the withdrawal of the Palestinian forces from the beleaguered city. But even at that stage of escalating aggression it became obvious that the Zionist hawks wanted not so much the removal of the Palestinian fighters from Beirut and Lebanon as the physical destruction of the PRM, above all the PLO leadership. Their barbarous intention found expression in the massacre of the inhabitants of West Beirut and in the clearly unacceptable conditions of withdrawal of the Palestinian fighters from Beirut put forward by them.

The Israeli gorillas' robber-like tactics were quietly okayed by Washington. However, pressure from an indignant world opinion, resolute warnings from the Soviet government and the staunchness of the heroic defenders of Beirut forced the White House to begin maneuvering. Reagan even voiced "anger" at the reckless behavior of his Israeli partner, but Tel Aviv's Ambassador to Washington, Moshe Arens, hastened to dismiss it as "anger in the context of very close strategic cooperation." Even the American press questioned the sincerity of the President's resentment. One paper said, not without reason: "He may not want to share responsibility for the dirty work, but does he really want it left undone?"³ Another comment by the same paper read: "It is inconsistent for the United States to look forward to the larger strategic fruits of the operation without tolerating Israeli tactics, harsh as they may be."⁴

That Washington expected to pick these "larger strategic fruits" is beyond all doubt. Its primary aim was to defeat the Arab national liberation movement and impose its undivided domination on the region, meaning above all else monopoly control of the region's vast energy resources. The position of undisputed master would have enabled the United States to force its competitor-allies from certain positions and win greater opportunities of putting economic and political pressure upon them. These calculations added inevitably to what was already strong friction between Washington and its West European partners, above all France. The French reject the U.S. imperialists' claim to absolute hegemony in the

Middle East, especially since they are used to considering Lebanon a traditional sphere of their influence. Paris expressed discontent at the prospect of Israeli troops storming Beirut and offered to participate in the dispatch of international forces to disengage the belligerents. The French stance was also influenced by the growing protest of the country's democratic opinion against Israel's atrocities and by the expanding movement in support of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The French communists played a vanguard role in this.

The utter degradation of rightist Arab regimes, which surrendered to imperialist and Zionist designs and stooped to renouncing national patriotic goals, stood out in stark contrast against the background of the "strategic cooperation" of the parties to the U.S.-Israeli alliance. They were reluctant to do even a minimum, such as helping call an urgent Arab summit so as to publicly take a common stand of some sort (I must note, however, that in the past this often served as a mere disguise for reluctance to put up effective resistance to the invaders).

What angered public opinion most of all was the disgraceful refusal of Saudi Arabia and other Persian Gulf countries to use the effective strategic weapon they possess — oil and enormous reserves of foreign exchange (over \$200 billion) deposited in West European and American banks — against aggression. Had they used or at least seriously threatened to use this weapon, Washington would have had to crack down on its men in Tel Aviv. But the reactionary Arab regimes shrank even from severing diplomatic relations with the United States in protest against its undisguised complicity in the aggression. Think how sadly the "noble anger" of the Saudi rulers, who all but broke off all relations with Britain over a film on the life and death of a Saudi princess, compares with their cringing to the patrons of genocide against the Lebanese and the Palestinians. And surely the verbal protests of the regime under Hosni Mubarak, who refused to so much as freeze relations with the government of that blood-thirsty terrorist, Begin, were not worth much more.

Yet neither lavish military, financial and diplomatic aid to the aggressor from the United States, the Zionist invaders' unprecedented atrocities on Lebanese soil, the disunity of Arab states, nor outright betrayal on the part of reactionary regimes could break the will of the Lebanese and the Palestinians for resistance. The Tel Aviv strategists' plan for a blitzkrieg miscarried. The myth of the "invincibility" of

the Israeli army was exploded. The invasion made clearer than ever that Israel's "strength" lay primarily in the weakness of Arab regular armies with which the Israelis had to grapple in the past. The whole might of a colossal war machine was brought down on Lebanon. It was expected that over 100,000 troops supported by 1,000 tanks and covered by the most up-to-date aircraft of U.S. make would force Lebanon, Syria and the PRM to their knees in a matter of days. Defense Minister Ariel Sharon of Israel boasted that his army would accomplish the mission in a mere three days.

However, this time the aggressor came up against people's armed forces knowing what they were fighting for and prepared to hold out against any odds. Israel's casualties in Lebanon topped all those suffered by it in all previous military operations. For weeks fighters of the PRM and the Lebanese NPF operating in Beirut stood their ground against Israeli armored divisions and sustained bombing and shelling. At that time Beirut resembled in a way Paris during the 1871 Commune, for it was fighting not only against the superior forces of the Israeli invaders but against the Phalangists' fascist units and the apparatus of the Lebanese authorities, who submitted abjectly to the invaders' demands. The Israeli command will hardly ever have reason to pride itself on its military "gains" in Lebanon. The harsh lesson taught to the invaders will certainly have its effect on future developments in the region.

Nor did the parties to the U.S.-Israeli alliance achieve their main political objectives. In spite of the heavy casualties suffered by the Palestinian people and its armed units, the aggression proved counterproductive. Actions by world opinion, statements by many statesmen, the activity of the International Commission for inquiry into the crimes of Israel against the Lebanese and the Palestinian peoples and, lastly, the discussion of the Israeli aggression by the UN Security Council and the work of the Extraordinary Special Session of the UN General Assembly on the Palestinian problem played a very important part. More than ever before, they showed that the Palestinians' just cause enjoys international sympathy and appreciation. They also exposed the substance of Israel's expansionist policy and its role as a tool of imperialism in the region more than ever as well as the unprecedented isolation of Israel and its Washington backers.

The Palestinian and Lebanese patriots' courageous resistance and the invaders' losses in manpower and materiel also had an impact on the public mood in Israel itself, where there began an anti-war movement unparalleled in

scale. In the view of Israel's reactionary Zionist leadership, a dangerous rift opened in Israeli society. The democratic forces, especially the Communist Party of Israel, are gaining in prestige. The party again demonstrated its profound internationalism and real patriotism by demanding an end to aggression, to the policy of expansion and separate deals and by insisting on a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problems with due regard to the interests of every people of the region, including the people of Palestine represented by the PLO.

In pursuing its aims, the U.S.-Israeli alliance relied primarily on the strength of the Zionist military machine. Along with this, at all stages it resorted in varying degree to other devices, such as political maneuvering, fraud and intrigues. The Israeli invaders tried, for instance, to differentiate their treatment of the Palestinians and the Lebanese in the occupied areas of Lebanon by brutally suppressing the former and showing a measure of leniency to the latter (except, needless to say, for the communists and other NPF members). Arab reaction, in turn, tried to discredit Syria by accusing it of reluctance to engage the enemy. It expected to weaken the Syrian regime in this way, isolate it at home and throughout the Arab world and exonerate reactionary Arab rulers from responsibility for their refusal to come to the aid of the victims of aggression. The thesis of an "alternative homeland" for the Palestinians, said to be Jordan, was used once more. This ploy was aimed at misleading world opinion and blackmailing the Jordanian regime into accepting Camp David and ultimately becoming an accomplice in the liquidation of the rights of the Palestinian people. At the same time steps were taken to pave the way for a new crime against the population of the Arab lands seized by the Zionists, the expulsion of the greater part of the inhabitants.

Israel also tried in various ways to arouse doubts about the effectiveness of Soviet aid to the victims of aggression. Among other things, it insisted on the alleged technical imperfection and ineffectiveness of arms supplied by the Soviet Union to those who were resisting the invaders. The battle of Beirut, fought against heavy odds by the combined forces of the PRM and the Lebanese NPF using these arms, once again proved the opposite. And its experience showed that besides possessing arms, one must know how to use them and, most important of all, be willing to fight.

Speaking of the political aspect of the matter, we wish to stress that the Soviet Union promptly took a firm stand against the Israeli

aggression and gave the victims the necessary moral and material aid and support. At hours that were crucial for the Palestinian and Lebanese patriots, the head of the Soviet government, Leonid Brezhnev, sent direct messages to President Reagan stressing the need to act without delay in order to curb the aggressor and stop the bloodshed. The Soviet Union again demonstrated the sincerity of its friendship and the depth of its solidarity with the Palestinian, Lebanese and all other Arab peoples. This found vivid expression in Leonid Brezhnev's telegram to Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive, asking him to convey to the defenders of Beirut his admiration for their courage and staunchness. "We in the Soviet Union," the message said, "think highly of and appreciate the deep sense of responsibility and unshakable faith in the justice of your cause which you show in fighting to ensure that no more blood flows in the streets of Beirut and to secure the right of the Arab people of Palestine to life and free, independent development."⁵

The various dirty stratagems to which Tel Aviv and Washington had recourse failed to produce the results they sought. But it would be naive to imagine that these stratagems left no trace. It will take the communists and all other patriots much effort to clear away the falsehoods that were piled up, reveal the real causes and aims of the Israeli attack on Lebanon to millions of people and show who helped the invaders and how, and who defended the interests of the victims of aggression.

The Zionist plan to end the struggle of the Palestinian people by means of atrocities in the occupied areas and of genocide in Lebanon is bound to fail. Throughout their history, and more particularly since 1948, our people have repeatedly been a victim of heinous crimes on the part of imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction. But each time they recovered from reverses stronger than before and prepared to fight on. Neither difficulties nor sacrifices have broken their spirit and never will.

This is not to say, however, that vigilance in view of the enemy's treacherous schemes is no longer necessary. Fighting in Lebanon is not over and yet Israeli leaders have begun to hint at a new attempt to impose a "civilian administration" on the population of the occupied Palestinian territories, an attempt which in the past was defeated by a powerful upswing in popular resistance. During the fighting in Lebanon, Tel Aviv called for the resumption of the dialogue with "moderate elements" in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The occupation authorities look to collabora-

tion on the part of these elements as guarantee of pushing through the farce of "civilian administration."

At the same time repression against patriots in the occupied areas was stepped up. The Israeli invaders disbanded nine Arab municipalities which in Israel's view had shown particular militancy within the framework of national resistance to occupation. The persecution of mass organizations, primarily the unions, intensified and their leaders were thrown behind bars. There began raids on Arab villages during which the entire population was manhandled. Well-known fighters, such as Daoud al-Ataouna, a communist trade union leader, were ambushed and shot dead. Bandits from the so-called "village leagues" armed by Israel and recruited from out and out traitors and riff-raff, operated with growing insolence. Needless to say, all this was accompanied by boastful talk about "victories" of Israeli arms and by the allegation that the resistance forces were unable to hold their own against them.

There are many indications that the Israeli invaders do not plan to get out of Lebanon in the foreseeable future. In a setting dominated by the invaders' tanks and guns, Bashir Gemayel, leader of the right-wing Christian Kata'eb party, was elected Lebanon's new President. Menachem Begin himself sent him a congratulatory message. Official Washington, for its part, expressed satisfaction with Gemayel's election.

The likelihood of a new aggression against Syria cannot be ruled out. "The situation today," threatened Ariel Sharon, the Israeli Defense Minister, "is that all of Damascus is within artillery range of Israel."⁶ The roar of battle, the Zionist top leadership believes, is a suitable background for announcing the formal annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. If this happened the population of both territories would find itself under a savage reign of terror aimed at making the majority, if not everyone, leave the settled areas. Securing "land without people" has always been a Zionist ideal.

In these circumstances it is highly important to preserve the PLO and its apparatus which world opinion sees as the embodiment of the Palestinian people's independent nationhood. The Israeli aggressors and their U.S. patrons calculate that with the Palestinian fighters out of Lebanon, both the PLO and the PRM will split from within. They expect that the Palestinians' settlement in several Arab countries will inevitably increase the influence of these countries, which often differ over the Palestinian problem, on various organizations of the resis-

tance movement and that this, in turn, will result in deeper contradictions between them.

Even now some people, such as Hosni Mubarak, plan to take up Sadat's initiative regarding the formation of a "Palestinian government in exile" that would "replace" the PLO. It took long years of unrelenting effort to win recognition of this organization in the Arab world and internationally as the only legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine. Yet it is now proposed that a "government in exile" be brought into being on the model of certain, mostly reactionary Arab "analogues." And if this "government" adopts a different position it will be denied recognition and cooperation by official Arab circles, or will have to fight them from birth. In any case, its formation in today's conditions would inevitably injure the national unity of the Palestinians and tell on Arab support of their cause.

There is a further danger to which our party has already called attention. Following the heavy fighting in Lebanon, it is reasonable to expect an intensification of two harmful trends in the Palestinian movement. One of them expresses itself in a search through the rulers of Egypt and Saudi Arabia for an unprincipled settlement on U.S. terms. This trend will be the principal danger at the next stage. The other trend may translate into an inclination to rash, adventurist moves ignoring the great complexity of the present situation. Diametrically opposed at first sight, the two trends are, in effect, a reflection of despair and frustration that may grow worse under the impact of the hardships of a protracted and grim struggle. There is a need for constant vigilance to prevent the loss of the big gains made in revealing the justice of the Palestinians' fight for their legitimate national rights to world opinion. A consistent and explicit political position in line with the UN resolutions on the Palestinian question is exceedingly important in this respect.

Speaking of the various pressing political and organizational problems, we wish to single out another two tasks of strategic importance. They are as follows:

- preserving the fighting alliance of the Palestinian revolution, Syria and the Lebanese NPF while overcoming likely contradictions or differences among them;

- promoting friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union as the paramount requisite of fruitful pursuit of the struggle for our people's national goals.

Lessons of recent years have shown that neither military ventures, nor separate deals can bring the peoples of our region real peace.

Attempts to revive the hopelessly deadlocked "Camp David process" by exploiting the aftermath of the aggression against Lebanon are apt to aggravate the situation still more. The Middle East conflict can only be settled by the joint efforts of the parties concerned, including, of course, the PLO as the sole legitimate spokesman of the Arab people of Palestine. This is one of the most important lessons of the Lebanese epic, which is certain to have a strong impact on the Arab national liberation movement as a whole and contribute to the maturing of conditions for fundamental, revolutionary changes in the region.

early September 1982

1. See Rafic Samhoun, "When Masks Are Discarded," WMR, August 1982.

2. Since the founding of the State of Israel, the United States has granted it \$14.9 billion in aid. The Israeli Air Force is equipped with U.S. planes by 85 per cent. The Israeli Army has 1,460 M-60 and M-48 tanks and 4,000 armored personnel carriers purchased in the United States. Also, 90 per cent of its artillery, primarily 175 mm guns and the 155 and 203 mm howitzers firing cluster shells come from the Pentagon's arsenals. While this article was being written Israel was sent or was planned to receive a further 20 F-15 planes, 800 armored personnel carriers, 1,200 missile launchers and other military hardware worth \$1.5 billion.

3. *International Herald Tribune*, August 9, 1982.

4. *Ibid.*, August 7-8, 1982.

5. *Pravda*, August 6, 1982.

6. *International Herald Tribune*, August 16, 1982.

Free Paraguay's Patriots!

AGAINST REPRESSION AND PERSECUTION

World progressive opinion expresses concern about the fate of Antonio Maidana, First Secretary of the CC, Paraguayan Communist Party, and Emilio Roa, member of the PCP CC.

Maidana and Roa were kidnapped by the Argentine secret police in Buenos Aires on August 27, 1980. For a long time the authorities made no reply to the numerous inquiries, appeals and demands of the Communist Parties of Paraguay and Argentina, the Paraguayan community in Argentina and many other organizations as well as political figures of both countries seeking information about the two communists' whereabouts and fate. The federal police merely announced that an investigation was going on. Meanwhile Marcial Samaniego, National Defense Minister of Paraguay, paid a visit to Buenos Aires. There is information that he had talks with the Argentine authorities on the extradition of Maidana and Roa to the Stroessner regime.

The Paraguayan authorities denied in an official reply to the Human Rights Commission under the Organization of American States that the two leaders are in Paraguay. Moreover, they brazenly deny the very existence of the Emboscada concentration camp in the suburbs of Asuncion, where Maidana and Roa have been seen, according to reliable sources. The Secretariat for International Relations of the National Association of Paraguayan Opposition Forces operating abroad reports that the two

patriots were brutally tortured and ill-treated in the Emboscada camp. Subsequently the butchers transferred them to Pena Hermosa prison on the Brazilian frontier and lastly, to Esperanza military prison on the Bolivian border.

There is no doubt whatever that Maidana and Roa are victims of a conspiracy hatched by the CIA in collaboration with the repressive agencies of Argentina and Paraguay. The conspirators have put up a wall of silence and lies in an attempt to mislead world opinion and conceal the crime they are planning. The two patriots' lives are in great danger. A wave of solidarity with the Paraguayan revolutionaries is surging up again all over the world, with more and more forces joining in.

The kidnapping of Maidana and Roa is not only a conspiracy against the Paraguayan Communist Party and the country's progressive movement generally. It is also a plot against the communists of Latin America, against all who are fighting for the full and real independence of the countries of the continent, for peace and social progress.

It is a sacred duty of all internationalists to do their utmost in order to wrest Antonio Maidana and Emilio Roa out of Stroessner's prison cells.

Free Paraguay's patriots!

Representatives of Communist and Workers' parties of Latin America and the Caribbean on the Editorial Council of WMR

Country on the move

Raul Valbuena

CC member, Colombian CP

Jerzy Waszczuk

PUWP representative on WMR

Semy Pathe Gueye

CC member, Independence and Labor Party of Senegal

Rodny Ohman

Representative of Left Party — Communists of Sweden on WMR

Sixty years ago, in December 1922, the Soviet republics which took shape after the Great October Socialist Revolution, among them the Russian Federation, concluded a treaty on the establishment of a united multinational state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Since then, vast changes have taken place in the economy, social relations and every other sphere of the country's life. Soviet society has entered upon the stage of developed socialism, but the ideas of the October Revolution continue to provide powerful impulses to its growth, development and further advance along the Leninist course. A WMR delegation which visited Moscow and three Union Republics — Byelorussia, Uzbekistan and Armenia — at the invitation of the CPSU CC, reports on its meetings in the USSR on the eve of the historic anniversary.

Identity retained in unity

This report merely sketches out the vast panorama which unfolded before us on our trip. Being communists from different countries whose interests and predilections were not always identical, we tried, nevertheless, to reduce our impressions to a common denominator. Let us also note that in each of our countries there are different images of the Soviet Union. Whereas in socialist Poland and nearby Sweden, it is well-known, say, that the USSR is a country of many nations, you will find many people in Colombia and Senegal who believe that only Russians live in the USSR. We address this report to all readers, regardless of their knowledge about the country, which is why we start by emphasizing that Russians make up roughly one-half of the USSR's 270 million people, the other half consisting of people of more than 100 big and small nations. Some of these nations, like the Ukrainians, number more than 40 million, but then there are also tiny ethnic groups of under

1,000 people. Some nations are akin to their neighbors in language and origin, others are not. Let us report, however briefly, on the three nations which we came to know on this occasion.

The Byelorussians are a Slav people who are kin to the Russians; like the Ukrainians they are of the same ancestral stock, and originated in Kiev Rus, whose written history dates from the ninth century. These nations began to take shape as independent entities several centuries later. The Byelorussians live in the west of the Soviet Union.

Armenia lies 2,000 kilometers to the southeast of Byelorussia, beyond the Caucasian Range. The Armenians have carried their national traditions across centuries of trial and tribulation. They founded their first state centuries before our era. From then on, Armenia was repeatedly victimized by alien invaders, and what remained of it by the 19th century is now a part of the USSR. Under socialism, the Armenian people have regained their statehood.

One has to travel another 2,000 kilometers, from Armenia to the east, to arrive in Uzbekistan, in Central Asia. This was a cauldron in which "boiled" the history of hundreds of peoples, and the Uzbeks claim among their ancestors both Turkic nomads and the legendary Sogdians and Bactrians who warred against Alexander the Great. The Uzbek people were long subjected to oppression and rose to their full stature only in the Soviet period.

The nations of that vast country are diverse, but they now constitute a *single historical entity, the Soviet people*, and this has been written into the constitution of the USSR, which was adopted five years ago and which legislatively established the multifaceted structure of a developed socialist society.

How has this entity taken shape? In what direction is it now developing?

We had our first conversation on the relations between the nations of the USSR with Vitaly Ruben, Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He received us at his office in the Kremlin, which looked out on a panorama of Kremlin towers and temples, reminders of the long centuries of the state of Russia, whose territory was inhabited by different peoples now constituting a single entity. Vitaly Ruben began with a historical retrospective.

"The nature of relations between nations under socialism is the very opposite of what it was in tsarist Russia. An empire which oppressed and put down the peoples rested on the subordination of all the other nations to the Russian gentry and landowners, and was run on the 'divide and rule' principle. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Bolshevik Party came forward with its own alternative to the imperial policy, when it formulated the nationalities program demanding complete equality of the nations and their right to self-determination, including to secession. But even before the revolution, Lenin emphasized that defense of this right does not at all contradict the potential formation of a large multinational socialist state. He stressed, however, that such a state would be based on the principles of equality and voluntary membership. He wrote: *'The republic of the Russian nation must attract other nations or nationalities not by force, but exclusively by voluntary agreement on the question of forming a common state'* (Coll. Works, Vol. 24, p. 472). The communists merged the struggle for national liberation with the struggle for social emancipation."

Ruben opened a book and drew our attention to the following: "The principles of national equality and proletarian internationalism, which constitute the foundations of the Soviet state, were first applied in the organization of our party itself. It was not shaped as a Russian party, but as a party of the country called Russia, a party representing the interests of all the peoples of that state." He gave us some figures about the party's national make-up before 1917: 36 per cent of party members were non-Russians, and there were many Ukrainians, Latvians, Jews, Georgians, Poles and Armenians, men and women of more than 30 nationalities.

In the whole of the Soviet political system, the Leninist principles of equality and unity of nations remain immutable. The Soviet of Nationalities, which is now headed by Vitaly Ruben, a Latvian, provides a good example of this. In this context, Ruben emphasized some of the peculiarities of its formation and activity.

The Soviet of Nationalities differs from the

Soviet of the Union, the second chamber of the supreme organ of power, in that during the elections to it fundamental importance is attached to the country's division on national lines. The two chambers are equal in powers and the number of deputies. To the Soviet of Nationalities, each Union Republic elects 32 delegates, each autonomous republic — 11, each autonomous region — 5, and autonomous area — 1,* a total of 750 deputies. For the elections to the Soviet of the Union, the territory of the country is divided into the same number of districts equal in size of population, but regardless of the divisions on national lines. Consequently, the Soviet of the Union expresses the interests and requirements of the Soviet people as a coherent whole, while the Soviet of Nationalities additionally represents the specific interests of the big and small nations. However small the population of an autonomous area, it must have a representative on the supreme organ of power. The USSR Supreme Soviet now consists of deputies of 61 nationalities.

The Soviets were set up as organs of power by the workers during the first revolution in Russia (1905-1907), when Lenin discerned in them the embryo from which the whole system of the representative organs of socialist democracy has developed on the basis of socialism. Within a few days of our conversation in the Kremlin, we witnessed elections to the local Soviets of People's Deputies in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan. At the polling station which we visited, 32 men and women, from various walks of life and belonging to several nationalities — Uzbeks, Russians and Tatars — were running for the city district Soviet. They were not career politicians, but ordinary working people. Many of the voters came just after the polling station opened, so that there were many people around from the early morning. A band was playing near the polling station and young people were making merry. Close by, Uzbek pilaff was being cooked in large metal cauldrons and green tea which is so popular in Central Asia was available. The whole atmosphere showed that the elections were a popular festival and that the people regarded the formation of the organs of state power as their very own business in which they had a very high stake.

The striving for harmony in striking a balance between the interests of the whole state and of the big and small nations is most pro-

*Autonomous republics, regions and areas are parts of Union Republics. The USSR has 15 Union and 20 autonomous republics, 8 autonomous regions and 10 autonomous areas.

nounced not only in the Soviet political system, but also in all the other spheres of life: economic, social and cultural. This is exemplified by the elimination of the erstwhile economic and cultural backwardness in the areas which were once on the fringes of the old tsarist empire, as otherwise it would have been impossible to ensure the actual equality of nations.

We had a meeting for a conversation on this subject with Igor Chirgadze, Deputy Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the Uzbek Republic. We began by expressing our surprise at seeing a Georgian in such a leading post in Uzbekistan. Chirgadze shrugged his shoulders by way of reply:

"Any why not? Ours is a multinational republic. Several generations of my family have lived in Uzbekistan. Here, as everywhere else in the USSR, all the nations, big and small, now have equal opportunities, including the holding of leading posts."

He gave us a brief but expressive sketch of the development of the Uzbek economy in the course of socialist construction. In 1924, its industry consisted of a few brickworks, oil mills and handicraft workshops. Only manual labor was used in agriculture. The cotton crop barely exceeded 200,000 tons, and that despite the fact that Uzbekistan had the Soviet Union's best conditions for the growing of cotton, the bulk of which was then purchased abroad. It was in the interests of the country as a whole to be self-sufficient in cotton, while the republic of Uzbekistan was faced with the task of developing its economy as a basis for raising the people's well-being. Under capitalism, the metropolitan country in such cases fiercely exploits the raw-material supplying areas. It is their lop-sided development, their one-crop economy, their dependence on the supply of machinery and fertilizers, on the system of processing and marketing that enables the metropolitan center to appropriate the lion's share of the profit. But in Uzbekistan it was different: from the outset efforts were made to build up a ramified agro-industrial complex, and this was done by building up research facilities, erecting large-scale irrigation works, factories to turn out farm machinery, cotton-ginning enterprises, and textile mills.

An effort on such a scale was beyond the strength of one Republic, and so Uzbekistan was helped by the whole country. As a result, it now produces six million tons of cotton a year, with the highest yields in the world. Cotton was the basis for the growth of its industry and so also of its national working class. In social structure, the Republic was raised to the level of the advanced economic regions of the USSR.

Hundreds of thousands of hectares of once fallow and arid lands were irrigated. Its collective and state farms have become powerful mechanized units. In public health and education standards, Uzbekistan now ranks with the most advanced countries in the world. The people's well-being has grown immensely and the whole way of life has changed. Chirgadze told us:

"I have been keeping track of developments at the Frunze collective farm for several years now. In terms of income, it is an average farm, with 600 households. They all live in good houses with gas and running water. Every five years, the purchasing power of its inhabitants tends to go up by 50 per cent. One-third of the families have cars. Many others would have bought cars as well, but these are still in short supply."

Cotton is not the only source of Uzbekistan's wealth. It now has a powerful gas-energy industry, and a well-developed non-ferrous metallurgy. The Soviet Union's economic complex is now inconceivable without Uzbek cotton, gas, copper and gold.

In this way the country's economy is being internationalized, and this goes to benefit all the republics together, and each of them individually.

We were able to observe similar processes, even if in other forms, in Armenia and Byelorussia as well. The potassium salt deposits discovered in Byelorussia made it possible to build up a chemical industry in the Republic which now produces 50 per cent of all the potash fertilizer in the USSR. The Republic turned out to have favorable conditions for the development of engineering: one Soviet motorcycle in five, one tractor in six and one refrigerator in ten are made in Byelorussia. Its trucks will be found in every part of the Soviet Union and in many foreign countries. But it is short of fuel and metals, and the development of engineering and chemistry would have been impossible without oil, coal and metals, which are brought in from Siberia, from the Ukraine and other republics.

We find, therefore, two mutually related phenomena in the Soviet economy: the peoples discovered for themselves and began to use the wealth which they had but of which they had known nothing or had been unable to work. That is the first point. The second is that they have begun much more actively to exchange the acquired values and, moreover, to use them jointly. On the whole, these processes are characteristic not only of the material but also of the spiritual sphere. Here are some examples which indicate the general tendency.

In Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, we went to the Matenadaran, the Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, which was set up after the revolution and which is now housed in a specially built basalt palace. The Institute has a collection of more than 16,000 ancient manuscripts. Although the monk Mesrop Mashtots, to whom there is a monument in front of the Matenadaran, created the Armenian alphabet in the early fifth century, a majority of the Armenian people remained illiterate until the revolution, and so had no knowledge even of their own history. Just now, the ancient manuscripts are being studied and translated into other languages, and their publication has aroused great interest in Armenia and elsewhere.

Something similar also took place in Uzbekistan, where there has been a re-discovery of the legacy of many poets and philosophers, humanists of earlier ages. The whole country is now able to read the works of Rudaki, Djami, Navoi and Biruni, which have been translated into Russian and other languages. It is an interesting fact that in Uzbekistan many of the progressive figures of antiquity have become heroes of novels, plays and films. Like easel painting, these genres were not, of course, known to Central Asian art, and their development has resulted from the influence of other peoples. In this way the national cultures are enriched, from inside and outside, each people making an ever weightier contribution to the multinational and unified Soviet culture.

The dialectics of relations between nations under socialism is that the unity of the Soviet nations is achieved through their flourishing. However, "Sovietologists" abroad pretend that this amounts to "Russification" which results in a "revival of nationalism." What could one say about such "criticism" of the Soviet way of life?

Akil Salimov, CC Secretary, CP Uzbekistan, told us:

"I think that our ideological adversaries put the tag of 'Russification' on all the processes which express our urge to keep in step with the times: to develop an advanced economy, and a socialist culture and science open for contacts. They would like to see us retain our 'national peculiarity,' with its poverty, illiteracy, inequality of women and the inertness of retarded feudalism under which we lived before the revolution. However, we have firmly opted for our way and, incidentally, the knowledge of the Russian language has done much to help us in assimilating experience of other peoples and the achievements of the whole of human civilization. Anyway, when and where has the knowledge of a second language had an op-

pressive effect on national self-awareness? The facts testify to its rise in Uzbekistan: we have 221 newspapers, of which 187 appear in Uzbek (the rest are in Russian, Tajik, Tatar, Karakalpak and other languages). We publish 2,200 book titles a year, of which over two-thirds are Uzbek. Such an enlivenment of the national consciousness does not, of course, lead to nationalism, but to a strengthening of the friendship with all the other Soviet peoples."

In our view, everything we have seen shows very well that in the USSR, the nationalities question, in its old form, has been closed. The Soviet peoples have a common goal, which is to build a communist society, and they have a common ideology. They are all equal economically and have roughly similar social structures, in which the leading role belongs to the working class allied with the collective-farm peasantry and the working intelligentsia. The distinctions between these social groups are being gradually obliterated, and class boundaries within nations will disappear over the long term. All these factors of integration, which are in operation and which continue to gather momentum, have united the socialist nations into a new historical entity known as the Soviet people. But in the process, the national specifics have not disappeared: the more a nation realizes itself and becomes itself, the more united are the ranks in which it marches ahead with its brother-nations.

For the benefit of the working people

On the way to Armenia, to Yerevan, which a few years ago marked its 2,750th anniversary, the plane passes through a gigantic gateway in the Caucasian range, leaving Elbrus to the right, and its rival, Kazbek, to the left. Then, in a wide sweep, it descends into the Ararat valley. The majestic outlines of the mountain, where, according to the Bible, Noah's ark rested after the flood, shimmer white in the blue sky. Ararat, the symbol of Armenia, is depicted on its coat of arms, but for the historical reason of which we spoke has remained on Turkish territory. Armenia was brought to the brink of destruction by the Turkish invasion after the revolution and two years of nationalist rule. In 1920, there remained here 750,000 inhabitants, including refugees from Turkey.

Today, the Republic has a population of 3.1 million, with about 90 per cent of them Armenians. Nearly a quarter-million Armenians have returned to their ancient homeland from abroad. Yerevan, once a decaying town with 30,000 inhabitants, has developed into a city with a million people that is renowned for its beauty. In the Soviet period, Armenia holds the

record among the Union Republics for industrial progress: since 1922, its industrial output has multiplied more than a 1,000-fold. This does, of course, show that the starting level was very low, but it does nothing to minimize the importance of what has been achieved: Armenia generates, for instance, almost 5,000 kwh of electricity a year, which is less than the figure for the United States and the FRG, but is almost as much as that for Great Britain, and more than the figures for France, Italy and Japan.

"When we describe our achievements," Karlen Dallakyan, CC Secretary, CP Armenia, told us in Yerevan, "foreign visitors frequently ask: 'Don't you think that under another, non-socialist system, Armenia could have done as well?' I say: 'The road winding through the towns and villages of the Ararat valley runs close to the Turkish border. Go out there in the evening and you will see that over here everything is flooded in light, and over there it is dark, because they do not have electricity. By the way, the climate over there is the same, and the people are just as hard-working.'"

Armenia's economic achievements are no exception. Socialism has assured all the republics a high rate of economic growth. Vasily Kudinov, deputy head of the Central Statistical Administration under the USSR Council of Ministers, gave us some figures to show the country's achievements over the past 60 years. In the Soviet period, the USSR's national wealth (without the value of the land, the subsoil and forests) has multiplied 30 times. In 2.2 days it now produces as much national income as it did in the whole of 1922; it takes less than a month to produce the 1940 national income. The country's share of the world's industrial output went up from 1 per cent to 20 per cent. Such is the result of the people's collective efforts!

With the construction of developed socialism, Soviet economists say, the growth of production increasingly serves to solve the problems arising from the effort to raise the individual's well-being and all-round development. That is what, above all, now determines the switch of the economy to the way of intensification and the all-round enhancement of its efficiency. Labor productivity has been growing from one five-year period to another, but this is not achieved in the USSR through the ruthless depletion of human strength; on the contrary, this process has involved an easing of labor, whose standards have steadily gone up with the increase in technical facilities.

One of us once used to work at a factory in France, and knows at first hand what the sweat-

shop under capitalism is. He is fully qualified to confirm that the working conditions on the assembly line at the Minsk tractor works differ from those of the assembly line he worked on like night from day. The rhythm in Minsk is such that the working person does not at all feel that he is no more than an appendage of the conveyor belt.

Rationalization of production does not threaten the Soviet people with unemployment. In Yerevan, we went to the Armelectrosvet works, which makes fluorescent lamps. The operations on the lines on which these are made are mainly automated, but manual labor is still used in some places. These are being reduced from year to year.

The director of the works, Benyamin Tumasyan, told us:

"We have continued to automate the operations. At first 62 persons were employed on each line, now there are 38, and only 32 will remain by the end of the year. We shall then automate the packaging of lamps and reduce the number of workers to 28."

"What happens to those who are made redundant?"

"We shall employ all of them, because our production has been growing rapidly. In this five-year period, we plan to increase output by 62 per cent."

The intensification of production is the key line in the development not only of industry but also of the agrarian sector of the economy, as it is envisaged by the Food Program, which was adopted at the May 1982 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC. * The purpose of the program is to ensure the stable supply of the population with every type of food. Over the past 15 years, we were told at the Central Statistical Administration, the consumption of foodstuffs per head in the country has gone up considerably. And this with a steady growth of the population, a reduction in the number of people living in the countryside, and an increase in the urban population. But despite the successes achieved by agriculture, we were told, for a number of reasons it has failed to keep pace with the rapidly growing demand, which is why the supply of some types of foodstuffs leaves much to be desired. The reasons for these difficulties are being analyzed in the USSR openly, and this itself shows that the people are sure that these difficulties will be overcome.

In the Soviet Union we had occasion to see some impressive examples of just how in-

*For details see M. Gorbachev's article "The CPSU's Agrarian Policy at the Stage of Developed Socialism" in this issue.

tensive methods of agriculture are already being applied. At the mechanized farms of the Byelorussian state farm-combine Mir (peace) which is in the Brest region, one operator controls the maintenance of a 1,000 head of cattle. The farm annually sells to the state 5,000 tons of meat, and has a profit of 4 million rubles; it has a work force of 400 men and women, and their living standards are in many ways higher than those in the towns.

"Such farms exemplify our tomorrow," said Vladimir Grigoryev, Secretary of the Brest Regional Committee of the CP Byelorussia.

Economic progress, the improvement of social relations, the further cohesion of the Soviet peoples, the strengthening of friendship between them, all the changes in the society determined by the advance of these processes ultimately have an influence on the life of the working people. They are the chief integer of these changes; their well-being, the level at which their material and spiritual requirements are satisfied, is the main criterion in evaluating what socialism has achieved. We came to formulate this conclusion for ourselves most clearly after our meeting with Ulyana Krishtalovich, deputy minister of social security of Byelorussia. In a long conversation with her, we jotted down some interesting data. Over the past five-year periods, the social consumption funds, which include outlays on pensions, aids, student grants, housing subsidies (in the USSR, rents are much lower than the actual cost of the housing), the maintenance of children in nursery schools, etc., have been growing at an average of 25-30 percent, and now total 436 rubles per head a year (as compared with 95 roubles even in 1960). Roughly the same kind of growth has proceeded throughout the country. Social funds help to even out the material condition of individuals, because the bulk of the resources goes to those whose direct labor incomes are lower than the average wages.

From some of her replies we realized that she herself has had a hard life and asked her to tell about it. She said:

"I know for myself just how people find things under the capitalist system. Until 1939, up to the age of 16 years, I used to live in Western Byelorussia, which was occupied by bourgeois Poland. My father and mother worked as farm hands on a landed estate. There were many children in the family, but my parents did not, of course, receive any aids. I began to work at the age of eight, tending cattle, and then went to work in a bakery. As a woman, I was paid only half as much as the men, although I did the

same kind of work. I had only four years of schooling."

After liberation, the family at once joined a collective farm and life became easier. But in 1941, Byelorussia was occupied by the Hitler fascists. Krishtalovich joined a partisan detachment and was heavily wounded in the fighting. After the victory, she started a new life once again. She has brought up three children and has received a higher education. She was elected deputy to the district Soviet in her native place, then became chairman of its executive committee, and later first secretary of the district party committee. That was her way of rising from common peasant to statesman. She heaved a sigh:

"But my husband has no more than a primary education: he worked to maintain the family and gave me the opportunity to study. But we have lived together for more than 40 years now and are happy together."

There are many happy human destinies in the Soviet Union, as we found out from our conversations with people from various walks of life. An Uzbek collective farmer told us about his children: seven of them and all with an education. An Armenian worker showed us his new flat and rejoiced at the fact that his children were being allotted a flat next door, in the same house: "We don't want to part. We shall live as one family!" This does not suggest, of course, that in this country everyone is happy and life is a bed of roses.

"Our society has many problems of its own," Vladimir Sevruk, deputy head of the propaganda department of the CPSU CC, emphasized. "Although a favorable basis has been created for the shaping of the new man, because class and national antagonisms have been eliminated, and collectivism has become the law of social being, this does not mean that the formation of the harmonious individual is proceeding of itself, automatically. Among the obstacles are the unsurmounted survivals of the past; and in its development, the new society has its own contradictions and difficulties. Nor should we discount the influence of bourgeois views and bourgeois culture. That is why the party attaches great importance to the labor, political and moral education of the masses."

We saw how the features which distinguish the man of socialist society are manifested in the various age groups.

We visited the Sverdlov state farm near Tashkent. Its nursery school is housed in a well-equipped two-storey building, where 186 little boys and girls spend the whole day while their parents are at work. Families pay less than 10 per cent of the actual cost of maintenance.

The children play games, are given instruction in music and are prepared for school. But what we liked most was that each room had a little corner about one of the Soviet Republics. The Byelorussian corner had dolls in Byelorussian costumes, and books with Byelorussian fairy-tales. In Byelorussian schools, on the other hand, one will find children performing Uzbek and Georgian dances. From the earliest glimmer of consciousness, the child is taught to show interest in and display respect for other peoples.

The upbringing of the young generation is an important problem for Uzbekistan: its 3.6 per cent annual population growth ranks it second in the country. All the children attend school, and the young men and women are assured of jobs: the burgeoning industry needs roughly one million new hands a year. In the USSR they believe that the young worker must have a secondary education, a high skill standard, a developed political consciousness, diverse interests and sound health.

We went to Tashkent's secondary technical trades school No. 63 which trains building workers: house-painters, carpenters, plasterers and welders. It enrolls teenagers who have eight years of general schooling. The training course takes three years. Apart from instruction in a trade, the curriculum includes the teaching of mathematics, natural science subjects, history, literature, foreign languages and aesthetics. The work of trainees on building sites is paid. Tuition and board are free of charge. We spoke with several of the 400 graduates who finished the school this year. We found the young workers' attitude workmanlike, their mental horizon broad, and their readiness to mix tempered with modesty. Uzbekistan now has over 500 such schools. In the current five-year period, another 200 are to be opened.

Of course, the shaping of the individual's personality is not completed at school, college or institute. It continues in the adult's independent life. Under socialism, everyone has the opportunity to exercise his rights as the master of the enterprise at which he works, the city in which he lives and the state as a whole. But in order to realize this potentiality, the individual needs to develop certain personal qualities: consciousness and social activity. These are stimulated by the whole system of socialist democracy and especially — according to our observation — by the working people's extensive involvement in the management of production.

The Minsk tractor works is one of the largest enterprises in Byelorussia, and its tractors will be found on farms in Canada and in African countries. It employs over 20,000 men and

women, of whom 2,500 take part in the work of 34 standing production conferences, which have been set up in all the shops. It is within their competence to scrutinize plans and proposals for the improvement of production, and to assess the activity of the management. The working people's direct participation in running their own enterprise is ensured not only by discussion at every level but also by the preparation of the collective agreement between the trade union and the management, in which the whole collective is involved. The agreement which is now in force consists of 11 sections which provide for cooperation in fulfilling the production plan, improvement of working conditions and remuneration of labor, arrangement of facilities for rest and leisure, catering and medical services. Once again there is a quest for harmony: neither the interests of the works, nor the interests of the workers must suffer.

Here are some other data about the social and political activity of those employed at the works: 30 of them are deputies of the city district Soviet, 25 are assessors in the people's courts, while worker Evgeny Kirilchenko is a member of the CPSU Central Committee. One in six employees at the Minsk tractor works is a member of the Communist Party.

Let us not confine ourselves to one plant, and give the reader an idea of how the workers of the whole country exert an influence on the formulation of state policy. We found this out for ourselves from a conversation we had with Vitaly Provotorov, Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. He told us that 98.6 per cent of the country's economically active population — 131 million — is unionized. During the discussion of the draft of the latest state economic development plan, 9 million proposals were put forward, and the most important of these were incorporated in the final version of the plan.

The main line in the development of socialist democracy is extension of the working people's participation in running the state at every level. It is also a school for the education of the new man — the builder of the new society. Here, Soviet citizens in practice exercise the rights and perform the duties arising from the fulfillment of their responsible role of masters of the state, which belongs to them under socialism.

Stability belt

Thousands of kilometers lie between Minsk and Tashkent, and although they have roughly the same population — just over a million each — their faces are different. However, there is a common strand to their destiny.

In 1944, when Minsk was just liberated from the fascist occupation, this question stood on the agenda of the city Soviet: was the capital of Byelorussia, of which only the ruins remained, to be left in its old place, or built in a new place from the ground up. When the vote was taken, 49 per cent of the deputies voted for transfer, and 51 against. Minsk remained where it used to stand and where it stood for nearly 900 years before that. This was a wise decision: after all the concatenation of the times is itself a source of popular strength and so, despite all the difficulties, the city was restored.

The destiny of the whole of Byelorussia was reflected in that of its capital. War had destroyed 96 Byelorussian towns and 2,200 villages. Of them, 186, including Khatyn, which is now known throughout the world, were destroyed by the fascists together with their inhabitants. At the Khatyn memorial, there is a gap after every three birch trees planted here to symbolize the one Byelorussian in four who lost his life during the war.

Nothing compares with war in the great grief, devastation, and horrors which it brings, and the wounds in people's hearts which refuse to heal. But great calamities also happen in peace-time. Another memorial tells what happened to Tashkent. A mirror-like stone pedestal under a sculptured group, depicting a man and a woman holding a child in their hands, is rent by a jagged rift; where it starts there stands a stone cube bearing this inscription: "5 hours, 23 minutes, April 26, 1966." That was the epicenter of the Tashkent earthquake, which destroyed a greater part of the city and left tens of thousands of people without house and home. But within a year, all the people of Tashkent were provided with permanent housing. Today, Tashkent is a convenient and beautiful city with new palaces, theaters and museums. Its architecture is a blend of modern rationality and the romanticism of the East. It has thousands of fountains, it is steeped in greenery, and presents all the colors of the rainbow. One of us said: "I have seen the city of the 21st century" — and we all agreed with him.

Minsk also looks into the coming century, for that is how one could evaluate the plans for its development about which we were told by its Chief Architect Yaroslav Linevich. A number of industrial enterprises are now being withdrawn from the city; a system of water and green zones has been built up and is being developed throughout the city; the building is up to the most modern requirements.

Both these cities, Minsk and Tashkent, have been resurrected by the power of the Soviet people's internationalist brotherhood. On the

upright metal and stone pillars behind the monument at the epicenter of the earthquake are listed* the republics, regions and cities which came to Tashkent's aid in its hour of trial. The list reads like a geography of the whole country. When Leonid Brezhnev visited Tashkent in the spring of this year he had good reason to say: "In the constellation of the capitals of the Union Republics shines the star of the East — Tashkent restored from the ruins — as a man-made symbol of the brotherhood and friendship of the peoples of the USSR."

These and many other facts from various spheres of Soviet life showed us that under socialism fraternal relations between the nations, between people, spring from its very nature and are consolidated as the new society acquires ever more developed and mature forms. This process has attracted the attention of Soviet historians, sociologists and philosophers. In Tashkent, we had a conversation on this subject with Professor Khamid Vakhidov, a well-known scientist and the director of Uzbekistan's Lenin Museum. He said:

"The antagonistic contradictions which are inherent in a society based on private property still split human civilization into hostile camps, countries, nations, and classes with deeper rifts than those caused by earthquakes. The ideologists of capitalism insist that this split is primordial and cannot be overcome. Socialism has proved in practice that social and national contradictions can be resolved, and that social and national harmony can be attained where man does not exploit man."

In the course of this conversation, we recalled the excellent words of the young Engels concerning the goals which socialists set themselves: "We eliminate the contradiction between the individual man and all others, we counterpose social peace to social war . . ."* On one of the stands at the Lenin Museum in Tashkent we read the following words of the leader of the October Revolution: "The legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of each nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 39). It occurred to us that the main content of the reality which is taking shape in accordance with the socialist ideal could be defined as follows: the harmonious development of the free man in conditions of social peace and international unity.

There is tremendous interest among the peoples of the world in the experience of the

*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 248.

actual realization of this age-old human dream in the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries, which shows that the principles of equality and unity of nations can be translated into life. In the USSR we met people from various continents of the globe. The Uzbek Society for Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries, whose presidium we visited, alone has contacts with 120 countries of the world and annually receives more than 150 delegations and tourist groups.

"We willingly share our experience," we were told in Moscow, Yerevan, Tashkent and Minsk. "But we have no intention, of course, of 'exporting' it."

The whole experience of socialist construction in the USSR provides solid evidence that it is possible to advance in this sphere only if the people are led by the vanguard of the working class, a well-knit Marxist-Leninist party based on Lenin's organizational principles, a party of revolutionary action. At all the factories, collective and state farms, and scientific institutions we visited we saw that, as a rule, the best workers in production, inventors, scientists and skilled organizers are communists, who give a lead to all the other working people by their vigorous effort which springs from their sense of having right on their side and being moved by the great importance of their goal in life.

The party led the people in the revolution and in the struggle to establish the multinational socialist state. Today, in the period of developed socialism, its leading role is further enhanced. This is reflected in the constitution of the USSR, which contains a special article on the party's leading and guiding role in the society as the core of its political system. The CPSU now has nearly 18 million members, which means that 1 in every 11 adults in the country is a communist.

In a special resolution, the CPSU CC has summed up the results of the USSR's development and of its own activity in this 60-year period of history. Now, after our trip and after

everything we have seen, we find special meaning in the words of this document: "The Soviet Union does not impose on anyone any stereotypes or 'models' of state system which ignore the specific features of this or that country. It exerts a growing influence on the course of history by the very fact of its existence, by the actual practice of the new type of social relations among nations, by the power of its example in tackling the most complicated problems with which capitalism cannot cope. The USSR, a mighty socialist state, bases its relations with other countries on the lofty human principle of equality, as Lenin put it, and not on the principle of privilege, which is humiliating for a great people."

At every stage of our trip we were convinced that the principles of Soviet foreign policy enjoy full support in the country. The party, the state and the people are united. This, incidentally, contains the answer to the question which one sometimes hears in European countries: Why are there no "anti-government" peace marches in the USSR? There is no difference in approach to the main issue of our day — the question of peace — among all those with whom we had occasion to converse.

Alexander Kuzmin, CC Secretary, CP Byelorussia, told us: "Two of my sisters died during the war. Whenever I go to visit my mother, she cries: if only Valya and Sasha were alive . . . During the war I was a pilot and found myself dropping bombs on Byelorussia, my homeland. My heart bled but I had to drop the bombs. What is the point of asking about our attitude to war?"

We were told at many Soviet plants that their workers, on their own initiative, work one day a month for the Peace Fund. This Fund, set up in the USSR on a voluntary basis, helps the peoples which now suffer from war. Writers and artists donate their royalties and bonuses to the Fund; a teacher who lost her son in the war, donates a part of her pension; tens of thousands of people make donations to the Fund to express their urge to defend and preserve peace.

In Tashkent, architects showed us new houses which are designed to withstand the heaviest earthquakes and mentioned what is known as stability belts, which are designed into the building. The forces of socialism, the forces of peace, are now the main belt of stability in the edifice of human civilization. The creation of the stability belt zone continues. Socialism is on the move, it is all growth, and in its front ranks is the Soviet Union, the country which blazed for the whole world the trail to socialism and which has advanced farthest along this trail.

Where Human Rights are Real

George Morris

cloth 176 pp \$4.50

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

Restructuring the economy

Svatopluk Potac

CC CPCz member, Deputy Chairman, CSSR Government,
Chairman, State Planning Commission

The congresses of the fraternal parties of the European socialist countries held at the turn of the 1980s decided on the main guidelines and targets of their countries for the next five years, reemphasizing the importance of qualitative changes in the economy. The possibilities of chiefly extensive development have virtually been exhausted, whereas there are cases in which planning and management methods have yet to be brought into line with the more complicated external and internal conditions of economic activity. Coupled with some objective causes, this has led to a certain slow-down in economic growth rates.

The only way to maintain growth rates at an optimal level and steadily raise the standard of living at this stage of building a developed socialist society is to resolutely and comprehensively intensify production. The economic development dynamic in the European CMEA countries today depends on a balanced and efficient economy to a much greater degree than before. Furthermore, economic processes in socialist countries over the past decade have been visibly influenced by major changes in world prices. Due to a sharp increase in the prices of fuels and some raw materials, it now costs more to meet growing social requirements than expected.

It would be impossible in this new situation to do without extensive use of all intensification factors, including management levers. A planned restructuring of the economy should play a primary role in achieving the goals set. Structural policy is becoming an important aspect of the economic strategy of the European CMEA countries in the 80s. The main lines of specialization of their national industries are being determined with due regard to the particularities of each member of the community; at the same time the logical need to further integrational cooperation stands out more and more.

The keynote of the current economic policy of the CPCz is to gain maximum efficiency in the economy by using intensive growth factors in greater measure. This policy was adopted by the 14th party congress (early 70s) and reaffirmed by the 15th congress (1976). In specifying

it with regard to the 1980s, the 16th congress (April 1981) described steadfast intensification as the principal prerequisite of fulfilling the new five-year plan.

The chief objective of the party's socio-economic policy is to maintain and raise the living and cultural standards of the population. This is no easy task in today's complicated situation, for the expenses of supplying the country with both domestic and imported material resources are mounting and the proportion of able-bodied people is increasing slowly while the home and foreign market is more and more exacting as to the quality and technical standards of output and the rate of renewing the range of products. Inasmuch as the consumption of fuel, power, raw and other materials in the production sphere under the current five-year plan will be the same as before or will increase but negligibly, the national income can only be augmented by making better use of every component of the production process.

Besides, the economic development of our country in the 80s will be accompanied by a certain decrease in the share of accumulation. The fact is that the balance of payments has to be put right under the five-year plan. Czechoslovakia's convertible currency debt is not so very great considering its economic potential. However, payment of the foreign credits granted in the past will, of course, swallow a certain part of the national income. In consequence, the funds allocated for use inside the country, will be less than the resources created anew; compared with the previous five-year period, this is a reverse ratio which will tell on the share of accumulation, investment and reserves since we plan to maintain consumption at its present level or even to increase it.

Our seventh five-year plan (1981-1985) specifies the main targets of the country's social and economic development, proceeding from an assessment of the present state of the economy and a forecast of economic conditions in the 80s. These targets are based on the actual potentialities of the economy and take account of the accelerated economic growth which we expect intensification to bring about. The plan

provides for an annual increase in the national income averaging from 2 to 2.6 per cent; 90 to 95 per cent of this increase is to be achieved by raising the social productivity of labor. Intensification is to be effected primarily by making better use of power, raw material and manpower resources as well as investments and foreign exchange earnings. We plan to reduce annual consumption of fuel and energy by not less than 2 per cent and metals by 4.5 to 5 per cent and to save imported resources.

The economy will adopt new methods gradually (with growth slowing down somewhat in 1981 and 1982) to ensure that after adjusting it and creating economic requisites we can revert to a higher growth rate in subsequent years.

As in other CMEA countries, structural changes are an indispensable element of all-round intensification. The 16th CPCz congress stressed that "to reach the targets of the seventh five-year plan ... it is necessary to consistently carry out ... effective structural changes, primarily by accelerating scientific and technological progress and making maximum use of its results and increasing the participation of the CSSR in the international socialist division of labor ..."

The main lines of the present macrostructure of the Czechoslovak economy took shape in the course of building socialism in the country. The victory of the revolution paved the way for fundamental social changes that led, in turn, to a deep-going reorganization of economic activity. The socialization and further development of industrial production increased the share of industry and changed the interrelation of its various branches. Particularly rapid headway was made in mechanical engineering. The industrialization of Slovakia was accelerated with active assistance from the Czech people. Cooperation brought into being large-scale social production in the countryside — the 1950-1960 period saw its share in gross agricultural production go up from 17 to 90.5 per cent.

The formation of a new economic structure — production and technical facilities for socialism in the CSSR — was completed by the late 60s and constituted a major economic advance. However, this structure had, of course, certain features which had been engendered by the peculiarities of the post-war period of development of our country as, indeed, of other socialist countries of Europe. The system in the making was a multisectoral one, with a marked trend toward independent, autarkic functioning. The fact that the Czechoslovak economy had to seek the greatest possible independence

from the world capitalist market is easy to explain, since in cold war years the imperialist powers often resorted to foreign trade embargoes to put pressure on countries which had chosen a socialist road. But the trend toward self-sufficiency in production also extended to relations with socialist partners, for traditional bilateral trade was still the predominant form of foreign economic cooperation in those years while international specialization and industrial cooperation were only just beginning. In time these structural peculiarities of Czechoslovak production came into conflict with the requirements of modern economic development.

From the point of view of current needs, the imperfection of the existing structure of our economy lies in the fact that it necessitates large expenditures of power, raw and other materials and large investments and that fixed production assets demand an excessive amount of labor. Our level of processing raw and other materials is lower than in a number of highly industrialized countries. About 40 per cent of our industrial output is made up of articles requiring relatively large quantities of materials but falling short of advanced scientific and technological standards. With regard to power and material-intensive industries, Czechoslovakia holds a leading place in the world in steel (972 kg per capita), in cement (673 kg), in footwear (eight pairs) and in fabrics (58 sq. m.). Every per cent of national income growth is achieved by increasing the consumption of prime energy resources by roughly 0.8 per cent, which is far more than the average indices of other industrial countries.

In these circumstances, supplying industry with fuel, power and raw materials (mostly imported ones) puts a heavy burden on our balance of payments. When, in the 70s, foreign trade conditions deteriorated for Czechoslovakia, the problem of balancing out foreign-exchange and monetary relations became more difficult; the large share of costly fuel, power, raw materials and food in imports, on the one hand, and the predominance of relatively low-priced manufactured goods in our exports, on the other, have an unfavorable effect on the results of foreign economic activity.

It is the economic structure of Czechoslovakia that makes the amount of the national income we create strongly dependent on consumption in the production sphere, primarily on the physical quantity of the energy and raw material resources we obtain. We have a major economic potential and vast scientific and technological facilities, have achieved a high level of employment and high profes-

sional standards and take an active part in international trade. Nevertheless, the reproduction process does not yield the value effect that we might have expected in these conditions and that it could yield given definite structural changes.

A gradual restructuring of the economy began after the 14th CPCz Congress (1971). However, the adjustment of our economy to the changed conditions of reproduction is going on slowly, with the result that lately the aggregate social product and consumption in the production sphere have been growing faster than the national income. Investments are growing faster than the national income and accumulation in the production sphere is ahead of that in the non-production sphere. Taken as a whole, economic efficiency is increasing more slowly than before. All this makes it difficult to raise the standard of living steadily.

If we want our economy to meet contemporary exigencies to a greater extent we must effect changes in its macroproportions making it possible, first, to accelerate intensification, second to ensure a balanced home market, and third, to restore balanced foreign economic relations. To materialize this concept, we must show greater vigor than in the 70s in modernizing and reconstructing production and making rational use of basic material and technical facilities. Production of articles requiring less raw materials and power and more creativity and skilled labor will gradually increase. We are gearing our scientific and technological potential to the priority development of a number of progressive machine-building, electrical engineering and chemical industries as well as industries using domestic raw materials and producing articles that can be sold on the foreign market at a profit. Further progress in international specialization will enable us to reduce the excessively wide range of articles and substantially improve their technical properties. The overall task we have set ourselves is to greatly heighten the export capacity of our economy and lower demand for imports. Unlike the post-war period, the task now is not to make the whole economy more self-sufficient but to increase the self-sufficiency of industries for which favorable natural and economic conditions exist.

Industry will retain its key function in adapting the economy to the external economic situation. Substantial macro and microstructural changes will come about primarily in four key production complexes of the economy: fuels and power, raw and other materials (especially in metallurgy and the chemical industry), machine-building, and light industry.

Fulfillment of the state goal-oriented program of rationalizing fuel and energy consumption will right the balance. Among other things, oil import will decrease and coal production will go up but slightly, to between 125 and 128 million tons. Gas consumption, too, will grow somewhat. An increase in energy resources under the seventh five-year plan will be brought about mainly by building atomic power stations; these will account for some 55 per cent of the overall increase in the capacity of electric power stations (3,960 Mw). To back up this rapid growth materially, Czechoslovakia is developing atomic machine-building for both the home and the foreign market.

We plan no increase in pig iron or steel output. The emphasis is on an effective review of the range of products and on better utilization and processing of metals.

As oil is expensive and the possibilities of purchasing it are limited, chemical production will increase by only seven per cent under the five-year plan. But then we intend to considerably restructure it in order to process initial raw materials more thoroughly. The state goal-oriented program for the chemical industry provides for greater production of polymers, basic organic substances, medicines, biofactors, organic dyes, additives to polymeric materials, and pure chemicals.

Mechanical engineering will remain the mainstay of updating the basic material resources and technical facilities of our economy, raising labor productivity, utilizing scientific and technological achievements and promoting export industries. It will increase by 28 to 33 per cent in five years. We give priority to electronics, for which the plan envisages a faster growth rate ranging between 36 and 42 per cent. Conditions are being created for the early mastery of the production of more highly integrated circuits, microprocessors and semiconductor memory devices for some industries. Besides, we are launching the production of machines and plant that will help reduce the expenditure of fuel, power, raw and other materials in other industries as well as the production of articles possessing high technical and economic indicators and consumer properties.

The structuring of light industry that we plan is aimed at improving the processing of imported raw materials, making greater use of domestic ones and improving the product mix for the home and foreign market.

Self-sufficiency in food is still an important task. Our agriculture has made noticeable progress in this respect; it meets our demand for

meat, dairy products and eggs fully and for grain, by 93 per cent. It will make further headway under the five-year plan; crop-farming will grow faster and stock-breeding will be restructured somewhat.

Our structural policy concept specifies the character of strategic industries. Taking sober account of the fact that all our resources are limited, we steadfastly concentrate energies and resources on selected development lines of decisive importance for higher efficiency of the economy as a whole and the satisfaction of society's growing requirements.

We attach equal importance to perfecting the microstructure of production (intra-industrial specialization, concrete range of products) — the sphere making it possible to secure results at an early date. To renew it on a large scale, it is necessary to evolve and introduce appropriate forms of planning and economic management as well as a system of material incentives encouraging enterprises and the individual worker to operate according to the main lines of structural policy. Our experience has shown that there are ample opportunities for intensification in precisely this sphere.

Only by combining macrostructural changes with a continuous flow of innovations at the microlevel can we overcome difficulties involved in the transition to an all-round rise in production efficiency. This is the only way to make further economic progress without raising the accumulation level excessively, considerably increasing investments and restricting or reducing consumption in the production sphere.

The formation of the structure of the Czechoslovak economy is largely predetermined by the long-term economic strategy of the European CMEA countries. The relevant fundamental document is the Comprehensive Program of the CMEA. It was used as the basis for drawing up and implementing a coordinated plan for multilateral integration measures for the 1976-1980 period which comprised about 30 major joint projects.

Nations and Internationalism

V.S. Semyonov

cloth 303 pp \$5.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

The 30th CMEA Session (1976) decided to work out long-term goal-oriented programs for cooperation in fuels, raw materials, machine-building, agriculture, the food industry, consumer goods and transport. A total of 343 measures were agreed on to put these programs into practice. Czechoslovakia is participating in the implementation of 90 per cent of them, a fact which has a considerable impact on the restructuring of its economy.

Socialist integration entered a new stage in the early 80s, with cooperation in key industries as the main line of further economic advance of the community in general and each of its member countries in particular.

The long-term concept of our structural policy is based on both multilateral integrational cooperation and bilateral projects signed with fraternal countries. First and foremost, we are extending and strengthening relations with the Soviet Union, our major economic partner. Bilateral relations with other CMEA countries help form more effective structures in our economy.

The long-term concept of structural policy takes account of overall world trends. The share of capitalist countries in our foreign trade is close to 23 per cent. That part of our balance of payments in which transactions are conducted in convertible currency is strained today. To re-establish balanced foreign economic relations, we must modernize our production to ensure that it keeps pace with technological progress and guarantees the competitive capacity of our output.

The share of developing countries in our foreign trade is only seven per cent at the moment. The economic assistance we render to these countries is intended primarily to strengthen their national industry and help them utilize their natural resources to a greater extent. However, the developing world's demands on Czechoslovak exports and imports are bound to change. Expanding economic relations with them will make it necessary for our production to adapt more flexibly to the peculiarities of industrialization in this or that group of developing countries.

The structural changes planned by the 16th CPCz congress open up qualitatively new and more complex ways of implementing the party's economic policy. An effective restructuring of the economy and a decisive advance toward intensifying it are an objective necessity to which the party devotes special attention. The enormous potentialities of the socialist system are a guarantee of successful fulfillment of the economic tasks set before the Czechoslovak economy for the 80s.

The social face of the working class

Professor Rudi Weidig
Dr. Sc. (Philos.), GDR

One of the major gains of socialism is that the revolutionary proletariat, guided by the Marxist-Leninist party, consolidates its influence in every sphere of life and gives broad scope for satisfying the social interests of the working class itself and of all the other working people as well. In the GDR and other countries of our community this has now become an important indicator that the existing social relations accord with socialist principles.

The working class, which makes up more than 75 per cent of all the working people in the GDR, is the chief socio-political force of progress. By its labor — manual and mental — it produces the bulk of the material values and creates the greater part of the national income. It is also the master of the whole people's property. That is why when its interests are made central to social policy which consistently implements the principle "everything in the interests of the working class, everything for the benefit of the people," this accords with social justice and reflects the humanistic character of our system.

This feature of socialist humanism does not, of course, emerge of itself but only as a result of tremendous political, economic and cultural activity on the part of the working class and all the other working people. It reflects, Lenin said, the creative role of the workers in striving to consolidate the achievements of the socialist revolution and to advance (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 423-424). That is why it is so important to develop to the utmost the creative capacities of the working class and its allies and to promote their activity at every stage in the formation of the new society, but especially today, in the 1980s, as developed socialism is being built up in a seriously complicated foreign-policy and external economic situation.

The modern face of the GDR working class has taken shape as a result of the revolutionary process of more than 30 years. In this period there has been a radical change in the conditions of its existence, its numerical strength, its structure and social role, as also, incidentally, those of the other classes and social strata in our republic.

In contrast to most of the other socialist countries, by the start of the revolution the prole-

tariat in the GDR was already the largest class in society, being concentrated mainly in industry. Nevertheless, it continued to grow numerically (especially in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism): from 1950 to 1980, it increased from 4.9 million to 7.2 million. In 1945-1946, industrial and office workers already made up about 70 per cent of those employed in the national economy. By 1960, the figure had gone up to 81 per cent, and by 1980 — to 89 per cent. It is indicative that in 1950 industry employed 41.6 per cent of all the industrial and office workers, and in 1980 — 43.2 per cent.¹

The working class itself is the main source of its quantitative growth: it is above all the women and young people from working class families taking up various vocations. Thus, the share of women among industrial and office workers went up from 35.7 per cent in 1950 to 45 per cent in 1960, and to 51 per cent in 1980. Every year, roughly 200,000 young men and women take up jobs in the national economy. The table shows the movement of all these major socio-economic changes.

Industrial and Office Workers*
in Various Sectors
of the GDR Economy (per cent)

	1950	1960	1970	1980
Socialist enterprises and institutions	61.6	83.3	86.5	96.3
Including:				
state	58.7	77.5	79.5	89.8
cooperative	2.8	5.7	6.9	6.5
Enterprises and institutions with state participation	—	5.9	6.9	0.3
Private sector	38.3	10.6	6.5	3.2

*Without trainees.

Source: *Statistisches Jahrbuch der DDR*. 1981, Berlin, 1981, pp. 106-107.

The social condition and functions of the working class have undergone a fundamental change with the build-up and consolidation of the new political and economic power, and the steady growth in the numbers of working

people involved in socialist relations of production. The working class fulfils its role of producer of the bulk of the social wealth in conditions which are totally different from those existing under capitalism. Under socialism, this class is simultaneously the producer and the holder of all the power, thereby acting as a truly new type of class never before seen in history.

All the old types of classes either exercised power, or produced, because in the exploitive society those who rule do not work, while those who work are deprived of real power. This division which lasted for millenia has been overcome under socialism: in alliance with all the other working people, the working class, led by its Marxist party, masters the skill of combining both these key social functions. This revolutionary and intrinsically contradictory process can run successfully only if there are major qualitative changes in the leader-class itself.

The development of the working class and its social face are most powerfully influenced by the establishment and strengthening of its political and economic domination, which has been and continues to be the crucial condition for social progress under socialism. General Secretary of the SUPG CC Erich Honecker says: "The workers' and peasants' power is the prerequisite for the new society, a society without exploitation and oppression, a society whose supreme law is the well-being of the people."²

Everyday politics in our republic show very well with what diversity and how creatively the working class fulfils its role as the mainstay of the state, while determining the content of policy and using administration and planning for the benefit of the working people, their desire for peace, their social certainty and social progress. This explains the GDR's constructive contribution to the strengthening of international security and the republic's economic achievements. Simultaneously tackling — in an indissoluble unity — economic and social problems, the masses in our country work to fulfil the main task, as formulated in the SUPG program and confirmed by the party's 10th congress, which says: "To continue further to raise the material and cultural standards of the people's life on the basis of a high rate of development of socialist production, a rise in efficiency, scientific and technical progress and growing labor productivity."³

The substance of this policy and the successes achieved in implementing it provide convincing evidence that political, economic and social processes under socialism are centered on the needs of the working people, and that

the working class uses its power to satisfy these needs.

If the workers' interests are to be raised to the level of state policy, there is a need for a relevant political system. Such a system has been built up in the GDR and it enables the working class to realize its leading role in various practical ways. First, a sizable section of the workers is directly involved in guiding and administering every sphere of life and in elaborating and realizing the guidelines of domestic and foreign policy in their capacity as members or functionaries of the ruling party. Of the 2.2 million communists, 1.6 million (73 per cent) belong to the working class either because of their earlier activity or social origin, and 57.6 per cent — in virtue of their current occupation.⁴ There is a steady growth in the share of members of the working class within the ranks of the party, and it has never been as high as it is today. This is an important indicator of the SUPG's growing ties with the class and a simultaneous prerequisite of the party's capacity to bring out the social interests of the working class, to express them and be guided by them in all its activity.

Second, a sizable section of the best representatives of the workers hold leading posts in the state apparatus and in the national economy. From 1946 to 1953, such functions were entrusted to 160,000 former production workers, and today 75 per cent of the leading cadre of the republic, 74 per cent of the procurators, 67 per cent of the judges and 67 per cent of the officers of the National People's Army are of working-class origin. This has proved that it is capable not only of creating a socialist state, but also of successfully directing it.

Third, our working class is taking an ever more active part in administration and management through the organs of popular representation, the trade unions, and other social organizations and commissions, and is also making a contribution to strengthening the socialist system by its daily labor effort. Thanks to this, Lenin said, the worker-and-peasant power "is the first in the world . . . to enlist the people . . . in the work of administration" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 247). That it is democratic, will be clearly seen from the constitution of the organs of popular representation in the GDR: in social origin, more than 72 per cent of the deputies of the People's Chamber and the elective local government bodies come from the working class. Sociological studies show that altogether 66 per cent of the working people in our country are involved in some kind of social activity, which means that millions of people daily take part in exercising power, increasing

socialist property by their knowledge and experience, and strengthening and defending their socialist homeland.

The fact that workers hold many responsible posts in the republic has had an effect on the sphere of mental labor, on the changing social face of the intelligentsia. A sociological study carried out in one industrial district of the country showed, for instance, that 44 per cent of those doing work by brain had been children of industrial workers, 19.1 per cent of office workers, 12.7 per cent of peasants and only 14.3 per cent were second-generation intellectuals.

Consequently, our state power has a solid social basis and is truly democratic, something that no bourgeois state can boast of. The extensive development of well tried forms and institutions of democracy, conscious initiatives by the workers and all the other citizens of the country and their capability to tackle the tasks facing the society, all of these are reliable guarantees that the policy of the state will not diverge from the interests of the working masses.

The growth of the working class and of its role in socialist construction are inseparable from the efficient use of social property in the means of production. Experience suggests an important conclusion: the guarantee of stability of the worker-and-peasant state is rooted above all in the economy. Recalling the early strides of Soviet power, Lenin said that the domination of the class was ensured after the Bolsheviks effectively settled the question of property (see *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 456). Socialist property in the basic means of production and their rational use and multiplication continue to be the socio-economic basis of the qualitative rise of the working class, helping to shape its new attitude to labor and a behavior that is totally different from anything in the past and that is characteristic of the true masters of this property making full use of their potentialities of immediate producers of material values.

Today, 97 per cent of all the workers in the republic have jobs at enterprises and institutions owned by the whole people (nearly 100 per cent in industry). Socialist property is not just some "external form" of activity, but a most concrete material medium in which the process of production and appropriation proceeds, new motive forces of progress are shaped and strengthened, and a new mode of thought and action is formed. Clear confirmation of this will be seen in the GDR's economic and social achievements, because the growing efficiency of the national economy and the rising productivity of labor are more than purely technical or economic processes; they are above all an

indicator of workers' increased capacity to act in practice as the producing and ruling class.⁵

The working class regards socialist property as its very own and this has resulted in the dynamic development of the national economy as the basis for the creation of the necessary material prerequisites for implementing the SUPG's socio-political program. The economic upswing is evident in the tangible improvement of the material condition of the workers and all the other working people and their families. In the 1970s, the average monthly earned incomes of industrial and office workers in industry went up from 768 marks to 1,038 marks, and those of production workers, from 748 to 1,018. Considering that the retail prices of the basic consumer goods and transport fares have remained at the old low level, real incomes per industrial and office worker family member went up by 123.1 per cent over 1960. From 1970 to 1980, there has been a great increase in the average size of old-age pensions — by 72 per cent. The expansion of housing construction has been of tremendous importance in improving the working people's social condition: the population has received 1.5 million new and modernized flats, and this has markedly improved housing conditions for 4.5 million persons, i.e., roughly a quarter of the GDR's citizens. More than 60 per cent of the newly built flats in our republic are earmarked for workers as a tribute to their role in creating the national wealth. Add to this the fact that, in accordance with the socio-political program for the 1970s, over 1.5 million jobs in industry, building and transport have been remodelled in accordance with modern labor-organization requirements, and this is having an effect on the workers' social condition.

In a socialist society, people have tangible evidence of the relation between the growth of living standards and economic growth, because for the first time in history the new system has created a strong bond between economic and social progress for the benefit of the working class and all the other working people. Awareness of this bond from one's own daily experience, backed up with our party's ideological activity helps to generate important motive forces for the qualitative development of the working class, enabling it to gain a more profound understanding of the economic and social interconnections and shaping an active stand in life among masses of people, which for its part brings about a fresh socio-economic upswing.

This dialectic is well illustrated by the "new ideas movement." Industrial and office workers, intellectuals and cooperative peasants do

not just fulfil their immediate production duties honestly but make an effort to achieve outstanding scientific, technical and economic results and do much to improve working conditions. From 1970 to 1980, the number of innovators nearly tripled, with the share of production workers growing fastest among those most involved in scientific and technical creativity. In 1981, one working person in three throughout the republic made a contribution to rationalizing production. In 1970, the economic effect of this movement was computed at 2.5 billion marks, and in 1980 — at 4.6 billion marks. On the whole, over the past 10 years the national economy received an additional 38 billion marks in this manner. But the importance of this movement is not confined to purely economic or technical results. Apart from manual work, hundreds of thousands of workers are taking up work by brain for their own benefit and of the society as a whole. They work on a par with engineers and technicians for the same purposes, renewing and rationalizing production out of a sense of personal responsibility, thereby ever more actively expressing themselves as the basic social force realizing and accelerating scientific and technical progress.

Creative effort in production by millions of conscious citizens is of fundamental importance for the further development of the working class and the whole socialist society. The intricate process of intensification of production requires vigorous participation by the working class and all the other working people. The SUPG's economic strategy can be successfully implemented and its main task fulfilled only if the productivity of manual and mental labor is rapidly increased. Our people are advancing along this road, and this will be seen from the mass socialist emulation movement under this motto: "High economic growth through rising labor productivity, efficiency and quality — all for the benefit of the people and world peace."

The level in the development of the productive forces attained in the GDR, the division of labor and the nature of our demographic processes do not allow us to expect any sizable increase in manpower resources. Any further release of manpower from agriculture would entail adverse consequences for that sector, and especially for the quality of its produce. The role of science, technology, education, culture, medical services, administration, management and planning tends to increase, and this requires a marked increase of employment in the non-production sphere. This means that a section of our young people, especially working-

class youth, has to move into the ranks of the intelligentsia. It is no longer possible to raise the level of women's employment, which in our country is already very high: more than 87 per cent of our women either work or study, and they constitute more than one half of the country's working class. Consequently, its growth can and must be exclusively qualitative, going hand in hand with a change in its make-up and better exercise of its class functions.

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie argue that scientific and technical progress and the development of the productive forces generally are allegedly a matter for the "intellectual élite" alone. They assign to workers the role of passive performers who have no creative potential of their own. Such biased and speculative constructs distort the actual state of things even under capitalism, to say nothing of the fact that they are totally inapplicable to socialism.

Indeed, nowadays, the pact of technical progress is determined and established, more than ever before, in scientific laboratories and on the drawing boards. The intelligentsia has a growing responsibility for the development of social production. But that does not in any way belittle the role of the working class. On the contrary, its importance has been growing, because scientific and technical achievements are not an end in themselves, but a means for realizing social and political goals. Science becomes a productive force serving to promote social progress as it becomes the business of the whole people. That is why purposeful development and use on a massive scale of the creative potentialities, skills and education of the working people are the most important reserve for accelerating scientific and technological progress. By consciously shaping the conditions for the creative team-work of industrial workers and intellectuals, we help not only to rationalize production, but also qualitatively to develop the leading class of society.

Since the establishment of our republic, the working people's general educational and professional training has risen tremendously, especially with the entry into working life of a young generation that, as a rule, has 10 and 12 years of schooling and training in some trade. In 1970, 79 per cent of all school leavers had 10-12 years of education, and in 1980 — more than 90 per cent. Out of the 8.7 million working people in the republic, more than 4 million men and women now have a secondary education; 75 per cent of the working people between the age of 20 and 30 years have a 10-year education, while 90 per cent are certified as skilled workers. This tremendous progress applies

equally to young men and women. Their educational standards have continued to grow: in the future, we expect to increase the percentage of workers with a 10 or 12-year education to 90 per cent.

Because of the large-scale resources put in by the socialist state, similar progress has also been achieved in professional training. In 1955, 25 per cent of industrial workers were skilled, and in 1980 — nearly 65 per cent (over 62 per cent among production workers). In 1980, 85.6 per cent of school leavers received occupational training and became skilled workers. The number of personnel with a secondary specialized education in industry was nearly 5 times higher than it was in 1960, and with a higher education — 10 times.⁶ Meanwhile, the share of trained and untrained workers⁷ had fallen to about 20 per cent.

The opportunity of receiving a higher education and a skill is a social value which many people by right directly link with our social system and with the humanistic policy of the SUPG and the socialist state. That does not mean, however, that we are not entitled to expect the increase in the skilled living labor potential to yield corresponding scientific, technical and economic results, and the inputs into education — an adequate national economic effect. For the time being, some skilled personnel are employed in jobs which make it impossible to use their knowledge and experience to the full extent. If the education and training one has received fail to find adequate application for years, the willingness to learn tends to weaken, to produce dissatisfaction and frequently to cause manpower fluidity. That is why better planning of personnel training, consistent realization of the principle of remuneration of labor according to its quantity and quality, and encouragement of joint creativity of workers, technicians and engineers mean creation of better opportunities for the working people to express and assert themselves in society.

The gradual reduction in arduous, hazardous and monotonous labor is highly important in the social progress of the working class. From 1975 to 1979, the share of production workers employed in arduous labor in the GDR industry fell from 7.5 per cent to 5.3 per cent. But the problem has not yet been solved. In manual assembly-line operations, in shop-floor transportation and carriage, in partially automated lines of production and also in operations preceding or completing automated processes, the share of monotonous operations, arduous physical labor remains considerable. In order to create a production apparatus and a type of

division of labor that would lead to a general reduction or even elimination of conditions which have an unfavorable effect on human health and mentality, major scientific and technical efforts and large-scale material outlays are required. Fresh potentialities are being created in this field by the use of microelectronics, industrial robots and other means of automation, which help to transfer to machines the most arduous and uninteresting operations and to bring out the capabilities of workers more comprehensively, so enriching their work with elements of creativity.

The use of modern technology does not have uniform social consequences even under socialism, but on the whole it does promote the incipient transformation of the workers into a class engaged not only in manual but also increasingly in mental labor. This was emphasized at the 26th congress of the CPSU by Leonid Brezhnev, when he said: "There is also a change in the character of the modern workers' labor itself. It is a labor that is being increasingly filled with intellectual content."

One should also bear in mind that those who are, for objective reasons, still employed in monotonous manual labor or in performing uncreative mental operations are simultaneously engaged in responsible work in the party, trade unions and the youth league, are involved in the new ideas movement, in socialist emulation, and in the discussion and drawing up of plans, which enables them to combine their duties with creative mental activity.

There are some groups of industrial and office workers the content and conditions of whose work can already be so changed as to establish a close link between manual and mental functions. The result is frequently a change in the demands made by their work on their personality so that in order to fulfil their production tasks they have to obtain a secondary specialized or higher education. That is why conceptions which reduce the working class to groups of people doing manual labor clash with the actual changes through which this class is going under socialism.

In view of this, the SUPG has made the task of advancing the spiritual development of the workers and all the other working people central to its activity. Primary attention is being given to improving administration, management, planning and education, and perfecting material and moral incentives for skilled personnel. To create the conditions that would make it possible to use effectively the skilled labor potential for boosting the productivity of the national economy means paving the way

for the fulfillment of the strategic task, which is to convert the achievements of socialism into the motive force of scientific and technological progress.

The accelerated application of scientific and technical innovations and socialist rationalization have been paralleled by a further concentration and growing organization of the working class. In 1956, enterprises employing over 1,000 accounted for 49.9 per cent of all industrial and office workers in socialist industry, and in 1981 — 69.5 per cent; 98 per cent of the working class is now concentrated in large industrial combines. Nevertheless, 29.2 per cent of the industrial output still comes from factories and plants employing less than 1,000 persons (86.7 per cent of the total number of enterprises). That is an important social problem: the fact that the bulk of the working class is concentrated in large-scale production does not obviate the need for giving serious attention to work collectives at middle and small enterprises. The main processes of the scientific and technological revolution, especially complex automation, proceed above all in mass and batch production, so affecting the small enterprises only in an indirect way. But they cannot be allowed to remain on the sidelines of technical progress, for this is bound to have an adverse effect on the social condition of a part of the working people. Hence the task of purposeful socialist rationalization of production processes at the small and middle enterprises so as to shape for them living and working conditions in line with social requirements and potentialities.

Important structural changes are under way within the working class.

First, there is a gradual reduction in the share of workers immediately involved in the process of production. Meanwhile, the share of industrial and office workers preparing the basic operations, making the means of rationalization, repairing equipment, processing information and performing other ancillary functions has been growing. This law-governed phenomenon, most closely connected with the development of the modern productive forces, has been characteristic of the GDR working class for a number of years. This process is simultaneously the effect and the condition for the extensive employment of the means of automation.

Second, in the growth industries (chemistry, electronics and modern electric power generation) there is a gradual increase in the number of industrial and office workers whose production functions require a higher or a secondary specialized education. That is a manifestation

of the fact that the working class is moving closer to the intelligentsia: this means the shaping of a group of highly skilled industrial and office workers some of whose features are akin to those of the technical intelligentsia. This group has a tendency to increase.

Third, up until recently there has been a marked growth in the share of industrial and office workers employed in the non-production sphere, especially in the sphere of the services, and some areas of administration and management. This trend is bound to continue in the services, but in management and office work the introduction of microelectronics, modern information and computing facilities will entail a sizable reduction in workplaces and a shift of personnel to other work, naturally, according to their qualifications, interests and importance in national economic terms. The socialist society cannot allow intra-class mobility to mean any kind of social degradation for anyone. The introduction of technical facilities to perform some types of mental labor confronts managerial and clerical personnel with totally new requirements, notably, with the need to introduce and use modern equipment, to raise their skill standards, to change their place of work and frequently even their vocation and work collective.

With the automation of production, the spiritual and social progress of the working class will become ever more pronounced. However, even where the content of the labor of some is enriched, objective conditions often long remain for the reproduction of groups of trained and untrained workers, even if on a shrinking scale. That is why there is a differentiation of the GDR working class from the standpoint of skill standards. In the process, new conditions are created in which industrial and office workers with totally different skill standards tend to work shoulder to shoulder in the same production collectives, and there is to some extent evidence of a growing stratification of workers, interests and requirements of their individual groups.

Sociologists have been studying such differentiation, above all from the standpoint of the law-governed tendency to growing unity. This is important, in particular, because the social structure of the working class has an effect on the shaping of the socialist individual. It is formed in concrete conditions which differ fairly markedly from each other: different technical equipment of labor, different levels of concentration and socialization of production, education, skills, etc. A comprehension of this specific and the mechanism of its influence on people is the starting point for purposefully

creating the material and technical prerequisites for developing people's capabilities and inner world, and also for changing the structure of the whole working class in the spirit of social progress. The general problem is scientifically to establish how individual groups and strata of workers influence each other and how, as the substantial distinctions between them are gradually overcome, the class as a whole rises to a higher stage of its development. Here, an active role now belongs to social planning and administration, which stimulate the creation of an atmosphere in which the working people's social activity is raised to a higher level.

Thanks to the qualitative growth and leading role of the working class, the changes in the social structure of the socialist society have not run toward greater differentiation, as they have under capitalism, but have, on the contrary, brought the classes and strata ever closer together and then also to the gradual obliteration of existing distinctions. The worker-and-peasant power and socialist relations of production give the friendly classes of working people a reliable perspective. Under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party, they increasingly display all their capabilities, pool their efforts and join the workers in vigorously participating in building a developed socialist society.

1. Unless otherwise stated, the figures come from *Statistisches Jahrbuch der DDR*, 1981, Berlin, 1981. —Ed.

2. *Neues Deutschland*, April 23, 1982.

3. *Protokoll der Verhandlungen des X. Parteitages der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands*. Vol. 1, Berlin, 1981, p. 31.

4. *Ibid.* p. 133. In addition, 9.1 per cent of the SUPG members are office workers, 22.1 per cent are intellectuals, and 4.7 per cent — peasants.

5. Here are some basic indicators helping to judge the way traversed by the GDR economy thanks to the people's intense and honest labor effort. A year after the proclamation of the GDR, in 1950, socialist enterprises in industry and agriculture turned out just over one-half (56.8 per cent) of the net social product; 30 years later, the figure had gone up to 96.4 per cent. From 1949 to 1980, the national income multiplied nearly 8-fold (from 22.4 million marks to 173.9 billion marks), or 7.4 times per person employed in the production sphere. These results were achieved with an insignificant increase in the total number of workers — 12.4 per cent (and in the production sectors, only 2.7 per cent). Gross industrial output per industrial and office worker increased more than six-fold. In 1980, it took the country only five weeks to turn out the 1950 annual commodity output in industry. In 1960, it took one employed person 160 working hours to turn out 1,000 marks of the national income, in 1970, 100 hours, and in 1980, only 58 hours. How much more economically energy and materials are being used is likewise indicative: in the last few years, the volume of production has been increasing while the overall consumption of fuel and raw materials has not grown.

6. *Neues Deutschland*, April 23, 1982.

7. In contrast to untrained (unskilled) workers, who are given no more than a technical briefing and told of safety techniques before they start work, trained (low-skilled) workers are given training at their work place. But this does not entitle them to receive a certificate of training — Ed.

Hunger in Africa: how to defeat it?

Izzeddin Ali Amer
CC member, CP of the Sudan

The world's press has been reporting with alarm the growing threat of hunger in various parts of the African continent. From its pages the eyes of children filled with grief and despair stare at the reader, their faces hung with the wrinkled skin of senile decay, stomachs bloated with starvation. Television screens show people dying in the streets because they cannot even have a square meal once a week, never mind once a day.

There are more and more indications of the unfolding tragedy: over the past decade, the consumption of food per head dropped by 10 per cent, and the picture over longer periods is equally dismal. Since 1960, the gross domestic product per head increased by less than 1 per cent in 19 countries and did not grow at all in

15 countries. It has been estimated that between 26 and 52 per cent of the population in independent countries on the continent suffer from malnutrition, while more than 150 million Africans top the list of the world's hunger victims. One African child in five dies before the age of one year chiefly because of poor nutrition, and in sub-Saharan Africa infant mortality is 30 times higher than the average for the entire group of developing countries. A report of the UN World Food Council says: "In the 1980s, hunger and malnutrition are expected to be far more widespread . . . unless concrete measures are intensified to reverse these trends."¹

Behind this array of alarming statistics is not merely the semi-starvation of millions, but a condition that is nothing short of dying life. A

decade ago, people were dying in the Sahel² which was hit by a succession of severe droughts; quite recently, a similar disaster took a toll of 50,000 lives in Karamodja (Uganda). Famine is likely to flare up on a massive scale in other areas as well.

For a number of specific reasons, Africa is now extremely vulnerable in food supply. It is an area with over a score of states that are extremely backward socially and economically, with incomes per head that are much lower than those in other newly liberated countries (under \$150 a year). Heavy cereal crop failures on the continent in the 1970s had an extremely negative effect, and the problem was compounded by wars and large-scale social upheavals, like those in Uganda and Chad. Nor can one disregard the historical background. According to some sources, the population of Europe and Africa in the mid-17th century was roughly equal (about 100 million) but by the beginning of this century the population of Europe had multiplied four-fold, while that of Africa had increased by less than a quarter. The reason was the "export of people" from Africa to the plantations of the New World. It has been variously estimated that the slave traffic deprived Africa of between 40 million and 80 million of its most able-bodied people, to say nothing of the after-effects of the colonial wars, and downright genocide perpetrated by the colonialists. This played havoc not only with the reproduction of manpower resources, but also with its complex inter-relationship with the formation of the productive forces in agriculture.

Those are, briefly, some of the specific continental characteristics of the problem of hunger and malnutrition. At the same time, the grave food situation is an outgrowth of the basic factors operating on the scale of the whole vast periphery of the world capitalist economy. Marxist-Leninist science regards hunger among the population of developing countries as a specific uniformity, an inevitable consequence of the international division of labor between the metropolitan countries and their colonies, between the centers of capitalism and the periphery it exploits, a division which took shape in the colonial epoch. The exploitation of formerly enslaved countries by means of neo-colonialist methods objectively still dooms hundreds of millions of people to a life of near-starvation. Capitalism has imposed on these countries a deformed, lop-sided agriculture. The prevalence of one-crop economies has paralyzed the remaining sectors of productive agriculture, turning agriculture into an appendage to the economy of the capitalist centers.

Since the Second World War, outbreaks of mass famine have occurred on all the continents of the developing world. Despite the measures taken by the national governments to cope with the food problem, including agrarian reforms, the increment of foodstuffs has proved to be inadequate: at least 28 per cent of the Asians, 25 per cent of the Africans and 13 per cent of the Latin Americans suffer from malnutrition (less than 2,000 calories a day). A total of about half a billion people are doomed to starvation. More than one-half of them are children under the age of five. Another 1.3 billion people suffer from chronic malnutrition.

However, there is nothing like a consensus on the meaning of these figures. Bourgeois science, followed by the imperialist media, prefer to put neo-Malthusian interpretations on the causes behind the suffering of millions (the growing poverty and hunger in the Third World, they claim, stem from the population explosion), or to attribute it to the intense urban sprawl or even to mistakes in planning, in economic policy, and so on. The communists and other progressive forces, for their part, believe that the crux of the problem lies in the inequality, oppression and discrimination in the economic relations between the two groups of states — capitalist and developing — which have been preserved even after the disintegration of the colonial system.

The markets of the capitalist centers continue to lay down their laws, forcing the primary producing countries to retain their lop-sided export orientation. The cost of dependent development is always borne by these countries. This is exemplified by the after-effects of the boom in industrial livestock farming in capitalist Europe and the United States with its growing demand for feed (manioc, soya beans and, partly, sorghum) which are grown in the tropical belt. As a result, the area under soya beans in Brazil has been extended at the expense of haricot bean crops, the major source of proteins for the poor, while the growing exports of soya beans have spiralled the prices of this product at home. Today, a third of the Brazilians cannot afford the luxury of buying soya beans or oil. Their average protein consumption has fallen by six per cent.

The consequences of such pressure from the international market have made themselves felt in the Sudan as well. Although over the past decade, the sorghum crop declined by 50 per cent, its export, particularly to Saudi Arabia, has increased many times over. The same is true of other farm produce in our country: it is being exported, while the people subsist on near-starvation diets. The Nimeiri regime has

acted in collusion with its imperialist patrons in imposing "starvation discipline" on the masses.³

The tragedy of economic dependence is graphically emphasized by this fact: at the height of the disastrous 1971-1973 drought, the eight Sahel countries exported from two to five times more proteins than they imported in the form of grain. Furthermore, throughout our continent, local cereals and food plants (millet, sorghum, sweet potatoes, etc.) are being sacrificed to export crops. The coffee crop alone is now four times as large as it was in Africa 20 years ago. The newly liberated countries have to dispense with the prime necessities in order to meet the demand of overseas markets. Such is the relentless logic of the laws of capitalism.

One should also take into account that the lop-sided orientation toward the intensive growing of export crops has devastating ecological consequences. Soils are depleted by over-farming, which leads to erosion. Over the past 50 years, nearly 650,000 sq. km. of fertile soils to the south of the Sahara have been converted to dust, and another 18 per cent have been designated as a "zone of risk" in view of their possible conversion into desert.

At the same time, the steady deterioration of the terms of trade has compelled the developing countries to spend more and more on food imports. Sharp declines in grain production in the capitalist centers have repeatedly skyrocketed grain prices, so forcing a reduction in grain imports by developing countries. In the capitalist economic system, world food prices cannot be expected to remain stable. As a result, multitudes of undernourished and even starving people in the vast areas of the former colonial periphery find themselves in the grip of multinational corporations specializing in the food trade and using food both as a source of profit and as an instrument of political pressure.

The causes of the undernourishment of millions of people, of the critical shortage of food, which makes people exist on the brink of death from starvation, cannot be divorced from the capitalist system, which has divided the world into oppressors and oppressed and which, to this very day, continues to control much of the economic leverage on the internal economic situation in the former colonies. It is the socially and economically retarded countries that are made to suffer the greatest ordeal. However, one question remains unanswered: does this "starvation discipline," practised in its extreme forms, serve the long-term interests of the capitalist centers themselves?

When direct colonial rule was eliminated,

imperialism changed its strategy on the periphery of the capitalist economy. In order to enable the economy of the "centers" to go on functioning in the new conditions, a whole package of measures was produced, and this is sometimes defined as the strategy of economic aid.⁴ In the 1950s and in the subsequent period, much was made by the imperialist circles of grain deliveries on easy terms under extended credits and of some other types of food aid. Today, such aid has come under increasing criticism both by the public at large and by some spokesmen for imperialist capital.

Why then is this widely advertised form of aid (bourgeois ideologists claim that it is virtually a "life-jacket" in the ocean of backwardness and poverty) being questioned just now, at a time when the prospects for food supply are not at all encouraging?

The reasons are several. First of all, it should be emphasized that the halo of nobility around capitalist aid has been a false one from the outset: having pulled out from the colonies, the former imperial centers were forced to devise a mechanism to market a part of their agricultural produce which appears as a "surplus" in times of agrarian crises of over-production. Dr. Katherina Focke, one-time minister of the Bonn government and now a deputy of the European Parliament, says: "The EEC food-aid policy is still dictated by agriculture interests rather than by an intention to promote development (in the newly liberated countries)."⁵ When many Asian and African governments came to realize that food deliveries tended to drop sharply after every change in the market situation, criticism was directed at the self-seeking character of the food aid. These countries' very much greater dependence on such deliveries is likewise seen as a threat to national sovereignty, especially since imperialism frequently uses food aid as an instrument of political diktat. Similar tactics are used in Africa by the apartheid regime. South African Minister Hendrik Schoeman has declared with an air of complacency that well-stocked granaries meant that they could negotiate from strength. He expected the growth of the population in the countries of Black Africa to induce them to depend increasingly on Pretoria for their staple foods.

The public at large, both in the capitalist world and in the developing countries, has criticized the food aid as a form of handout from imperialism to privileged groups. Brokers and profiteers have been making fortunes out of grain imports, while the impoverished masses suffer from malnutrition. It has been estimated that in Bangladesh, for instance, only 25-30 per cent of the food aid coming in under the aus-

pices of international organizations reaches the poorest strata of the population.⁶ We have a similar situation in the Sudan, and in any of the other African countries ruled by a bureaucratic bourgeoisie and an army élite fattened up on imperialist handouts. In such cases, the distribution of aid leaves little hope for improving the food supply of the masses. Indeed, the inequality is further deepened, all the more so since, according to World Food Council estimates, 10 per cent of the highest-bracket families in developing countries have almost 40 per cent of the aggregate private incomes, the next 30 per cent of families account for another 40 per cent of the incomes, the next 40 per cent down the scale receive only 15 per cent of the total, and the remaining 20 per cent of the families get 5 per cent of the incomes.

There is also a sceptical attitude to this type of aid because the wheat and rice imports tend to change the long established diets and tastes, so in fact worsening the prospects of any increase in the production of traditional crops, despite the fact that these are the major source of food for the poorest strata. The neglect of local cereals also has an adverse effect even where high-yield varieties of rice, maize and other crops have been introduced on a particularly large scale. Two decades after the arrival of the Green Revolution in the Philippines, "its miracles in high-yield cereal and vegetable production have lost their luster, and Philippine specialists are conducting a nation-wide search for indigenous varieties. In the process, they have rediscovered useful plants that may become important sources of food, fuel and chemicals."⁷

The criminal practices of capitalist firms supplying inferior products to developing countries have repeatedly come under sharp criticism over the past few years. In some cases, they have sold to these countries grain and tinned foods intended for domestic animals, and also stale dairy and other products hardly fit for consumption.

Greater awareness by the public at large in the capitalist countries of the incontrovertible fact that the hunger of hundreds of millions was a business for a handful of commercial and financial tycoons, primarily the major U.S. grain multinationals seeking to dictate their will on the whole developing world through the capitalist market, was a major breakthrough. The disillusionment with food aid, together with the resentment over a policy which carries suffering to the peoples, has led to the emergence of organizations and movements, above all in capitalist Europe, calling for

efforts "to defeat hunger in the Third World." Those involved believe that in these countries and in the capitalist centers themselves it is necessary to release the population, starting with the peasantry, from the power of the transnational agro-food corporations. While many of these projects have a touch of utopia about them (emphasis on a drive against the excessive consumption of foods rich in proteins and carbohydrates in Europe so as to use the resources thus saved to combat hunger in Asia, Africa and Latin America, etc.), this action is, in effect, a symptom of the changing mood among some sections of the public protesting — in such a peculiar way — against the monopolists' control of the production and distribution of food.

Calls for effective action to save the newly liberated nations from hunger and malnutrition cannot just be ignored by the ruling classes in the capitalist countries. This problem is now being discussed at the government level and was recently debated in the European Parliament. A section of the monopoly bourgeoisie now tends to regard hunger as an impediment to its continued commercial and economic expansion. The perpetual malnutrition of millions, a state quite acceptable in terms of big business ethics, holds out the prospect of social explosions or disadvantages for monopoly groups seeking to create a more buoyant market in the developing world, which is why they want to see the most flagrant manifestations of poverty eliminated. The Brandt Commission report says: "Only major efforts of investment, planning and research can make enough food available for the six billion people the world will probably hold by the year 2000. But not only must the food be there; people who need it must be able to buy it. The reduction of poverty itself is equally essential for abolishing hunger."⁸ The reference in the report is, indeed, only to a reduction of poverty, because poverty and capitalism are indivisible. In the capitalist countries themselves, hunger and malnutrition affect the most disadvantaged strata of the population and there is a constant growth in the number of those who rank below the official poverty line. A striking example is offered by the United States, where cutbacks in social programs under the Reagan administration doom more millions to near-starvation.

One of the keynotes of the report reflecting the reformist thinking of those who advocate more stable long-term links between the capitalist world and the developing countries is "a massive transfer of resources" with a view to changing the unfavorable economic and food situation on the capitalist periphery. This

would require, in their view, efforts to remedy some of the chronic ills which plague the peoples of the former colonies. That is why this report and — ever more frequently — statements by some capitalist governments repeatedly stress the need for a war on backwardness, disease and malnutrition. But it is still a far cry from such pious hopes to real action.

However, there are also loud calls in the capitalist West for a solution to these problems that does not involve any palliatives or compromises like those recommended by the "Independent Commission." One is left with the impression that hunger and malnutrition are sometimes overdramatized by those who want to use the grave food situation in many developing countries to prod them into taking decisions suitable to imperialism, notably the present U.S. administration. Highly symptomatic in this respect is the report published by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD).⁹

The report abounds in statistics which indicate the grim realities and prospects for agriculture in the region. The figures have an ideological function to perform, providing background data to back up the initial two-fold premise: first, that it is the newly liberated countries that are themselves to blame for the existing situation, and second, that if it is to be remedied, there is a need to change the approach to the problems of agriculture and, accordingly, to the whole of socio-economic strategy. The recommendations of the report were concisely summed up in the *London Economist*¹⁰: more use of the price mechanism so that farmers grow more crops for the local market and export (in fact, the reference is to providing maximum incentives for private farming, while any initiatives in cooperative development and the establishment of state farms are strongly criticized in the report); less use of overextended, inefficient bureaucracies (the thrust of the recommendation is not at all aimed against bureaucratic mismanagement but against the state sector and its leading role in the economy), of local currency devaluations (this measure has repeatedly caused a disastrous skyrocketing of prices for the prime necessities in the Sudan and in many other liberated countries, thereby adding to the extremely heavy burdens borne by the poor).

To put the IBRD recommendations in a nutshell, they amount to an attempt to impose on a whole group of countries a remodelling of the economy that would open the floodgates for the "free play" of market forces. This is not a new recipe in any sense, and is entirely in the spirit of the neoconservative approach of Reagan-

omics. Nothing is said about the consequences of such development: the sharp step-up in the entrepreneurial activity of the "farmer" (the report even lays emphasis on the "small farmer") is bound to enrich some and impoverish others. The experience of countries that have variously applied this "model" — Pakistan, India and the Philippines — speaks for itself. Despite the establishment of kulak-type and other big private grain farms in the course of the Green Revolution there, the problem of mass malnutrition and even of hunger was never radically solved.

The IBRD report also refers to the outlook for foreign aid in the development of African agriculture, and even assumes that it should be doubled by the end of the 1980s, but on one condition only: local governments should accept the IBRD recommendations. "Nothing could be clearer: behave politically and economically the way we dictate or do not expect our help." Such is the sarcastic comment of the approach by a London journal.¹¹ Nor is that an empty threat. There are, in fact, indications that it would be carried out if the developing countries try to defy the will of the advocates of Reaganomics and other kindred spirits in bourgeois economic science. IBRD circles, for instance, have voiced criticism of the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) for allegedly overemphasizing "costly food programs." It is Washington that has found its activity most unpalatable (FAO makes a million tons of food a year available to indigent countries). Another instance of undisguised pressure is the refusal by capitalist donors (United States, France, Netherlands, Belgium and Norway) to participate in financing a project for creating buffer stocks of grain for countries in the Sahel region. The African countries have, nevertheless, displayed resolve to implement this program by drawing on finance from Arab sources.

In other words, coordination of efforts with capitalist powers in tackling the food problem hardly gives the developing countries any grounds for optimism. The inequitable nature of the relations between them either tends to limit the possibility for solving the problems inherited from colonialism, or hampers the peoples' constructive efforts by channelling them into avenues favorable to imperialist capital.

The communists and other democratic forces emphasize in their programs the need for a radical restructuring of international economic relations. Steps in this direction would involve the establishment of a more equitable system of commodity exchanges between the states,

consolidation of the economic independence of the newly liberated countries, and a change in the terms of the foreign aid being made available to them in such a way as to command respect for the sovereign rights of the once oppressed peoples. This restructuring could set the stage for a more meaningful solution of the burning problems of hunger, disease and retardation.

But it would be utopian and simply incorrect to believe that any efforts toward self-sufficiency in food supply could be effective without deep-going social transformations and agrarian reforms. Genuinely effective efforts to feed the population are being made only where the system of exploitation has been ended and the orientation toward socialist construction taken. Experience shows that even the socialist countries which feel the full effect of backwardness and underdevelopment can successfully mobilize their still modest food resources to feed the people.

On the other hand, in the countries where social oppression still prevails, the communists and other revolutionaries can do much in the struggle to ease the plight of the exploited masses. A program for such a struggle in the African and Asian countries could include not only a demand for land reform and the cancellation of debts for the have-nots, but also more assistance through government channels to prevent soil erosion, apply modern farming techniques, and make more extensive use of inexpensive but effective farming implements. It would be highly important to have a well-considered policy to stimulate the growing of drought-resistant local crops, like sorghum, millet, cassava and other crops, to give the peasant a stake in his product.

International bodies, operating within the UN framework, could do much to support a hungry and undernourished population, especially in an emergency. If such aid is extended on a bilateral basis, it should have no political or other strings attached or lead to dependence.

The non-aligned movement has increasingly accentuated the role of solidarity among its members in grappling with the unfavorable food situation. To meet their demands, the UN World Food Council has drafted a program recommending wider use of economic incentives to develop local farming, improvement of the storage, transportation and sale of grain, and extension of the training of food-policy experts. It is significant that plans for economic integration in Africa are ever more frequently discussed in the light of the tasks which stem from the need to overcome hunger and malnutrition.

Finally, the communists believe that all these efforts will yield success only if our continent is truly turned into a region of lasting peace. Unfortunately, the situation here is alarming. The Reagan administration's policy tends to involve some regions in Africa in the arms race. Through its stooges, Washington wants to extend the zone of its own "vital interests" there. An agreement to make military bases available to the United States in Morocco was followed by a similar agreement with the reactionary Nimeiri regime. Washington clearly gives top priority to strategic installations instead of agricultural projects.

This sinister backdrop brings out in bold relief the distinctive features of the socialist countries' policy with respect to independent Africa. Guided by the ideals of peace, justice and progress, these countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, have done and continue to do a great deal to help the newly liberated peoples overcome the hard legacy of colonialism. Scores of agricultural facilities built with the USSR's assistance help to tackle the major social problems in the countryside and exemplify large-scale public management of agricultural production. The efforts of the socialist community countries for the establishment of a lasting and durable peace on every continent are of historic importance. Leonid Brezhnev's message to the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament says: "Even now boundless opportunities exist to get down to solving such human problems of global magnitude as the fight against hunger, disease, poverty and many others. But that requires scientific and technological progress to be used exclusively to serve the peaceful aspirations of man." It is hard not to agree with this idea. Hunger in the world can be vanquished only through the pooling of the creative potential of the peoples.

1. Quoted in: *Africa Research Bulletin*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1982, p. 6366.

2. A desert and semi-desert savannah zone running through Gambia, Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Upper Volta, Niger and Chad, up to the borders of the Sudan.

3. For details of the regime's policy, see Ahmed Salem's article in *WMR*, June 1982.

4. This includes government subsidies, concessional credits, and technical and other types of aid.

5. See *New African*, November 1982, p. 48.

6. *International Herald Tribune*, December 8, 1981.

7. *International Herald Tribune*, May 27, 1982.

8. "North-South: A Program for Survival. The Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt," London, 1980, pp. 90-91.

9. "Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: an Agenda for Action."

10. See *The Economist*, October 10, 1981, p. 90.

11. *New African*, February 1982, p. 22.

The industry of war and national sovereignty

Gabriel Lopez
Brazilian economist

The numerous group of states that are called developing countries are going through a complex evolution which is manifested in the most contradictory processes. The growing role of these countries in international affairs is a historically positive trend and an important aspect of the present stage. But this is accompanied by an increasingly rapid differentiation in the developing world that in concrete cases adds a special hue to the general trends and reduces them to a minimum or amplifies them to a maximum. Particularly noticeable among the growing distinctions is the "surge forward" of some major countries ahead of the main group of African, Asian and Latin American countries, with some of the former advancing to the state monopoly stage.

Brazil is a case in point. It has outpaced the majority of developing countries in many economic indicators. What attracts particular attention is the rise of a powerful arms industry in Brazil. This creates many challenging problems, such as those of the limits of independence and the bounds of dependence of economically medium-developed capitalist countries, the balance of forces in the capitalist world or the sources of the military-industrial power accumulating outside the old imperialist centers. These problems gained sharply in significance after the Malvinas crisis, which gave ample food for the discussions under way in Latin America about changes in the functions of the armed forces and ways of building up a national defense potential independent of the imperialist powers.

These problems understandably attract the attention of communists. While there are no easy and definitive solutions, the points of departure can be determined even now by taking a Marxist-Leninist approach, which helps to show the most important thing: the class interests behind the growth of the arms industry and take into account the contradictions undermining the hegemony of the main imperialist center. The communists of Brazil and other countries of our continent are resolutely against subordinating the policy of their countries to the U.S. policy of aggression. However, they are

also on the look-out against the dangerous strivings of the continent's own rulers.

They do not see the root of the problem of the military in the existence of an army or an arms industry as such but in their nature and trend, in the objectives they serve. Evidently, there is no ending the use of the military machine to the detriment of the masses and of international security without bringing about radical political and economic changes. To eliminate this danger, it is necessary to remove agents of reaction and imperialism from power, to end their control of the armed forces and the arms industry, really to democratize society and nationalize the main resources of the state, including its entire defense potential.

In every country the struggle against using the military apparatus in the interests of domestic reaction and imperialism goes on according to the existing balance of forces and the peculiarities of development of army institutions and their industrial base. Many such peculiarities exist in Brazil.

A decade ago Brazil only had seven plants producing revolvers and explosives or repairing machines and instruments of foreign make. Today enterprises of the military-industrial system whose output ranges from firearms to combat aircraft directly employ over 100,000 workers, engineers and technicians. Their number is estimated at about 100; according to other sources, there are as many as 350 companies¹ belonging to this system directly or indirectly.

Brazil's plants supply the armed services with military hardware and materiel, meeting 60 per cent of their requirements.² By the end of 1981 arms production had reached \$2 billion, with Brazil becoming one of the eight major arms producers in the capitalist world.

Brazil's military-industrial system now earns a large amount of foreign exchange. Industrial exports in 1980 rose to \$10.8 billion, which included one billion dollars' worth of output for military purposes, or nearly one-tenth of the total.³ In 1981 export of military equipment increased by nearly half. This is a most impressive rate, particularly in view of an overall economic slump in Brazil due to the current cycli-

cal crisis of the world capitalist economy. The decrease in gross domestic product last year amounted to 3.5 per cent (or 5.8 per cent per capita)⁴ even according to official, over-optimistic data. There had been no such sharp decline for decades.

In this crisis situation the government set out to increase exports and limit imports. However, the sale of traditional commodities encountered obstacles hard to surmount. Economic strategists needed goods that would provide new outlets and open up dependable sales prospects. Arms turned out to be one of the most promising items. International tensions, local conflicts in various parts of the world and the desire of many developing countries to modernize their armed forces all held the promise of a large market.

This brought together the interests of the senior officers, who insisted on strengthening the industrial rear, the bourgeois state, which wanted to build up its military power while at the same time searching for ways of restoring the economic balance, and big national capital with its drive for profitable business.

Anyone who analyzes the formation and development of Brazilian military production will readily detect its varied links with foreign capital. Transnational arms manufacturers have a certain stake in the development of domestic arms industries. For them, arms production in our country is both a profitable investment sphere and a promising market. They also derive a great deal of profit by saving on wages. Besides, foreign monopolies search for opportunities to sell their models through Brazil, using the easy export terms offered by it.

It must be pointed out, however, that what characterizes the Brazilian arms industry is not so much the scope of its relations with foreign capital as their diversification, which, moreover, is much greater than in the civilian sector of the economy. A particularly noteworthy fact is that the range of relations with U.S. military-industrial companies is narrower than with West European monopolies. Why?

Washington hardly expected any serious differences with the ruling circles of the biggest South American country when, after the "Reds' general offensive" (as imperialist propaganda described the victory of the Cuban revolution and the subsequent upsurge in the liberation fight on the continent), the United States seemed to have stopped it by avenging itself in the April 1964 coup in Brazil. U.S. strategists operating through the CIA helped the extreme right wing of the Brazilian military gain control of the armed forces. After our country had been put into uniform, the White

House expected to see it in the role of obedient policeman. But to perform police functions, the regime had to have proper "truncheons." In view of the potential of Brazilian industry, Washington decided that it would be useful if arms production developed partly on the spot. It also calculated to settle various ticklish matters, such as indirect arms deliveries to countries where direct U.S. interference might have undesirable political repercussions or where the recipient preferred a "neutral" supplier. And needless to say, Washington expected U.S. companies to share in Brazilian military-industrial business and to control it directly or indirectly.

But with the passage of time, having strengthened their positions, Brazil's generals, who badly needed the backing of their northern patron in the early years after the coup, began to show "ingratitude." Their own interests made themselves felt more and more. Latent changes were under way in the ruling group as well. Inveterate anti-communists, outspoken advocates of a pro-U.S. orientation and rabid fascists lost ground; due to their "excesses," they no longer saw eye to eye with big Brazilian capital and discredited it on the world scene, which prevented it from gaining greater access to foreign markets. A moderate right nationalist trend, military pragmatism, won the upper hand. It was linked with the sectors of the domestic financial bourgeoisie that had entered into permanent relations with transnationals but were not directly associated with them. In turn, alliance with the military pragmatists gave Brazilian capital political strength and helped it assert itself.

The new leaders attached special importance to a strengthening of the state sector as the mainstay of "national security." By the mid-70s there was evidence of a policy of diversifying the economy and greater government control over business activity.

The tendency to increase the role of the state and the country's own industrial potential manifested itself before long in the military policy of Brazil. As far back as 1968, an attempt was made to substitute arms imports. The government proceeded to reproduce models purchased in the United States, in enterprises owned by war departments. However, imitating U.S. hardware proved to be too complicated a matter that did not pay. By the mid-70s the government had decided on maximum pooling of the resources of the state with those of private companies, which it began to draw into military production with due regard to their traditional specialization. This was preceded by a change toward diversifying arms imports

which the U.S. resented more and more. Washington had reason to assess the "deal of the century" worth about 12 billion marks — the 1975 agreement with West Germany on aid to Brazil in developing a nuclear power industry — as a challenge.

The Brazilian "policeman" whom the U.S. imperialists had been carefully grooming was getting out of hand. Mutual "grievances" accumulated and finally, during Carter's term in office, Washington decided to pull up the Brazilian generals short. Hoping to capitalize on its make-believe concern for "human rights," the White House called attention to their violations in Brazil. The Carter administration's real purpose was to show that the military government risked international isolation unless it behaved itself in regard to the United States. The show was staged in proper form, with Washington admonishing the gorillas and urging them to embellish the façade of their regime and, more important still, resume the role of submissive partner.

The U.S. government's demagogical declarations annoyed Brazil's generals, who in 1977 suspended relations with the Pentagon and abrogated the 1952 treaty on military cooperation. The Washington politicians, who had overrated their leverage in our country's ruling quarters, achieved the results they had expected least of all. The military production potential of Brazil was growing independently of the U.S., acquiring the qualities of a force by itself.

This year's Malvinas crisis laid bare the contradictions which had been accumulating for decades and which separate Latin America from the U.S. The crisis revealed, among other things, an objective trend in the shape of a serious discrepancy between the interests of some of the region's ruling regimes and those of the main imperialist centers, that is, showed once more what in the past had led to a cooling of U.S.-Brazilian relations.

Reagan's open support of the Thatcher government dissipated many an illusion. Those who still pinned hopes on U.S. patronage realized that the White House scorned its Latin American partners not only for selfish reasons but also when the interests of its close imperialist allies were affected. It transpired that Washington saw all mutual legal commitments as solely a one-sided duty of Latin Americans. Furthermore, the outcome of the Malvinas conflict made for the exposure of the strategic principles of "hemispheric defence" which U.S. imperialism had been foisting on the region for decades.

The thinking of the ruling circles of Brazil

and some other Latin American countries underwent a change calling, in effect, for new solutions that would be a departure from the earlier patterns of military solidarity among states of the Western hemisphere. This is why increasingly frequent appeals are heard in Latin America for the replacement of the "inter-American system," a product of the Rio de Janeiro Pact, by an "inter-Latin American system" excluding the United States. Initiatives of this nature are supported at the government level in many countries of the region.

The point at issue is not only military-political but also military-technological dependence. After all, the experience of the Argentine army, showed that any state depending on the U.S. or some other NATO country for its arms supply may find itself completely helpless when faced with an imperialist aggressor. Incidentally, this is an inevitable result of the entire system of military relations between the United States and Latin America. Both the arms deliveries and military training methods of this system gear the countries concerned to "anti-guerrilla" operations, to struggle against "subversion," that is, are aimed at assuring an order acceptable to Washington and not at defending national sovereignty. The concept itself is replaced in the recipes of the Pentagon strategists by the imperatives of "defense of the hemisphere," in which the U.S. armed forces are assigned the chief role while the Latin American military are expected to operate in a subordinate capacity, performing police functions.

After the Malvinas conflict the problem of restoring the natural and principal function of the army as defender of territorial integrity and national dignity and guarantor of national sovereignty confronted public opinion in Latin American countries. Those on the continent's political scene who declare for independent development of the national defense potential are much more numerous today. Expressing a point of view that is gaining ground, José Vicente Rangel, a progressive public figure of Venezuela, stressed that modernization of the armed forces "cannot be subordinated to imperial power centers either politically, logistically, technologically, or operationally, any more than in intelligence matters."⁵

Many Latin American politicians, both military men and civilian turn to the example of Brazil. Several possibilities are generally mentioned. First, they are discussing the need to diversify foreign sources of arms supply, often naming Brazil as an alternative supplier. Second, they call for the establishment of a modern

national arms industry. To be sure, not all countries and armies are equal to this task — far from it. A third possibility is seen, therefore, in the formation of joint Latin American military-industrial companies that could be based on the Brazilian and Argentine enterprises concerned.

The conclusions which bourgeois politicians and military leaders draw from the Malvinas crisis and, in this connection, from the Brazilian example are an important sign of change in the traditional approach to defense problems. But these conclusions are certainly no novelty in themselves. The communists have long since exposed the conversion of the army into a tool of imperialist forces. Today, when there is talk about modernizing it on the basis of the country's own military-industrial potential, they do not at all regard such a choice as definitive; they probe deeper into the matter, realistically weighing the likely results. Indeed, an arms industry such as Brazil's, is a great force. It diverts huge resources needed for the solution of urgent social and economic problems, particularly for a higher standard of living for the masses. Nor is it clear which way this force would turn, whom it would side with. Would it help consolidate national sovereignty and resist imperialist diktat, or submit to the strategic interests of U.S. imperialism and, in a different situation, give in to the reckless, expansionist ambitions of domestic reaction?

Of course, the growth of military production in Brazil is stimulated by factors usual in bourgeois society. Capital always rushes where it is attracted by the prospect of making maximum profit. It is also clear that capital does not care about moral considerations or patriotic principles.

The military-industrial sector is a supporting factor for those in power. It guarantees the monopoly upper stratum involved in arms production a heavy flow of profits, and the state, the means needed to stop various holes in a national economy battered by the waves of a crisis. But this exacts a high social price. Taxes levied on the working people are used unproductively for military purposes while millions of people live in poverty and starve. Brazilian arms add fuel to the fire in hot spots of the planet and are used by the fascist-like Pinochet and Stroessner dictatorships to preserve their regimes and subdue the protesting masses.

It is essential to remember, however, that we are discussing the arms industry in a country still being relegated to the periphery of the world capitalist economy and situated in the area of the traditional military strategic hegemony of the United States. Brazil is

exploited on a large scale by foreign capital, nor is it free from bonds tying its economy to imperialist centers. These objective conditions have told, as they were bound to, on the formation of its military-industrial system, breeding complex contradictions. Although it had begun to develop according to the functions of a dependent executor of the imperial will, military production in Brazil has outgrown this framework. It is easing the country's military and military-technological dependence, becoming in some cases a competitor of the imperialist powers' traditional manufacturers and exporters of arms.

Significantly, this is taking place in the context of political changes. Throughout the past years Brazil has been the scene of an *apertura*, with valves opening to let off the "steam" of social tensions. But at the same time there are real changes. The country has gone over from an omnipotent and terroristic military dictatorship to a regime of "limited democracy." Some constitutional rights have been restored and legal provisions once used as an authorization of repression and particularly hateful to the people have been repealed. This is a result of the change in the balance of class and political forces that has occurred in the course of the country's social and economic development and of the mounting struggle of the masses. The nationalist section of the military and bourgeois groups allied with them — those who hold the levers of power — have departed from the concepts of "ideological frontiers" and blind anti-communism in favor of the principles of "responsible pragmatism," and try to take account of realities both at home and abroad. But favorable changes are rather more detectable in foreign policy, a sphere in which the interests of the ruling circles of Brazil, now aware of their own strength, often clash with the interests of Washington.

Brazil was the first non-socialist country to recognize the people's government of Angola and to render economic assistance to independent Mozambique. It supports the rights of the Palestinian people and condemns Israel's policy of aggression. When the people's war broke out in Nicaragua, the Figueiredo government backed the anti-dictatorial forces of that country. The Brazilian government rejected Washington's plan for the formation of an aggressive South Atlantic bloc and expressed its solidarity with Argentina during the Malvinas crisis. Fruitful ties between Brazil and socialist countries have been developing in the recent period. In this respect, too, Brazil is moving away from Washington's designs. Economic relations with the Soviet Union have

reached an unprecedented high. Intergovernmental agreements provide for increasing bilateral trade to \$1 billion in 1982, doubling it compared to 1981.

However, Brazilian progressive opinion knows that while the influence of extreme reactionary groups in the army has been curbed, it has by no means been eliminated. These groups have succeeded those who were the strike force of the 1964 coup that nullified the people's democratic gains. Besides, it would be wrong to ignore the dangerous expansionist aspirations of part of the Brazilian financial oligarchy. And it would be naive to imagine that U.S. imperialism will reconcile itself to Brazil's military-industrial potential playing an independent role. Washington proceeds and will proceed in a way enabling it in the new situation to involve Brazil in its strategic system. Democrats are well aware of the danger of a distortion of the aims of defending national sovereignty, the danger of a stepped-up arms race in the interest of the monopolies.

This is why the anti-imperialist movement and mass actions for the complete democratization of society are also the chief requisite of suppressing dangerous trends in the Brazilian economy. Our people believe that the crucial

problems of national life are intimately linked with the issue of war and peace. The country must win independence from U.S. imperialism in the military sphere as well. But the masses do not want the interests of the arms business to overshadow the fundamental problems of the nation or bring misfortune to other nations.

The progressive forces of Brazil see their duty in mobilizing public opinion against militarist aspirations among the country's leadership, protecting the army against the corrupting influence of imperialist centers and maintaining its national character. It is important to ensure that the country's armed forces and industrial potential serve to strengthen sovereignty and not to suppress the people and that they never pose a threat to peace. People in Brazil remember that the paramount task of humanity is to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and bring about general disarmament.

Abridged

1. See "America Latina. Informe politico." May 28, 1982, p. 083.
2. "America Latina. Informe politico." May 28, 1982, p. 083.
3. *Exame*, November 4, 1981, p. 42.
4. *Exame*, March 10, 1982, p. 24.
5. *Tribuna Popular*, May 28-June 3, 1982.

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

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Canada and U.S., \$12.50 a year. Institutions, double rate.

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

tuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Turkish and Vietnamese.

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

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

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

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



Editions of the journal

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH:

Central Books Limited,
14 The Leathermarket,
London, SE1 3ER, England
Progress Subscription Service,
71 Bathurst Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6, Canada

Imported Publications,
320 West Ohio Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA

New Horizon Publications,
P.O. Box 2165
Mushin, Lagos, Nigeria

FRENCH EDITIONS:

Coopérative Ouvrière de Presse et d'Éditions,
16, rue Christoph Plantin,
Luxembourg/Gasperich

Société Populaire d'Éditions,
rue de la Caserne, 33-35
1000 Bruxelles, Belgique

Éditions Nouvelles Frontières,
185, rue Ontario est,
Montréal, Québec H2X 1H5, Canada

Gestu BP 2678

Dacar, Senegal

AMHARIC EDITION:

Press Department
Ministry of Information and
National Guidance
P.O. Box 30232
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ARABIC EDITIONS:

Al-Wokt, POB 6247,
Beyrouth, Liban
32, rue Ledru Rollin B.P. 152
Casablanca, Maroc
Dar Al-Hilal
16 Mohamed Ezz-Arab Street
Cairo, Egypt

BULGARIAN EDITION: Hemus,
Russki 6, Sofia, Bulgaria

CZECH EDITION: Artia,
Praha 1, Ve smeckach, 30, CSSR

DANISH EDITION: Förlaget Tiden,
Bredgade 37, 1260 København K, Denmark

FINNISH EDITION: Aikakauslehti Kommunisti,
Kotkankatu, 11, 00510 Helsinki 51, Finland

GERMAN EDITIONS:

Buchexport Volkseigener Aussenhandelsbetrieb
der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,
701 Leipzig, Leninstrasse 16, DDR
Brücken-Verlag GmbH Literatur-Vertrieb,
Export-Import, 4000 Düsseldorf,
Ackerstrasse 3, FRG

GREEK EDITIONS:

Papayannis Stephanos,
Menandru 66, Athens, Greece

People's Agency
Tricouppis 53c, Nicosia, Cyprus

HEBREW EDITION: Problems of Peace
and Socialism, POB 9525, Haifa, Israel

HUNGARIAN EDITION: Kultura,
Könyv-és Hírlap, Külkereskedelmi-
Vállalat, Budapest 1, fő u 32, Hungary

INDIAN EDITIONS:

Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055, India.
In: Bengali, Hindi, Malayalam, Oriya, English,
Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati and Telugu

ITALIAN EDITION: Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe, Oscure 4,
001 86 Roma, Italia

MONGOLIAN EDITION: Ulaanbaatar Mongol,
Ulsyn Nomyn, Khudaldaany Gazar,
V.I. Lenin gudamzh 1, Mongolia

NORWEGIAN EDITION: Verden og vi,
Boks 3715, GB Oslo 1, Norway

PERSIAN EDITIONS: P.B. 49034,
10028 Stockholm 49, Sweden

16 Azar Ave.
No. 68, Tehran, Iran

POLISH EDITION: RSW "Prasa-
Ksiazka-Ruch", BKWZ Warszawa,
ul Towarowa 28, Poland

PORTUGUESE EDITION: Revista Internacional,
Av. Santos Dumont, 57,
30 Lisboa-1, Portugal

ROMANIAN EDITION: Ilexim,
Calea Grivitei 64-66,
POB 2001, Bucuresti, Romania

RUSSIAN EDITION: Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga,
Moskva 121200, USSR

SINHALESE EDITION: 91 Cotta Road,
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

SPANISH EDITIONS:

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Aéreo 1253, Bogotá, Colombia
Revista Internacional,
Apartado 4665, San José, Costa Rica
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
16 616 Praha 6, Thakurova 3, CSSR
Ediciones Cubanas,
Ministerio de la Cultura,
La Habana, Cuba

Empresa Editora e Importadora C.A.,
Villami 211 y Calderon,
Casilla 6217, Guayaquil, Ecuador
Ediciones de Cultura Popular S.A.,
Filosofia y Letras 34,
Col. Copilco Universidad,
Mexico 20, D.F., Mexico

Revista Internacional,
Calle 46, Este No. 16,
Panama, Rep. de Panama
Ideologia Y Politica,
Jr. Rufino Torrico No. 671-Of. 401,
Lima, Peru

San Pedro a San Francisquito,
Edif. Cantaciaro, 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

